



The prevalence of victimization and polyvictimization in sexual minority adolescents in Spain

Noemí Pereda ^{a,b,*}, Alba Águila-Otero ^{a,c}, Varinia Leiva ^d

^a Research Group on Child and Adolescent Victimization (GReVIA), University of Barcelona, Spain

^b Institute of Neurosciences (UBNeuro), University of Barcelona, Spain

^c Faculty of Psychology, University of Oviedo, Spain

^d Faculty of Medicine, University of Concepción, Chile

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Sexual minority

Youth

LGB

Polyvictimization

Spain

ABSTRACT

Background: Sexual minority youth are particularly vulnerable to victimization and polyvictimization.

Objective: This study aimed to investigate the prevalence of victimization and polyvictimization over the past year among secondary school students in Spain who identify as sexual minorities, and analyze differences based on gender and ethnicity.

Participants and setting: In a sample of 4024 adolescents ($M = 15.52$, $SD = 0.99$), 13.9 % ($n = 559$) of participants self-identified as belonging to a sexual minority (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, or other (LGB)). The gender distribution indicated that 23.3 % of participants self-identified as boys, 66.7 % as girls, 4.8 % as having non-conforming gender identities, and 5.2 % preferred not to respond. Most participants identified as European ethnicity (81.4 %), while 18.6 % identified as minority ethnic groups.

Methods: An adapted version of the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ) was used incorporating additional questions on sexual exploitation and online victimization.

Results: 74.1 % of LGB youth reported experiencing at least one form of victimization. Caregiver victimization was reported by 43.5 % and electronic victimization by 42.9 % of participants. Gender differences were observed, with individuals identifying as non-conforming reporting notably high prevalence rates. Ethnic differences were also found, with minorities reporting higher prevalence rates in several victimization experiences. The mean number of victimizations was 4.6 ($SD = 3.7$). Overall, 32.4 % of youth were classified as polyvictims.

Conclusions: Given the high prevalence of victimization and polyvictimization among LGB youth, and its intersection with gender and ethnic minorities, the findings underscore the importance of developing prevention programs tailored to address the unique needs and vulnerabilities of this population.

Sexual minority individuals (including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and other sexual orientations) face an elevated risk of discrimination and victimization (Katz-Wise & Hyde, 2012). Interpersonal victimization is a unique type of adverse life experience that differs from other events, in so far as it involves harm inflicted on individuals by other people acting in ways that

* Corresponding author at: Departament de Psicologia Clínica i Psicobiologia, Universitat de Barcelona, Passeig Vall d'Hebron, 171, 08035 Barcelona, Spain.

E-mail address: npereda@ub.edu (N. Pereda).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2025.107505>

Received 19 July 2024; Received in revised form 28 April 2025; Accepted 12 May 2025

Available online 22 May 2025

0145-2134/© 2025 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

breach social norms. The human agency and the violation of social norms are elements that increase the potential for traumatic impact (Finkelhor, 2007).

1. Victimization in sexual minority youth

Sexual minority adolescents are at increased risk of experiencing higher levels of victimization compared to their heterosexual peers (Toomey & Russell, 2016). School bullying is particularly prevalent among youths from sexual minority groups (Fedewa & Ahn, 2011; Webb et al., 2021). In addition to bullying, these adolescents are more likely to endure physical assaults at school and to miss school due to feeling unsafe or fearful of victimization (Friedman et al., 2011). A study across Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Peru, Paraguay, and Colombia revealed that 67 % of youths felt unsafe at school due to their sexual orientation or gender identity (Kosciw & Zongrone, 2019).

The scant available research on cyberbullying in sexual minority youths shows that this group is at a higher risk of victimization when compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Abreu & Kenny, 2018). There is a significant contrast in rates of severe bullying between heterosexual (9 %) and non-heterosexual (25 %) youths, as well as severe cyberbullying between heterosexual (6 %) and non-heterosexual (14 %) youths in Spain (Garaigordobil & Larrain, 2020). Sexual orientation has also been shown to be a relevant risk factor for experiencing multiple forms of bullying and cyberbullying (Elipse et al., 2018).

Sexual minority youths who report both offline and electronic bullying are more likely to reside in neighborhoods characterized by elevated rates of hate crimes against sexual minorities (Hatzenbuehler et al., 2015). Thus, violence against sexual minority youths does not appear to be limited to bullying victimization, and emerging evidence also suggests occurrences of hate crimes against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) adolescents. The National Crime Victimization Survey in the US between 2017 and 2019 indicates that LGBT youths are almost 6 times more vulnerable to violent crimes than their non-LGBT counterparts. Moreover, approximately 9.2 % of all violent victimizations against LGBT individuals were categorized as hate crimes, compared to 4.1 % for non-LGBT victims (Flores et al., 2022).

Research on other victimization experiences among sexual minority youths shows that they also tend to experience dating violence victimization more frequently than their heterosexual counterparts (Martin-Storey, 2015). A study analyzing the data from the Youth Risk Behaviors Survey from 2001 to 2011 (Luo et al., 2014) showed that sexual minority youths have significantly increased odds of physical dating violence victimization compared with non-sexual minority youths. Lesbian/gay youths reported a last-year prevalence of physical dating violence victimization of 24.6 %, and bisexual youths reported a prevalence of 21.5 %, whereas non-sexual minority youths reported a prevalence of 10.7 %. Results from the Youth Risk Behaviors Survey in 2019 also indicated that sexual minority youths were significantly more likely than heterosexual youths to experience sexual violence (22.3 % vs. 9.1 %), sexual dating violence (16.3 % vs. 6.4 %), and forced sexual intercourse (17.6 % vs. 5.9 %) (Williams & Gutierrez, 2022). Another study conducted with youths from the US showed that LGB youths reported higher rates of physical dating violence (43 %), psychological dating abuse (59 %), cyber dating abuse (37 %), and sexual coercion (23 %) than did heterosexual youths, who reported rates of 29 %, 46 %, 26 %, and 12 %, respectively (Dank et al., 2014). Similarly, a longitudinal study across a 5-year period by Whitton et al. (2019) found that 45.2 % of sexual minority youths were physically abused and 16.9 % were sexually victimized by a dating partner during the study.

Sexual minority youths also seem to be particularly at risk for sexual violence. The National Teen Health and Technology study (Mitchell et al., 2014) showed that lesbian/queer girls reported the highest rates of past year sexual harassment (72 %), followed by bisexual girls (66 %) and gay/queer boys (66 %), while heterosexual boys reported the lowest rate (23 %). Similarly, Atteberry-Ash et al. (2020) found that the risk of experiencing sexual violence in sexual minority youths was tenfold higher than in heterosexual youths. Compared with sexual nonminority adolescents, sexual minority adolescents were on average 3.8 times more likely to report childhood sexual abuse in the review of school-based studies by Friedman et al. (2011). A meta-analysis found that experiences of sexual abuse are very prevalent in sexual minority youths, approaching 30 % (Jonas et al., 2022).

Physical abuse by caregivers is also more prevalent among sexual minority youths (Brangwin et al., 2023). A meta-analysis of adolescent school-based studies by Friedman et al. (2011) showed that compared with sexual nonminority adolescents, sexual minority adolescents were on average 1.3 times more likely to report parental physical abuse. The mean of the absolute prevalence for parental physical abuse was 33.4 % for bisexual females, 31.2 % for lesbian females, and 18.4 % for heterosexual females. The mean of the absolute prevalence was 24.2 % for bisexual males, 18.5 % for gay males, and 11.4 % for heterosexual males. Abuse by caregivers extends beyond physical violence, with rates of emotional abuse consistently higher for sexual minority youths than for their heterosexual peers. Emotional neglect (58 %) and emotional abuse (56 %) seem to be especially prevalent in sexual minority youths (Craig et al., 2020). This trend extends to sibling abuse, aggression, and exposure to domestic violence (McGeough & Sterzing, 2018). The study by Sterzing et al. (2016) showed that a sizeable percentage of sexual minority youths reported moderate to extreme emotional abuse (46 %), physical abuse (34 %), sexual abuse (32 %), emotional neglect (28 %), and physical neglect (26 %) by their parents or caregivers.

2. Polyvictimization in sexual minority adolescents

Sexual minority youth continue to navigate hostile and stressful social environments, growing up in cultures that often lack support or recognition of their gender differences. These environments foster stigma, prejudice, and discrimination, as well as frequent gender-related motivations for various forms of violence (Testa et al., 2012). Compared to their heterosexual peers, sexual minority youth are more likely to fall into profiles marked by polyvictimization, involving the experience of multiple forms of victimization (Baams, 2018).

In a study by [Craig et al. \(2020\)](#), 43 % of sexual minority youth reported experiencing four or more adverse childhood experiences, indicating a high level of trauma exposure. [Mitchell et al. \(2023\)](#) found that among US youth aged 14–15, 13 % of sexual minority girls were classified as polyvictims, compared to 8 % of heterosexual girls. Similarly, 9 % of sexual minority boys, compared to 5 % of heterosexual boys, were categorized as polyvictims.

Given that prior research has shown that total exposure to violence is a strong predictor of mental health and somatic outcomes in gender minority adolescents ([Sterzing et al., 2019](#)), studying polyvictimization in this population is highly relevant.

3. Aim of the study

As outlined above, peer victimization and school violence are serious problems reported by sexual minority youths ([Myers et al., 2020](#)). However, there is evidence suggesting that other forms of victimization are also highly prevalent in this group (i.e., sexual exploitation, [Mazursky & Nadan, 2024](#)), even though fewer studies have delved into this aspect. Additionally, studies based on intersectionality have found within-group variation in victimization among sexual minorities, based on gender, ethnic, or social groups of historical vulnerability ([Angoff & Barnhart, 2021](#)). There is growing recognition that sexual minority youths constitute a heterogeneous group, and that investigations should focus on exploring both similarities and differences within sexual minority populations, rather than solely comparing them to heterosexual individuals ([Alvy et al., 2013](#)).

Therefore, the purpose of the current study was to examine the prevalence of multiple forms of victimization among sexual minorities in a representative sample of secondary school students in Spain. It should be noted that although Spain is ranked among the top five European nations that support LGBTQ+ rights (International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans & Intersex Association, [ILGA Europe, 2023](#)), sexual minority individuals in Spain continue to experience systemic and persistent forms of discrimination ([Mondolfi et al., 2024](#)). Given the limited research to date, Spain lacks a clear picture of the diversity and extent of victimization experiences against LGB adolescents. Moreover, the second objective of this study was to ascertain the prevalence of polyvictimization among sexual minority youths, as few studies have provided estimates on the accumulation of victimization experiences among LGB youths ([Mitchell et al., 2023](#)). In addition, conclusive results on gender differences regarding victimization in sexual minority youths are lacking. Findings from intersectional analyses show within-group variation in bullying victimization across sexual orientation based on gender ([Angoff & Barnhart, 2021](#)). Some studies have indicated that the risks associated with sexual minority status are elevated for male youths ([Levine & Button, 2022](#)). On the contrary, others found that females had the highest odds of victimization ([Semprevivo, 2021](#)). Although there are few studies in Europe that have analyzed the role of ethnicity, minority stress theory ([Meyer, 2003](#)) confirms an increased risk of victimization associated with this variable. Thus, the last objective was to understand the intersections between self-identified gender and ethnicity on the victimization of sexual minority youths.

4. Methods

4.1. Procedure

A randomized representative sample of secondary school-aged students in Spain was surveyed about victimization and offending behaviors. Stratified random sampling was employed based on academic year and gender. Data were collected from September 2022 until June 2023 in 70 secondary schools in Spain. Schools were contacted via phone and email. Upon obtaining permission from the school administration, information about the project was shared with the tutors of randomly selected groups. Tutors were briefed on the project and guided on managing potential emotional reactions in the classroom through a concise explanatory video. A video explaining the voluntary nature of participation, the anonymity of collected data, and the study's objectives was also made available to potential participants. After the video, the adolescents who were willing to participate signed an informed consent document before completing the questionnaire. Surveys were administered online through a secure platform. Upon completion, participants were provided with information specifying the contact details of the child protection resources that exist at the national level and in their specific region, as recommended by international standards ([UNICEF, 2012](#)). Ethical approval for the research was obtained from the Bioethics Commission at the University of Barcelona (blinded for review).

4.2. Participants

The analytic sample included sexual minority adolescents ($n = 559$) between 14 and 17 years old ($M = 15.52$, $SD = 0.99$) attending secondary school centers in Spain. We collected a non-probabilistic unweighted sample of 4319 students but excluded those who did not fall into the target age range, had missing responses to our dependent variable, or who may have given incorrect information because they presented unusual or incoherent responses ($n = 295$, 6.8 %). We then selected only participants who self-identified as belonging to a sexual minority based on their sexual orientation (i.e., gay, lesbian, bisexual, or other), who accounted for 13.9 % of the total sample ($n = 559$).

4.3. Measures

4.3.1. Sociodemographic characteristics

Five multiple-choice questions regarding personal information from the participant covering aspects such as gender, sexual orientation, age, country of birth, ethnic or racial group, were included. These questions were created ad hoc for the purposes of the

study. Participants were allowed to select all the ethnic groups they identified with. However, due to the diversity of responses, we categorized the data into two broader groups: “European” and “Minority” (including Others/Mixed Ethnicities) to simplify the analysis and enable meaningful comparisons between groups.

4.3.2. Victimization

An adaptation of the Spanish version of the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ) (Pereda et al., 2018) was used. Several questions on child and adolescent sexual exploitation, covering both offline and online behaviors (Averdijk et al., 2020; Fredlund et al., 2013), were added to the original instrument due to their social relevance and the lack of prevalence studies on this problem in Spain. Additionally, to capture updated experiences of online victimization, questions from the Juvenile Victimization through the Internet and/or Mobile Phone Questionnaire (JOV-Q) by Montiel and Carbonell (2012) were included. The final questionnaire comprised 32 items, which assessed 8 different forms of victimization, organized into modules: (a) *conventional crimes* (3 items related to robbery, kidnapping, hate crimes); (b) *victimization by caregivers* (4 items including physical abuse, emotional abuse, physical neglect, and parental abduction); (c) *peer victimization* (4 items evaluating physical aggression, physical bullying, verbal/emotional aggression, and verbal/emotional bullying); (d) *dating violence* (3 items assessing physical, sexual, and control violence in dating relationships); (e) *sexual victimization* (4 items related to sexual violence with physical contact by known and unknown adults; and 4 items related to sexual violence with physical contact by peers of similar age to the victim, known and unknown); (f) and *sexual exploitation* (3 items asking about sexual victimization, with and without physical contact, in exchange for money, alcohol or drugs, or some gift); (g) *exposure to domestic violence* (3 items including physical and verbal/emotional violence between parents, physical violence from parents to siblings, and physical violence to grandparents); and (h) *electronic victimization* (4 items referring to victimization by online harassment, sexual solicitations, online grooming, and hate speech).

4.4. Analytical strategy

The prevalence of various forms of past year victimization was obtained. Polyvictimization was quantified by summing the total number of different types of victimization (out of 32) experienced by each participant (Finkelhor et al., 2005) during the past year. Additionally, past year polyvictims were identified as the one-above-the-mean number of victimizations in the victims’ group (Segura et al., 2020). When comparing binary gender (masculine vs feminine) chi-square analyses were performed and the Odds Ratio (OR) was computed in order to quantify the association between gender and victimization rates. The OR measure was considered statistically significant when its 95 % CI did not include 1. In cases where expected cell frequencies were below 5, Fisher’s exact test was preferred over the chi-square test, as it provides more accurate results under these conditions to indicate the significance of the test. Moreover, participants who identified as gender non-conforming were included in a descriptive analysis, but not in the comparative analysis, due to the size of the group.

Table 1
Sample characteristics.

	Total	
	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	130	23.3
Female	373	66.7
Non-conforming	27	4.8
Don’t know/no response	29	5.2
Age		
14–15	279	49.9
16–17	280	50.1
Sexual orientation		
Lesbian or gay	115	20.6
Bisexual	380	68
Other	64	11.4
Ethnic group ^a		
European	455	81.4
Minority	104	18.6

^a Ethnic group that youths identify as belonging to: European or another ethnic group or mixed ethnic group.

5. Results

5.1. Sociodemographic

With regard to gender distribution, 23.3 % of participants identified as males, 66.7 % as females, 4.8 % as gender non-conforming, and 5.2 % preferred not to disclose their gender. Most of the participants belonged to European ethnic groups (81.4 %). In terms of sexual orientation, 81.5 % ($n = 304$) of girls identified as bisexual, 12.6 % ($n = 47$) as lesbian, and 5.9 % ($n = 22$) with another sexual orientation. Among boys, 42.3 % ($n = 55$) identified as bisexual, 40 % ($n = 52$) as gay, and 17.7 % ($n = 23$) as having another sexual orientation. Among individuals identifying as non-conforming, 40.7 % ($n = 11$) identified as bisexual, 14.8 % ($n = 4$) as homosexual, and 44.4 % ($n = 12$) reported having another sexual orientation (Table 1).

5.2. Prevalence of past year victimization

Among the 559 sexual minority participants, a total of 74.1 % ($n = 414$) reported experiencing at least one victimization in the past year. Specifically, 69.2 % of self-identified males ($n = 90$), 74.3 % of self-identified females ($n = 277$), 88.9 % of individuals identifying as gender non-conforming ($n = 24$), and 79.3 % ($n = 23$) of those who preferred not to indicate their gender reported experiencing some form of victimization within the last year.

The prevalence of various forms of victimization during the past year is presented in Table 2, categorized by modules and individual events.

5.2.1. Conventional crime

Within the sexual minority sample, 31.5 % of adolescents reported experiencing some form of conventional crime in the past year. Significant differences between males (36.9 %) and females (26.5 %) were found in this victimization category. In addition, individuals with non-conforming gender identities reported a notably high prevalence of 55.6 % for this type of victimization. Among conventional crimes, hate crimes emerged as the most common form of victimization, with 24.7 % of participants reporting incidents. Notably, self-identified males reported a higher prevalence of this specific form of victimization (30 %) compared to females (20.1 %). Individuals with non-conforming gender identities reported a substantially high rate of hate crime victimization (44.4 %). Regarding the ethnic group, ethnic minority adolescents reported significantly more conventional crimes in general (43.3 %) in comparison with European adolescents (28.8 %), including more robberies (18.3 %) and hate crime (37.5 %), being three times more likely to experience this victimization than their European peers.

5.2.2. Caregiver victimization

A total of 43.5 % of the entire sample reported experiencing victimization at the hands of caregivers. Individuals identifying with non-conforming gender identities showed a notably high prevalence of victimization (55.6 %). Physical neglect was significantly more frequent among females (8.9 %) than males (3.1 %), i.e., practically three times higher. Parental abduction was more commonly reported by ethnic minority adolescents (13.5 %) compared to their European counterparts (4.2 %), with an OR higher than 3. Similarly, neglect was also more frequent in the ethnic minority group (15.5 % vs. 7.3 %), with an OR of 2.

5.2.3. Peer victimization

Among youths, 34.5 % reported experiencing peer victimization, with verbal and emotional aggression being the most common form (28.6 %). As shown in Table 2, no significant difference was found between gender or ethnic groups. Individuals with non-conforming gender identities reported the highest prevalence rate, with 48.3 % of them reporting victimization.

5.2.4. Dating violence

A total of 22.9 % of participants reported experiencing dating violence in the past year, with a higher prevalence in self-identified females (26 %) compared to males (14.6 %). Participants with non-conforming gender identities reported a prevalence of 22.2 % for this type of violence. Control violence was also significantly more prevalent among females (18.8 %), who were twice as likely to experience this form of victimization compared to males (9.2 %). Physical violence was more frequently reported by ethnic minority adolescents (9.7 %) compared to European adolescents (4.2 %), with ethnic minority youth facing nearly three times the risk of this type of violence.

5.2.5. Sexual victimization

Seventeen percent of sexual minority adolescents reported experiencing sexual victimization, with no significant gender differences. However, individuals with non-conforming gender identities showed a notably high prevalence of sexual victimization (29.6 %). Females were more likely to report sexual touching by unknown adults (5.4 %) compared to males (0.8 %), with an OR of 7 for this type of sexual violence. Conversely, males were significantly more likely to experience oral sex and/or intercourse by a known adult (3.8 %) compared to females (0.5 %). Regarding ethnic differences, non-European adolescents reported higher rates of sexual touching by known adults (8.7 %), oral sex and/or intercourse by an unknown adult (2.9 %), by known peers (6.7 %) and by unknown peers (5.8 %). The findings indicated that non-European adolescents are three to six times more likely to experience these forms of victimization than their European counterparts.

Table 2

Victimization experiences in sexual minority youth in the last 12 months.

	Total (n = 559) n (%)	Gender n (%)			Non-conforming (n = 27)	Ethnic group n (%)		
		Males (n = 130)	Females (n = 373)	OR [IC]		European (n = 455)	Minority (n = 104)	OR [IC]
Conventional crimes	176 (31.5)	48 (36.9)	99 (26.5)	0.6* [0.40–0.94]	15 (55.6)	131 (28.8)	45 (43.3)	1.88** [1.22–2.92]
Robbery	60 (10.7)	13 (10)	35 (9.4)	0.93 [0.48–1.82]	7 (25.9)	41 (9)	19 (18.3)	2.26** [1.25–4.08]
Kidnapping	34 (6.1)	7 (5.4)	17 (4.6)	0.84 [0.34–2.07]	4 (14.8)	24 (5.3)	10 (9.6)	1.91 [0.88–4.13]
Hate crime	138 (24.7)	39 (30)	75 (20.1)	0.59* [0.39–0.92]	12 (44.4)	99 (21.8)	39 (37.5)	2.16*** [1.37–3.40]
Caregiver victimization	243 (43.5)	50 (38.5)	164 (44)	1.26 [0.84–1.88]	15 (55.6)	188 (41.3)	55 (52.9)	1.29 [1.04–2.45]
Physical abuse	84 (15)	16 (12.3)	52 (13.9)	1.15 [0.63–2.10]	6 (22.2)	65 (14.3)	19 (18.3)	1.34 [0.76–2.35]
Emotional abuse	220 (39.4)	46 (35.4)	150 (40.2)	1.23 [0.81–1.86]	12 (44.4)	173 (38)	47 (45.2)	1.34 [0.87–2.07]
Physical neglect	49 (8.8)	4 (3.1)	33 (8.9)	3.06* [1.07–8.83]	7 (25.9)	33 (7.3)	16 (15.5)	2.35** [1.24–4.46]
Parental abduction	33 (5.9)	6 (4.6)	22 (5.9)	1.30 [0.51–3.27]	4 (14.8)	19 (4.2)	14 (13.5)	3.57*** [1.73–7.38]
Peer victimization	193 (34.5)	40 (30.8)	126 (33.8)	1.15 [0.75–1.76]	14 (48.3)	156 (34.3)	37 (35.6)	1.06 [0.68–1.65]
Physical aggression	70 (12.5)	17 (13.1)	40 (10.7)	0.80 [0.44–1.46]	5 (18.5)	55 (12.1)	15 (14.4)	1.23 [0.66–2.27]
Physical bullying	18 (3.2)	2 (1.5)	11 (2.9)	3.06 [0.60–15.65]	1 (3.7)	13 (2.86)	5 (4.8)	1.67 [0.47–5.88]
Verbal/emotional aggression	160 (28.6)	29 (22.3)	109 (29.2)	1.44 [0.90–2.30]	13 (48.1)	132 (29)	28 (26.9)	0.90 [0.56–1.45]
Verbal/emotional bullying	78 (14)	15 (11.5)	51 (13.7)	0.87 [0.38–1.97]	8 (29.6)	62 (13.6)	16 (15.4)	1.57 [0.68–3.65]
Dating violence	128 (22.9)	19 (14.6)	97 (26)	2.05** [1.20–3.52]	6 (22.2)	99 (21.8)	29 (27.9)	1.39 [0.86–2.25]
Physical violence	37 (6.6)	8 (6.2)	24 (6.4)	1.05 [0.46–2.40]	3 (11.1)	23 (5.1)	14 (13.5)	2.92** [1.44–5.88]
Sexual violence	60 (10.7)	11 (8.5)	43 (11.5)	1.41 [0.70–2.82]	3 (11.1)	48 (10.5)	12 (11.5)	1.11 [0.57–2.17]
Control violence	88 (15.7)	12 (9.2)	70 (18.8)	2.27* [1.19–4.34]	1 (3.7)	68 (14.9)	20 (19.2)	1.36 [0.78–2.35]
Sexual victimization	95 (17.0)	16 (12.3)	64 (17.2)	1.48 [0.82–2.66]	8 (29.6)	72 (15.8)	23 (22.1)	1.51 [0.89–2.56]
Sexual touching by a known adult	22 (3.9)	5 (3.8)	12 (3.2)	0.83 [0.28–2.41]	2 (7.4)	13 (2.9)	9 (8.7)	3.22** [1.34–7.75]
Oral sex and/or intercourse by a known adult	8 (1.4)	5 (3.8)	2 (0.5)	0.14** [0.03–0.70]	0 (0)	5 (1.1)	3 (2.9)	2.67 [0.63–11.37]
Sexual touching by an unknown adult	25 (4.5)	1 (0.8)	20 (5.4)	7.31* [0.97–55.01]	2 (7.4)	17 (3.7)	8 (7.7)	2.15 [0.9–5.12]
Oral sex and/or intercourse by an unknown adult	5 (0.9)	1 (0.8)	2 (0.5)	0.70 [0.06–7.73]	0 (0)	2 (0.4)	3 (2.9)	6.73* [1.10–40.79]
Sexual touching by a known peer	53 (9.5)	11 (8.5)	34 (9.1)	1.08 [0.53–2.21]	3 (11.1)	43 (9.5)	10 (9.6)	1.02 [0.49–2.10]
Oral sex and/or intercourse by a known peer	16 (2.9)	3 (2.3)	11 (2.9)	1.29 [0.35–4.69]	2 (7.4)	9 (2)	7 (6.7)	3.58** [1.30–9.84]
Sexual touching by an unknown peer	40 (7.2)	4 (3.1)	29 (7.8)	2.66 [0.92–7.70]	2 (7.4)	30 (6.6)	10 (9.6)	1.51 [0.71–3.19]
Oral sex and/or intercourse by an unknown peer	10 (1.8)	1 (0.8)	5 (1.3)	1.75 [0.2–15.14]	1 (3.7)	4 (0.9)	6 (5.8)	6.9*** [1.91–24.92]
Sexual exploitation	31 (5.5)	7 (5.4)	15 (4)	0.74 [0.29–1.85]	4 (14.8)	20 (4.4)	11 (10.6)	2.57* [1.19–5.55]
Sexual material in exchange for money, alcohol or drugs, or some gift	21 (3.8)	4 (3.1)	11 (2.9)	0.96 [0.30–3.06]	3 (11.1)	14 (3.1)	7 (6.7)	2.27 [0.59–5.78]
Sexual touching in exchange for money, alcohol or drugs, or some gift	9 (1.6)	2 (1.5)	4 (1.1)	0.69 [0.13–3.83]	0 (0)	6 (1.3)	3 (2.9)	2.22 [0.55–9.04]
Oral sex and/or intercourse in exchange for money,	7 (1.3)	2 (1.5)	1 (0.3)	0.17 [0.15–1.91]	2 (7.4)	4 (0.9)	3 (2.9)	3.35 [0.74–15.20]

(continued on next page)

Table 2 (continued)

	Total (n = 559) n (%)	Gender n (%)		OR [IC]	Non-conforming (n = 27)	Ethnic group n (%)		
		Males (n = 130)	Females (n = 373)			European (n = 455)	Minority (n = 104)	OR [IC]
alcohol or drugs, or some gift								
Exposure to domestic violence	160 (28.6)	28 (21.5)	113 (30.3)	1.58** [0.99–2.54]	8 (29.6)	122 (26.8)	38 (36.5)	1.57* [1.0–2.46]
Physical violence between parents	31 (5.5)	2 (1.5)	25 (6.7)	4.60* [1.07–19.69]	1 (3.7)	19 (4.2)	12 (11.5)	2.99** [1.40–6.38]
Verbal/emotional violence between parents	143 (25.6)	26 (20)	100 (26.8)	1.47 [0.90–2.39]	8 (29.6)	112 (24.6)	31 (29.8)	1.30 [0.81–2.08]
Physical violence from parents to siblings	33 (5.9)	4 (3.1)	23 (6.2)	2.07 [0.0–6.10]	1 (3.7)	23 (5.1)	10 (9.6)	2 [0.92–4.34]
Physical violence from parents to grandparents	7 (1.3)	0 (0)	5 (1.3)	1.01 [1.0–1.03]	0 (0)	5 (1.1)	2 (1.9)	1.76 [0.34–9.24]
Electronic victimization	240 (42.9)	57 (43.8)	152 (40.8)	0.88 [0.59–1.32]	19 (70.4)	196 (43.1)	44 (42.3)	0.97 [0.63–1.49]
Online harassment	119 (21.3)	29 (22.3)	75 (20.1)	0.88 [0.54–1.42]	9 (33.3)	97 (21.3)	22 (21.2)	0.99 [0.59–1.67]
Online sexual solicitations	138 (24.7)	26 (20)	99 (26.5)	1.45 [0.88–2.35]	8 (29.6)	113 (24.8)	25 (24)	0.96 [0.58–1.58]
Online grooming	44 (7.9)	14 (10.8)	24 (6.4)	0.57 [0.29–1.14]	3 (11.1)	34 (7.5)	1. (9.6)	1.32 [0.63–2.76]
Hate speech	122 (21.8)	38 (29.2)	63 (16.9)	0.49** [0.31–0.78]	12 (44.4)	100 (22)	22 (21.2)	0.95 [0.57–1.60]

Note. The total sample is composed by sexual minority adolescents, whose sexual orientation is gay, lesbian, bisexual or another. The non-conforming group comprises adolescents whose gender identity differs from male or female. As regards ethnicity, the European group comprises adolescents who self-identify only as European. The ethnic minority group comprises adolescents with mixed self-identified ethnic group, or ethnicities other than European.

The rows in bold indicate the scores for the general modules.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p \leq .001$.

5.2.6. Sexual exploitation

The prevalence of sexual exploitation was 5.5 %, with no significant gender differences being observed. However, individuals with non-conforming gender identities reported a particularly high prevalence of 7.4 %. The most common form of exploitation involved exchanging sexual material for money, alcohol, drugs, or gifts, with an overall prevalence of 3.8 %, as shown in Table 2. Ethnic minority adolescents reported higher rates of sexual exploitation (10.6 %) compared to European adolescents (4.4 %), with an OR of 2.5.

5.2.7. Exposure to domestic violence

A total of 28.6 % of sexual minority youths reported exposure to domestic violence in the past year, with a significantly higher prevalence in self-identified females (30.3 %) than males (21.5 %). Individuals with non-conforming gender identities reported a prevalence of 29.6 %. Physical violence between parents was more frequently reported by females (6.7 %) compared to males (1.5 %),

Table 3

Number of victimization experiences and modules in the last 12 months.

	Gender		Ethnic group	
	Male (n = 90)	Female (n = 277)	European (n = 333)	Minority (n = 104)
Victimization experiences [M (SD)]	4.3 (3.3)	4.4 (3.5)	4.3 (3.4)	5.6 (4.5)*
Victimization modules [M (SD)]	2.94 (1.8)	2.85 (1.7)	2.96 (1.7)	3.48 (2)*
Number of victimization modules [n (%)]				
One module	26 (28.9)	65 (28.9)	86 (25.8)	16 (19.8)
Two modules	17 (18.9)	62 (22.4)	71 (21.3)	15 (18.5)
Three modules	12 (13.3)	59 (21.3)	65 (19.5)	13 (16)
Four modules	17 (18.9)	30 (10.8)	41 (12.3)	9 (11.1)
Five modules	11 (12.2)	29 (10.5)	35 (10.5)	15 (18.5)
Six modules	4 (4.4)	26 (9.4)	27 (8.1)	6 (7.4)
Seven modules	2 (2.2)	5 (1.8)	4 (1.2)	6 (7.4)
Eight modules	1 (1.1)	1 (0.4)	4 (1.2)	1 (1.2)
Polyvictimization [n (%)]	29 (32.2)	85 (30.7)	102 (30.6)	32 (32.4)

* $p < .05$.

with females facing four times the risk ($OR = 4$). This form of violence was also more prevalent among ethnic minority adolescents (11.5 %), who faced nearly three times the risk.

5.2.8. Electronic victimization

There was a high prevalence of electronic victimization among sexual minority youths, with a global prevalence of 42.9 %. Individuals with non-conforming gender identities reported the highest rate of victimization (70.4 %). Hate speech emerged as the most common form of electronic victimization (21.8 %). Self-identified male participants reported a higher prevalence rate (29.2 %) than females (16.9 %). Notably, 44.4 % of individuals with non-conforming gender identities reported experiencing hate speech. No significant differences were found between ethnic groups.

5.3. Polyvictimization in sexual minority youths

Information regarding polyvictimization is shown in Table 3. In terms of past year experiences, the mean number of victimizations in victims was 4.6 ($SD = 3.7$), with a maximum of 21. Thus, 32.4 % of the victims were polyvictims, experiencing 6 or more victimizations (mean number of victimization experiences plus one). No significant differences were found in the mean number of total victimizations between genders, but ethnic minority adolescents showed a higher mean number compared to European adolescents, having suffered an average of 5.6 victimizations in the past year. Ethnic minority adolescents also reported a higher number of victimization modules than European adolescents.

6. Discussion

This study adds to the growing but still limited body of knowledge on self-reported multiple victimization experiences among sexual minority youth in Spain. With 13.9 % of the sample identifying as sexual minorities, our findings align with earlier research, such as that of Garaigordobil and Larrain (2020), though exact figures on sexual minority youth remain elusive due to factors like exploration of sexual orientation or reluctance to disclose.

A key finding is that 74.1 % of sexual minority youth reported at least one incident of victimization in the past year, surpassing the 68.6 % prevalence observed in the general population (Pereda et al., 2014). This suggests that sexual minority youth face disproportionate levels of victimization, which are further intensified by the broader vulnerability of youth as a demographic group (Finkelhor, 2007).

From an intersectional perspective, our results underscore the heightened, intersecting risks faced by adolescents who identify both as sexual minorities and as members of ethnic minority groups. While Spain has made significant strides in advancing rights for minorities, these youths continue to experience considerable discrimination. These findings are consistent with previous research (Jackman et al., 2020), which highlights the overlapping vulnerabilities experienced by these intersecting groups. Violence against individuals based on their sexual orientation or ethnicity is one of the ways in which stigma and prejudice are expressed (Meyer, 2003).

In this context, sexual minority youth in Spain continue to face various forms of oppression and discrimination, despite notable social, legal, and political advances aimed at safeguarding the basic human rights of LGBT individuals (Mondolfi et al., 2024). While Spain has made substantial progress in promoting gender and sexual diversity rights, traces of discrimination against young people persist in certain regions and among specific segments of society (Galán et al., 2009). A similar situation exists for minority ethnic groups. Although overt expressions of racism have become less frequent in Spain, it remains uncertain whether these traditional forms of bias have instead shifted into more subtle or covert manifestations of prejudice (Rodríguez et al., 2009).

Our study also reveals significant rates of caregiver victimization in LGB youth, with 43.5 % reporting such experiences, double the rate seen in the general Spanish adolescent population (Pereda et al., 2014). This suggests that intolerance or non-acceptance of non-heterosexual orientations by family members may increase the risk of abuse (Corliss et al., 2002). Additionally, non-European ethnic sexual minority youth reported higher rates of parental abduction, a finding that warrants further investigation to understand the socio-cultural factors at play. While further empirical research is needed, prior studies (Middel et al., 2022) point to ethnic disparities in decision-making and protective measures, underscoring the need for targeted interventions for minoritized groups.

Among LGB youth, 28.6 % reported exposure to family violence, compared with a figure of only 2.8 % reported in Spanish adolescents in a previous study (Pereda et al., 2014). Witnessing violence in the family can result in not only feeling threatened and afraid for oneself in the moment but can also have more enduring negative effects (Artz et al., 2014). Female adolescents reported being more exposed to physical violence between their parents. While this result warrants further analysis, a possible explanation could be the existence of gendered differences in the recognition and interpretation of violent incidents, as found in other European studies (Hietamäki et al., 2021). Also, ethnic minority youths reported more exposure to physical violence between their parents, as found in other studies conducted in the US (Moore et al., 2007).

In terms of electronic victimization, we found that 42.9 % of LGB youth reported such experiences, which is substantially higher than the 8.9 % seen in the general population (Pereda et al., 2014). The high prevalence of online hate directed at LGB individuals, along with the emotional consequences it entails, further underscores the urgency of addressing cyberbullying and hate speech in the context of sexual minorities (Keighley, 2022). Our findings also reveal a gendered pattern, with self-identified males more likely to experience hate speech, reflecting the broader societal prejudices that disproportionately target male sexual minority youths (Bettinsoli et al., 2019). Racism, xenophobia, and prejudices against sexual orientation and identity minorities are the two most frequent motivations for hate crimes in Spain (Ministerio del Interior, 2023), showing a very high rate in the country. Although aggravating factors related to sexual orientation have been included in the Criminal Code since its inception, with those concerning

sexual identity added in 2010, the Ministry of the Interior did not publish its first report on the subject until 2013. Additionally, the National Office Against Hate Crimes was only established in 2018, underscoring a growing acknowledgment that tackling such crimes has become a priority for Spain (Martín Aragón, 2020).

As anticipated, peer victimization was also common, with 34.5 % of LGB youth reporting such experiences. Although no ethnic differences were observed in peer victimization, our findings align with research indicating that ethnic diversity can sometimes act as a protective factor against victimization (Basilici et al., 2022). However, it is clear that the broader social climate, including discriminatory bullying and an unsafe school environment, contributes to heightened mental health issues among sexual minority youths (Russell & Fish, 2016).

The high prevalence of dating violence, particularly among LGB females, is a significant concern. As found in other studies (Tomaszewska & Schuster, 2021), the persistence of machismo culture in Spain plays a role in shaping these experiences, with LGB adolescents, particularly females, facing a disproportionate burden of dating violence. These findings are consistent with research on ethnic minorities in other contexts, highlighting the need for culturally tailored interventions to address dating violence among diverse youth populations (Padilla-Medina et al., 2022).

Finally, the prevalence of sexual victimization was notably high in our sample, with 17.0 % of LGB youth reporting such experiences—substantially higher than the 5.3 % observed in the general population (Pereda et al., 2016). Ethnic minority LGB youth, in particular, exhibited a higher risk of oral or penetrative victimization. These findings are consistent with research suggesting that sexual exploitation is more prevalent among sexual minority youth, particularly those from ethnic minority backgrounds (Benavente et al., 2022; Georges, 2023). This highlights the need for intersectional, culturally sensitive prevention programs to address the unique vulnerabilities of sexual minority youth.

Overall, the study's findings underscore the heightened victimization risks experienced by sexual minority youth, particularly those who also belong to ethnic minority groups. The elevated rates of polyvictimization identified in this population, consistent with the results reported by Craig et al. (2020), further emphasize the urgent need for systemic interventions that respond to the overlapping vulnerabilities associated with sexual orientation, gender identity, and ethnicity. Effectively addressing these issues will require not only strengthening protective services but also promoting broader social acceptance and reinforcing legal safeguards to reduce the impact of stigma, discrimination, and victimization.

6.1. Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of the current study. Firstly, the study relied solely on self-reported sexual orientation to assess sexual minority status, without utilizing any other measures. Additionally, in terms of self-identified gender identity, the inclusion of transgender adolescents in the binary category may have impacted the results. Researchers should aim to assess sexual orientation and gender identity more comprehensively through the use of multiple items, such as identity, attraction, and sexual behavior (Martin-Storey, 2015). Moreover, the study did not control for various socio-economic factors, parental styles, social and emotional competencies, or access to information and communication technologies among youths, which have been identified as important variables in previous research on bullying and cyberbullying in Spain (Gómez-Ortiz et al., 2016; Romera et al., 2016). Furthermore, standardized questions on discrimination against sexual minorities (Morrison et al., 2016) and specific questions on dating victimization (Ricks et al., 2023) were not incorporated into the study. Instead, a general measure of victimization encompassing these topics was utilized, potentially influencing the rates obtained. Additionally, due to the limited number of participants in specific minority sub-groups (e.g., gays, bisexuals), comparisons between these groups could not be made. Similarly, individuals who did not identify as gender binary were not adequately represented. Addressing these limitations in future studies is recommended.

6.2. Practice implications

This study underscores the urgent need for comprehensive interventions targeting sexual minority youths, particularly those from ethnic minority backgrounds, to address the high prevalence of victimization they face. Interventions should focus on the intersectionality of sexual orientation, gender identity, and ethnicity, recognizing how these factors compound vulnerability to various forms of violence (Meyer, 2003). Practitioners should adopt a holistic approach that addresses multiple forms of victimization, as these experiences are often interconnected and exacerbate the impact of trauma (Sterzing et al., 2019). Moreover, it is crucial to implement programs that foster resilience and post-traumatic growth, focusing on safe spaces, support services, and educational efforts aimed at reducing stigma and discrimination (Craig & Austin, 2016). Training for caregivers, educators, and healthcare professionals is essential to better support sexual minority youths and identify signs of victimization early. Additionally, further research is needed to develop evidence-based, culturally sensitive interventions that specifically address the needs of transgender and non-conforming gender identities within this population (Mitchell et al., 2023).

6.3. Conclusion

This study highlights the disproportionate levels of victimization experienced by sexual minority youths, particularly those from ethnic minority backgrounds, in Spain. The high prevalence of interpersonal violence across various domains underscores the need for comprehensive, intersectional approaches to prevent and address victimization in this group (Carrera-Fernández et al., 2022). Further research is essential to better understand the complex dynamics of polyvictimization and the reciprocal relationship between minority

stress and victimization (Sterzing et al., 2019). Efforts to support these youths must include both prevention and resilience-building strategies, alongside continued advocacy for systemic change to combat stigma and discrimination.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Noemí Pereda: Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Conceptualization. **Alba Águila-Otero:** Writing – original draft, Software, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation. **Varinia Leiva:** Writing – original draft, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization.

Funding details

This work was supported by “la Caixa” Foundation (LCF/PR/SR21/52560016). The author Águila-Otero holds a Margarita Salas postdoctoral contract funded by the University of Oviedo, in the Program for the Requalification of the Spanish University System (MU-21-UP2021-030). The author Varinia Leiva-Peña holds a Becas Chile predoctoral scholarship, granted by the National Research and Development Agency of Chile (ANID).

Declaration of competing interest

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

References

- Abreu, R. L., & Kenny, M. C. (2018). Cyberbullying and LGBTQ youth: A systematic literature review and recommendations for prevention and intervention. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma*, 11, 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40653-017-0175-7>
- Alvy, L. M., Hughes, T. L., Kristjanson, A. F., & Wilsnack, S. C. (2013). Sexual identity group differences in child abuse and neglect. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(10), 2088–2111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512471081>
- Angoff, H. D., & Barnhart, W. R. (2021). Bullying and cyberbullying among LGBQ and heterosexual youth from an intersectional perspective: Findings from the 2017 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *Journal of School Violence*, 20(3), 274–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2021.1879099>
- Artz, S., Jackson, M., Rossiter, K., Nijdam-Jones, A., Géczy, I., & Porteous, S. (2014). A comprehensive review of the literature on the impact of exposure to intimate partner violence on children and youth. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies*, 5(4), 493–587. <https://doi.org/10.18357/ijcyfs54201413274>
- Atteberry-Ash, B., Walls, N. E., Kattari, S. K., Peitzmeier, S. M., Kattari, L., & Langenderfer-Magruder, L. (2020). Forced sex among youth: Accrual of risk by gender identity, sexual orientation, mental health and bullying. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 17(2), 193–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2019.1614131>
- Averdijk, M., Ribeaud, D., & Eisner, M. (2020). Longitudinal risk factors of selling and buying sexual services among youths in Switzerland. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 49, 1279–1290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-019-01571-3>
- Baams, L. (2018). Disparities for LGBTQ and gender nonconforming adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 141(5), Article e20173004. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-3004>
- Basilici, M. C., Palladino, B. E., & Menesini, E. (2022). Ethnic diversity and bullying in school: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 65, Article 101762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2022.101762>
- Benavente, B., Díaz-Faes, D. A., Ballester, L., & Pereda, N. (2022). Commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents in Europe: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 23(5), 1529–1548. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838021999378>
- Bettinsoli, M., Suppes, A., & Napier, J. (2019). Predictors of attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women in 23 countries. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 11(5), 697–708. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619887785>
- Brangwin, E., Zhao, Z., Shramko, M., Toomey, R. B., & Syvertsen, A. K. (2023). The association between family physical abuse and suicide attempts among gender minority adolescents: A comparison study. *LGBT Health*, 10(2), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2021.0415>
- Carrera-Fernández, M. V., Almeida, A., Cid-Fernández, X. M., González-Fernández, A., & Fernández-Simo, J. D. (2022). Troubling secondary victimization of bullying victims: The role of gender and ethnicity. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(15–16). <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211005151>
- Corliss, H. L., Cochran, S. D., & Mays, V. M. (2002). Reports of parental maltreatment during childhood in a United States population-based survey of homosexual, bisexual, and heterosexual adults. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26(11), 1165–1178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134\(02\)00385-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(02)00385-X)
- Craig, S. L., & Austin, A. (2016). The AFFIRM open pilot feasibility study: A brief affirmative cognitive behavioral coping skills group intervention for sexual and gender minority youth. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 64, 136–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.02.022>
- Craig, S. L., Austin, A., Levenson, J., Leung, V. W., Eaton, A. D., & D'Souza, S. A. (2020). Frequencies and patterns of adverse childhood events in LGBTQ+ youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 107, Article 104623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2020.104623>
- Dank, M., Lachman, P., Zweig, J. M., & Yahner, J. (2014). Dating violence experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43, 846–857. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9975-8>
- Elipé, P., de la Oliva Muñoz, M., & Del Rey, R. (2018). Homophobic bullying and cyberbullying: Study of a silenced problem. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 65(5), 672–686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2017.1333809>
- Fedewa, A., & Ahn, S. (2011). The effects of bullying and peer victimization on sexual minority and heterosexual youths: A quantitative meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 7(4), 398–418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2011.592968>
- Finkelhor, D. (2007). Developmental victimology: The comprehensive study of childhood victimizations. In R. C. Davis, A. J. Lurigio, & S. Herman (Eds.), *Victims of crime* (3rd ed., pp. 86–107). Sage.
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2005). Measuring poly-victimization using the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29, 1297–1312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.06.005>
- Flores, A. R., Stotzer, R. L., Meyer, I. H., & Langton, L. (2022). Hate crimes against LGBT people: National Crime Victimization Survey, 2017–2019. *PLoS ONE*, 17(12), Article e0279363. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0279363>
- Fredlund, C., Svensson, F., Svedin, C. G., Priebe, G., & Wadsby, M. (2013). Adolescents' lifetime experience of selling sex: Development over five years. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 22(3), 312–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2013.743950>

- Friedman, M. S., Marshal, M. P., Guadamuz, T. E., Wei, C., Wong, C. F., Saewyc, E. M., & Stall, R. (2011). A meta-analysis of disparities in childhood sexual abuse, parental physical abuse, and peer victimization among sexual minority and sexual nonminority individuals. *American Journal of Public Health*, 101(8), 1481–1494. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.190009>
- Galán, J. I. P., Puras, B. M., & Riley, R. L. (2009). Achieving real equality: A work in progress for LGBT youth in Spain. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 6(2–3), 272–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361650902897581>
- Garaigordobil, M., & Larrain, E. (2020). Bullying and cyberbullying in LGBT adolescents: Prevalence and effects on mental health. *Comunicar*, 28(62), 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.3916/c62-2020-07>
- Georges, E. (2023). Review of the literature on the intersection of LGBTQ youth and CSEC: More than a monolith. *Current Pediatrics Reports*, 11(4), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40124-023-00302-6>
- Gómez-Ortiz, O., Romera, E. M., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2016). Parenting styles and bullying. The mediating role of parental psychological aggression and physical punishment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 51, 132–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.10.025>
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Duncan, D. T., & Johnson, R. M. (2015). Neighborhood-level LGBT hate crimes and bullying among sexual minority youths: A geospatial analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 30(4), 663–675. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-13-00166>
- Hietamäki, J., Huttunen, M., & Husso, M. (2021). Gender differences in witnessing and the prevalence of intimate partner violence from the perspective of children in Finland. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(9), 4724. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18094724>
- ILGA Europe. (2023). Annual review of the human rights situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex people in Europe and central Asia. Rainbow-Europe. <https://rainbow-europe.org/sites/default/files/annual-report/Annual-Review-Full-2023.pdf>
- Jackman, K., Kreuze, E. J., Caceres, B. A., & Schnall, R. (2020). Bullying and peer victimization of minority youth: Intersections of sexual identity and race/ethnicity. *Journal of School Health*, 90(5), 368–377. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12883>
- Jonas, L., Salazar de Pablo, G., Shum, M., Nosarti, C., Abbott, C., & Vaquerizo-Serrano, J. (2022). A systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the impact of childhood adversities on the mental health of LGBT+ youth. *JCPP Advances*, 2(2), Article e12079. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcv2.12079>
- Katz-Wise, S. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2012). Victimization experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49(2–3), 142–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.637247>
- Keighley, R. (2022). Hate hurts: Exploring the impact of online hate on LGBTQ+ young people. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 32(1–2), 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2021.1988034>
- Kosciw, J. G., & Zongrone, A. D. (2019). A global school climate crisis: Insights on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender & queer students in Latin America. Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN). <https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2019-12/Global-School-Climate-Crisis-Latin-America-English-2019-0.pdf>
- Levine, E. C., & Button, D. M. (2022). Interpersonal violence among heterosexual and sexual minority youth: Descriptive findings from the 2017 youth risk behavior surveillance system. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(13–14), NP12564–NP12583. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211001351>
- Luo, F., Stone, D. M., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). Physical dating violence victimization among sexual minority youth. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(10), e66–e73. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302051>
- Martín Aragón, M. D. M. (2020). Framing LGBT-phobic incidents in Spain: Beyond hate crimes. *Revista de Criminología, Psicología y Ley*, 3, 56–91. <http://hdl.handle.net/10498/32968>
- Martin-Storey, A. (2015). Prevalence of dating violence among sexual minority youth: Variation across gender, sexual minority identity and gender of sexual partners. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 44, 211–214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0089-0>
- Mazursky, N., & Nadan, Y. (2024). Unveiling the shadows: Exploring the reality of commercial sexual exploitation among LGBTQ+ youth in out-of-home care. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 149, Article 106691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2024.106691>
- McGeough, B. L., & Sterzing, P. R. (2018). A systematic review of family victimization experiences among sexual minority youth. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 39, 491–528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-018-0523-x>
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 674. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>
- Middel, F., López López, M., Fluke, J., & Grietens, H. (2022). Racial/ethnic and gender disparities in child protection decision-making: What role do stereotypes play? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 127, Article 105579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2022.105579>
- Ministerio del Interior. (2023). Informe sobre la evolución de los delitos de odio en España. Retrieved from. Gobierno de España. https://www.interior.gob.es/opencms/export/sites/default/galerias/galeria-de-prensa/documentos-y-multimedia/balances-e-informes/2022/Informe_Evolucion_delitos_odio_2022.pdf
- Mitchell, K. J., Ybarra, M. L., Goodman, K. L., & Strom, I. F. (2023). Polyvictimization among sexual and gender minority youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 65(2), 182–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2023.01.045>
- Mitchell, K. J., Ybarra, M. L., & Korchmaros, J. D. (2014). Sexual harassment among adolescents of different sexual orientations and gender identities. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38(2), 280–295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.09.008>
- Mondolfi, M. L., Charak, R., Cano-González, I., & Ronzón-Tirado, R. (2024). “Still a long way to go”: Discrimination beyond the laws and policies as voiced by LGBTQ+ people in Spain. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 22, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-024-01005-3>
- Montiel, I., & Carbonell, E. (2012). *Cuestionario de victimización juvenil mediante internet y/o teléfono móvil [Juvenile Online Victimization Questionnaire, JOV-Q] Patent number 09/2011/1982. (Registro Propiedad Intelectual Comunidad Valenciana).*
- Moore, C. G., Probst, J. C., Tompkins, M., Cuffe, S., & Martin, A. B. (2007). The prevalence of violent disagreements in US families: Effects of residence, race/ethnicity, and parental stress. *Pediatrics*, 119(1), S68–S76. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2006-2089K>
- Morrison, T. G., Bishop, C. J., Morrison, M. A., & Parker-Taneo, K. (2016). A psychometric review of measures assessing discrimination against sexual minorities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 63(8), 1086–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2015.1117903>
- Myers, W., Turanovic, J. J., Lloyd, K. M., & Pratt, T. C. (2020). The victimization of LGBTQ students at school: A meta-analysis. *Journal of School Violence*, 19(4), 421–432. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2020.1725530>
- Padilla-Medina, D. M., Williams, J. R., Ravi, K., Ombayo, B., & Black, B. M. (2022). Teen dating violence help-seeking intentions and behaviors among ethnically and racially diverse youth: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 23(4), 1063–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020985569>
- Pereda, N., Abad, J., & Guilera, G. (2016). Lifetime prevalence and characteristics of child sexual victimization in a community sample of Spanish adolescents. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 25(2), 142–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2016.1123791>
- Pereda, N., Gallardo-Pujol, D., & Guilera, G. (2018). Good practices in the assessment of victimization: The Spanish adaptation of the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire. *Psychology of Violence*, 8(1), 76–86. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000075>
- Pereda, N., Guilera, G., & Abad, J. (2014). Victimization and polyvictimization of Spanish children and youth: Results from a community sample. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38(4), 640–649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.01.019>
- Ricks, J. M., Montgomery, C. M., & Nash, J. A. (2023). Measurement of adolescent dating violence in sexual minority youth: A scoping review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 73, Article 101870. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2023.101870>
- Rodríguez, F. J., Herrero, J., Ovejero, A., & Torres, A. (2009). New expressions of racism among young people in Spain: An adaptation of the Meertens and Pettigrew (1992) prejudice scale. *Adolescence*, 44(176), 1033–1043.
- Romera, E. M., Juan-Jesús, G. F., & Cristina, O. R. (2016). Cyberbullying: Social competence, motivation and peer relationships. *Comunicar*, 48, 71–79. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C48-2016-07>
- Russell, S. T., & Fish, J. N. (2016). Mental health in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 12(1), 465–487. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-021815-093153>
- Segura, A., Pereda, N., & Guilera, G. (2020). Poly-victimization from different methodological approaches using the juvenile victimization questionnaire: Are we identifying the same victims? *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 19(3), 289–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2018.1441352>
- Semprevivo, L. K. (2021). Dating and sexual violence victimization among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and questioning youth: Considering the importance of gender and sexual orientation. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 30(5), 662–678. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2020.1832175>

- Sterzing, P. R., Gartner, R. E., Goldbach, J. T., McGeough, B. L., Ratliff, G. A., & Johnson, K. C. (2019). Polyvictimization prevalence rates for sexual and gender minority adolescents: Breaking down the silos of victimization research. *Psychology of Violence*, 9(4), 419–430. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000123>
- Sterzing, P. R., Hong, J. S., Gartner, R. E., & Auslander, W. F. (2016). Child maltreatment and bullying victimization among a community-based sample of sexual minority youth: The mediating role of psychological distress. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma*, 9, 283–293. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40653-016-0101-4>
- Testa, R. J., Sciacca, L. M., Wang, F., Hendricks, M. L., Goldblum, P., Bradford, J., & Bongar, B. (2012). Effects of violence on transgender people. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 43(5), 452–459. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029604>
- Tomaszewska, P., & Schuster, I. (2021). Prevalence of teen dating violence in Europe: A systematic review of studies since 2010. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2021(178), 11–37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.20437>
- Toomey, R. B., & Russell, S. T. (2016). The role of sexual orientation in school-based victimization: A meta-analysis. *Youth & Society*, 48(2), 176–201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X13483778>
- UNICEF. (2012). *Ethical principles, dilemmas and risks in collecting data on violence against children: A review of available literature*. Statistics and Monitoring Section/ Division of Policy and Strategy.
- Webb, L., Clary, L. K., Johnson, R. M., & Mendelson, T. (2021). Electronic and school bullying victimization by race/ethnicity and sexual minority status in a nationally representative adolescent sample. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 68(2), 378–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.05.042>
- Whitton, S. W., Newcomb, M. E., Messinger, A. M., Byck, G., & Mustanski, B. (2019). A longitudinal study of IPV victimization among sexual minority youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(5), 912–945. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605166460>
- Williams, R. D., Jr., & Gutierrez, A. (2022). Increased likelihood of forced sexual intercourse, sexual violence, and sexual dating violence victimization among sexual minority youth. *Journal of Community Health*, 47(2), 193–200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-021-01033-9>