

Victimization Status Among Persons with Disabilities and its Predictors: Evidence from Bangladesh National Survey on Persons with Disabilities

Mizanur Rahman, MSc¹, Md Shohel Rana, BSS², Gulam Khandaker, PhD³⁻⁵, Md Mostafizur Rahman, PhD⁶, Md Nuruzzaman Khan, PhD²

¹Department of Fisheries, Bangamata Sheikh Fojilatunnesa Mujib Science & Technology University, Jamalpur, Bangladesh

²Department of Population Science, Jatiya Kabi Kazi Nazrul Islam University, Mymensingh, Bangladesh.

³CSF Global, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

⁴Central Queensland Public Health Unit, Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service, Rockhampton, Australia

⁵School of Health, Medical and Applied Sciences, Central Queensland University, Rockhampton, Australia

⁶Department of Population Science and Human Resource Development, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

Short title: Victimization Status Among Persons with Disabilities

Corresponding authors

Md. Nuruzzaman Khan, PhD

Assistant Professor

Department of Population Science

Jatiya Kabi Kazi Nazrul Islam University, Bangladesh

Email: sumonrupop@gmail.com

Word count

Abstract: 275

Main body: 3691

Tables: 5

Figures: 2

Background: Persons with disabilities often face various forms of victimization, yet there is limited research exploring this phenomenon in Bangladesh. This study aims to investigate the victimization status among persons with disabilities and identify its predictors.

Methods: Data of 4293 persons with disabilities analyzed in this study were extracted from the 2021 National Survey on Persons with Disabilities. Victimization status (yes, no) was considered as the outcome variables. Explanatory variables considered were factors at the individual, household, and community levels. A multilevel mixed-effect logistic regression model was used to explore the association of the outcome variable with explanatory variables by dividing the total sample into age groups of 0-17 years and ≥ 18 years.

Results: The study found that 44% of persons with disabilities in Bangladesh experienced victimization, predominantly involving neighbours (90.64%), friends (28.41%), and family members (27.07%). Among persons aged 0-17 years, increasing age was associated with higher likelihood of being victimized, while residing in the richest households or certain divisions like Khulna and Rangpur was associated with lower likelihoods. Conversely, among respondents aged 18-95 years, increasing age was associated with lower likelihood of being victimized. Unmarried respondents had increased likelihood of victimization compared to married individuals. Furthermore, persons residing in the richest wealth quintile compared to the poorest, and residence in certain divisions such as Chattogram, Khulna, Mymensingh, Rangpur, and Sylhet reported higher likelihoods of victimization compared to those in the Barishal division.

Conclusion: This study's findings underscore that around 4 in 10 persons with disabilities are being victimized. Tailored programs and awareness-building initiatives covering neighbours, friends, and family members of persons with disabilities are important to ensure dignified lives for this population.

Keywords: Persons with disability, victimization, Bangladesh

Introduction

As of 2022, an estimated 1.3 billion people worldwide were living with disabilities, constituting the largest minority group [1, 2]. More than 80% of these individuals reside in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), with projections indicating an increase in their numbers due to improvements in healthcare facilities and medical technology, leading to the survival of individuals who may have otherwise succumbed to their conditions [3, 4]. Additionally, the rising incidence of road traffic injuries contributes significantly to the burden of disability, particularly in LMICs [5]. This trend is mirrored in Bangladesh, an LMIC currently experiencing substantial advancements in healthcare facilities, medical technology, and an increase in road traffic injuries [6, 7]. As of 2022, Bangladesh is home to over four and a half million persons with disabilities, accounting for 2.79% of the total population [8, 9].

Persons with disabilities in worldwide encounter various challenges [10-13]. This poses a particular challenge for LMICs, as challenges arise from multiple levels. The primary level of challenges arises from community misconceptions, such as the belief that disability is primarily caused by parental curses [10, 11]. Other misconceptions include viewing persons with disabilities as burdens on society and as dependent groups. These existing community-level challenges in LMICs, including high unemployment rates and an education system that lacks disability-friendly provisions, can exacerbate these issues by impeding the ability of persons with disabilities to engage with mainstream society [9]. As a result, persons with disabilities in LMICs often rely on social safety net programs operated by governmental and non-governmental organizations or on support from family members to meet their basic needs, including food, education, and healthcare [14].

However, the support received under these programs is often insufficient to enable them to live with dignity. For example, in Bangladesh, persons with disabilities receive approximately 8 USD per month under government-operated social safety net programs, which is inadequate to fulfil even single basic requirements [14]. Consequently, they frequently report poor health conditions

compared to the general population, with these conditions often left untreated due to the lack of disability-friendly healthcare facilities—a situation prevalent in Bangladesh and other LMICs [15-18].

Furthermore, in addition to community-level misconceptions about disability, persons with disabilities are often victimized by members of their own community and even by family members [19-21]. This victimization further increases their vulnerability in society, impacting their participation in available support programs despite their existence [21]. Victims may hesitate to seek help due to fear, shame, or distrust, and the psychological effects of victimization can undermine their confidence and agency [22]. However, despite these pathways, the extent of victimization remains largely unexplored in LMICs, including Bangladesh. Existing studies in these settings predominantly focus on the prevalence of disability, determinants of disability, health conditions of persons with disabilities, access to healthcare services, and coverage of social safety net programs [2, 14-16, 18]. Studies on victimization status and its determinants are largely unexplored in LMICs, with none conducted in Bangladesh [23-26]. Available studies on this issue are also limited, focusing on several aspects, including the analysis of small samples collected from the regional level, consideration of an inadequate list of confounders, and the application of less precise statistical methods to analyzed data [23-26]. Therefore, we conducted this study to explore the extent of disability, as well as the factors associated with it, in Bangladesh.

Methods

Sampling strategy

We analyzed data extracted from the National Survey on Persons with Disabilities (NSPD), a nationally representative household survey conducted in 2021 by the government of Bangladesh. A two-stage stratified random sampling technique was employed to select the households. Initially, 800 primary sample units (PSUs) were chosen from a list of 293,579 PSUs generated by the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics during the 2011 National Population Census, which was the most

recent census available at the time of the survey. Household listing operations were then carried out in each selected PSU. Subsequently, in the second stage of sampling, 45 households were systematically selected from each chosen PSU, resulting in a list of 36,000 households, from which data were collected from 35,493 households, yielding a response rate of 98.6%. All 155,025 respondents from these selected households were included in the survey. A detailed explanation of the sampling procedure and the collected data has been published elsewhere [27, 28].

Analytical sample

Of the survey sample, 4,293 respondents reported having a disability, comprising 2.79% of the total sample. This subset of respondents was analyzed in alignment with the study's objectives. The inclusion criteria utilized to derive this subset were as follows: (i) individuals self-reporting disabilities, and (ii) those who responded to questions concerning experiences of discrimination or harassment by individuals or groups on various grounds within 12 months preceding the survey.

Outcome variables

The outcome variable under consideration was the experience of discrimination or harassment among persons with disabilities on various grounds. Each person with a disability was queried during the survey: "In the past 12 months, have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed based on the following grounds?" They were presented with multiple options, including disability, ethnicity/immigration, sex, age, religion/belief, and other reasons. Participants (or their caregivers/parents for persons with disability aged <18 years) were instructed to indicate "yes," "no," or "don't know" for each applicable option. Subsequently, we reclassified these responses into a single dichotomous variable of victimization status with the following response categories: "Yes" (indicating a positive response to any of the provided options) and "No" (reflecting negative or uncertain responses across all options). Persons who reported don't know were excluded from the analysis.

Explanatory variables

The selection of explanatory variables in this study followed a two-stage process. Initially, we conducted a thorough search across various databases using pertinent keywords, focusing on

Bangladesh and LMICs [2, 14-16, 18, 23-26]. Variables identified in relevant studies were compiled into a list. Subsequently, these listed variables were cross-referenced with the survey data we analyzed, resulting in a refined list of selected and available variables for consideration in this study. These then categorised under three broad themes (individual level factors, household level factors, and community level factors) as per the socio-ecological model of health [29]. Individual level factors encompassed respondent's age (0-17 years, 18-59 years, and ≥ 60 years), years of schooling (treated as continuous variable), gender (male or female), occupation (agriculture, blue-collar work, pink-collar work, white-collar work, student, housewife, unable to work, and others), and marital status (married, unmarried, widowed/divorced/separated). Household-level variable considered was household wealth quintile (poorest, poorer, middle, richer, richest) and religion (Islam, others). Household wealth quintile variable was derived by the survey authority through principal component analysis of household asset-related variables such as roofing type and ownership of a refrigerator. Furthermore, additional factors taken into account were respondents' place of residence (urban or rural) and their region of residence (Barishal, Chattogram, Dhaka, Khulna, Mymensingh, Rajshahi, Rangpur, and Sylhet) and they categorised under community level variables.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were employed to characterize the respondents analyzed in this study. The statistical significance of victimization status across the considered explanatory variables was assessed using a chi-square test. To investigate the relationship between victimization status and the explanatory variables, a multilevel mixed-effect logistic regression model was utilized. This choice was motivated by the nested structure of the NSPD data, where respondents were nested within households, and households were nested within a PSU. Previous studies have demonstrated that multilevel modelling provides more accurate results than conventional simple logistic regression models when dealing with such nested data structures. Two distinct models were run by categorizing the total sample into two age groups: 0-17 years and 18-95 years. This division was

made considering the inclusion of individuals with disabilities in national-level policies and programs based on these age categories. A progressive model-building approach was adopted for each age category, comprising three distinct models. Model 1 served as the null model, considering only victimization status. In Model 2, individual-level factors were incorporated along with victimization status, while both household- and individual-level factors were included in Model 3. Model 4 encompassed all individual, household, and community-level factors. Prior to running each model, multicollinearity was assessed using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). If evidence of multicollinearity was detected ($VIF > 5.0$), the relevant variable was removed, and the model was rerun. The results were reported as adjusted odds ratios (aOR) along with their corresponding 95% Confidence Intervals (95% CI). All statistical analyses were performed using STATA/SE 14.0 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, Texas, United States of America).

Ethics approval

The survey analyzed in this study underwent review and approval by the Ethics Committee of the BBS. De-identified data were obtained from the BBS upon submission of a research proposal. As the data received were de-identified, further ethical approval was not necessary.

Results

Background characteristics of the respondents

The background characteristics of the respondents are summarized in Table 1. The mean age of the respondents was 41.44 years. More than half (51%) of the total respondents fell into the age bracket of 18-59 years at the time of the survey. Approximately 59% of the respondents were male. Nearly one-third of the total respondents identified themselves as unable to work. Around 80% of the respondents resided in rural areas, while approximately 22% indicated Dhaka as their region of residence.

Table 1: Background characteristics of the respondent (N=4,293)

Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	95% CI
Individual level factor			
Respondent's age in years, mean (\pmSD)		41.44 (\pm 23.59)	
0-17	892	20.78	19.51-22.1
18-59	2,190	51.00	49.51-52.5
\geq 60	1,211	28.22	26.74-29.74
Respondent's gender			
Male	2,513	58.55	57.03-60.05
Female	1,780	41.45	39.95-42.97
Respondents year of schooling, mean (SD)		3.89(\pm 9.01)	
Respondent's occupation			
Agriculture	411	9.58	8.65-10.59
Blue collar worker ^b	290	6.76	6.01-7.59
Pink collar worker ^p	165	3.83	3.26-4.50
White collar worker ^w	375	8.75	7.89-9.68
Student	484	11.27	10.28-12.34
Housewives	505	11.76	10.76-12.83
Unable to work	1,413	32.92	31.35-34.53
Others	650	15.15	14.02-16.35
Respondent's marital Status			
Married	2,062	48.03	46.48-49.59
Unmarried	1,505	35.05	33.43-36.7
Widow/Divorce/Separate	726	16.92	15.79-18.11
Household level factor			
Religion			
Muslim	3,843	89.52	87.42-91.31
Others	450	10.48	8.7-12.58
Wealth Quintile			
Poorest	1,164	27.12	25.23-29.1
Poorer	942	21.95	20.49-23.48
Middle	853	19.87	18.45-21.37
Richer	727	16.92	15.47-18.48
Richest	607	14.14	12.7-15.72
Community level factor			
Place of residence			
Rural	3,470	80.83	79.37-82.21
Urban	823	19.17	17.79-20.63
Region of residence			

Barishal	227	5.29	4.63-6.05
Chattogram	697	16.22	14.96-17.57
Dhaka	923	21.50	20.07-23
Khulna	597	13.91	12.62-15.32
Mymensingh	311	7.24	6.46-8.11
Rajshahi	662	15.42	14-16.96
Rangpur	633	14.74	13.42-16.16
Sylhet	243	5.67	5.01-6.41

Notes: ^bblue collar worker means [factory/manufacturing workers/labour, transportation / communication workers, day labor (non-agriculture), auto / cng / tempo driver, rickshaw driver / van driver / boatman, poultry / animal husbandry for business, fishery or aquaculture and fisherman]

^PPink collar worker means [small business (capital up to taka 1000), business (capital over taka 10000), kabiraj /ojha/spiritual physician, village doctor and homeopathy doctor]

^wWhite collar worker means [teacher, lawyer /journalist /doctor/engineer, government employee/officer, private/Ngo employee / officer, handicraft/cottage industry, weaver/blacksmith/potter/goldsmith/service, imam/priest, family helper and housemaid/servant]

Victimization status and types of the persons with disability in Bangladesh

The overall prevalence of victimization status and its breakdown across several bases of victimization are presented in Table 2. We observed that 43.73% of the total respondents reported experiencing victimization within 12 months of the survey, with the primary basis of victimization being disability itself (98.73%).

Table 2: Victimization status and basis of victimization among persons with disabilities in Bangladesh, 2021

Background characteristics	Victimization status	
	Yes (%, 95% CI)	No (%, 95% CI)
Basis of victimization		
Ethnic or immigration origin	3.37 (2.57-4.40)	96.63 (95.6-97.43)
Sex	2.79 (2.09-3.72)	97.21 (96.28-97.91)
Age	5.58 (4.55-6.84)	94.42 (93.16-95.45)
Religion or belief	1.24 (0.79-1.92)	98.76 (98.08-99.21)
Disability	98.73 (98.07-99.16)	1.27 (0.84-1.93)
Other reasons	3.76 (2.86-4.94)	96.24 (95.06-97.14)
Overall prevalence of victimization (%, 95% CI)		
Victimized	43.73 (95% CI, 41.51-45.98)	
Non-victimized	56.27 (95% CI, 54.02-58.49)	

Persons with intellectual disabilities reported higher prevalence of victimization (66.37%) following by mental disabilities (62.11%) and down syndrome (59.04%) (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Victimization status across types of disabilities.

Persons or groups by whom respondents with disabilities were victimized within 12 months of the survey

We explored the individuals or groups responsible for victimizing persons with disabilities, and the results are presented in Figure 2. We found that neighbours (90.64%) constituted the primary group victimizing persons with disabilities, followed by relatives (43.41%), friends (28.41%), and family members (27.07%).




Figure 2: Persons or groups responsible for victimization of persons with disabilities in Bangladesh

Victimization status of persons with disabilities across individual, households and community level factors

Table 3 presents the distribution of victimization status across individual, household, and community-level factors. Children aged 0-17 years, respondents in other occupation categories, unmarried individuals, and respondents residing in the Barishal division reported a higher prevalence of being victimized within 12 months of the survey. We found significant differences in victimization status across individual, household, and community-level factors.

Table 3: Distribution of victimization among persons with disability across individual, household and community level factors.

Characteristics	Persons with disabilities by victimization status		P-value
	Yes (%)	No (%)	
Individual level factor			
Respondent's age (in years)			p<0.001
0-17	51.83	48.17	
18-59	49.22	50.78	
≥60	27.84	72.16	
Respondent's gender			p=0.18
Male	44.59	55.41	
Female	42.52	57.48	
Respondent's year of schooling (mean)	3.76	3.99	p<0.001
Respondent's occupation			p<0.001
Agriculture	42.45	57.55	
Blue collar worker	45.21	54.79	
Pink collar worker	39.4	60.6	
White collar worker	41.99	58.01	
Student	49.29	50.71	
Housewives	39.17	60.83	
Unable to work	40.31	59.69	
Others	52.8	47.2	
Marital status			p<0.001
Married	37.94	62.06	
Unmarried	56.6	43.4	
Widow/divorced/separated	33.5	66.5	
Household level factor			
Religion			p=0.09
Muslim	44.33	55.67	
Others	38.64	61.36	
Wealth Quintile			

Poorest	46.16	53.84	p=0.07
Poorer	44.91	55.09	
Middle	42.35	57.65	
Richer	44.51	55.49	
Richest	38.23	61.77	
Community level factor			
Place of residence			p=0.57
Rural	44.05	55.95	
Urban	42.39	57.61	
Region of residence			p<0.001
Barishal	56.81	43.19	
Chattogram	43.16	56.84	
Dhaka	54.92	45.08	
Khulna	34.5	65.5	
Mymensingh	39.5	60.5	
Rajshahi	42.58	57.42	
Rangpur	36.8	63.2	
Sylhet	39.91	60.09	

Note: Distribution presented in row percentages

Model selection to identify factors associated with victimization of persons with disabilities

We compared the intra-class correlation (ICC) and variance of the random intercept across each of the four models run for both groups (Table 4). The best model was identified by the least ICC values. For persons with disabilities aged 0-17 years, the ICC decreased from 37% in the null model to 33% in model 4. Similarly, for persons with disabilities aged ≥ 18 years, the ICC decreased from 31% in the null model to 28% in model 4. Therefore, model 4 emerged as the optimal model for both cases.

Table 4: Intra-class correlation and variances for random intercepts of victimization status by persons with disabilities in Bangladesh, aged 0-17 years and 18 or older

Model summary	Persons with disability aged 0-17 years	Persons with disability aged ≥18 years
Intra-Class Correlation (ICC)¹		
Model 1 (Null model)	0.37 ^{***}	0.31 ^{***}
Model 2 (Individual- and household-level model)	0.38 ^{***}	0.34 ^{***}
Model 3 (Community level model)	0.39 ^{***}	0.34 ^{***}
Model 4 (Individual, household and community level model)	0.33 ^{***}	0.28 ^{***}
Variance of the random intercept		
Model 1 (Null model)	1.98 (1.10-3.56) ^{***}	1.46 (1.14-1.88) ^{***}
Model 2 (Individual- and household-level model)	2.01 (1.04-3.91) ^{***}	1.72 (1.34-2.21) ^{***}
Model 3 (Community level model)	2.08 (1.07-4.08) ^{***}	1.69 (1.31-2.17) ^{***}
Model 4 (Individual, household and community level model)	1.59 (0.75-3.42) ^{***}	1.50 (1.15-1.95) ^{***}

Notes: ¹The ICC is a ratio of the cluster level variance to the total variance

^{***} $P < 0.01$, ^{**} $P < 0.05$, ^{*} $P < 0.1$

Factors associated with being victimized by persons with disabilities in Bangladesh

Of the four models run for both groups, Model 4 emerged as the best model. The results of Model 4 for both groups are presented in Table 5. Supplementary Tables 1 and 2 provide results for all models for persons with disabilities aged 0-17 years and 18 years and older, respectively.

For the model concerning persons with disabilities aged 0-17 years, we found that for each year increase in the respondent's age, there was a 1.07 times higher likelihood of being victimized (aOR: 1.07, 95% CI: 1.01-1.12). The likelihood of being victimized was lower among the richest individuals (aOR: 0.42, 95% CI: 0.20-0.88) compared to the poorest. Respondents residing in the Khulna and Rangpur divisions reported lower likelihoods of being victimized compared to those residing in the Barishal division.

For persons with disabilities aged 18 years and older, each year increase in age was associated with a 3% decrease in the likelihood of being victimized (aOR: 0.97, 95% CI: 0.96-0.97). We also observed a lower likelihood of being victimized among students (aOR: 0.40, 95% CI: 0.21-0.76) compared to respondents whose occupation was agriculture. Conversely, a higher likelihood of being victimized was found among unmarried individuals (aOR: 1.95, 95% CI: 1.44-2.64)

compared to married persons with disabilities. Lower likelihoods of being victimized were found among the wealthiest individuals (aOR: 0.51, 95% CI: 0.35-0.74) compared to the poorest. Additionally, we observed 53% to 69% lower likelihoods of being victimized among persons with disabilities residing in the Chattogram, Khulna, Mymensingh, Rangpur, and Sylhet divisions compared to those residing in the Barishal division.

Table 5: Factors associated with victimization status among persons with disabilities in Bangladesh.

Characteristics	Children aged 0-17		Adult and older aged 18-95	
	aOR	95% CI	aOR	95% CI
Individual level factor				
Respondent's age in years	1.07**	1.01-1.12	0.97***	0.96-0.97
Gender				
Male (ref)	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Female	0.85	0.58-1.25	0.99	0.77-1.27
Respondent's year of schooling	0.99	0.98-1.01	0.98	0.97-1.00
Respondent's occupation				
Agriculture (ref)	Na	Na	1.0	1.0
Blue collar worker	Na	Na	0.76	0.52-1.13
Pink collar worker	Na	Na	0.75	0.47-1.20
White collar worker	Na	Na	0.80	0.55-1.18
Student	Na	Na	0.40***	0.21-0.76
Housewives	Na	Na	0.78	0.52-1.17
Unable to work	Na	Na	0.96	0.70-1.32
Others	Na	Na	1.22	0.83-1.78
Marital status				
Married (ref)	Na	Na	1.0	1.0
Unmarried	Na	Na	1.95***	1.44-2.64
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	Na	Na	1.07	0.82-1.39
Household level factor				
Religion				
Muslim (ref)	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Others	1.12	0.53-2.38	0.78	0.55-1.09
Wealth quintile				
Poorest (ref)	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Poorer	0.88	0.52-1.51	0.84	0.65-1.08
Middle	0.64	0.36-1.15	0.80	0.61-1.04
Richer	0.78	0.42-1.46	0.76	0.56-1.02
Richest	0.42**	0.20-0.88	0.51***	0.35-0.74
Community level factor				
Place of residence				
Rural (ref)	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Urban	1.04	0.56-1.95	0.82	0.58-1.17
Region of residence				

Barishal (ref)	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Chattogram	0.88	0.35-2.23	0.47***	0.28-0.80
Dhaka	1.95	0.77-4.97	1.05	0.62-1.78
Khulna	0.31**	0.12-0.85	0.39***	0.23-0.68
Mymensingh	0.57	0.21-1.57	0.36***	0.19-0.67
Rajshahi	0.63	0.24-1.61	0.58	0.34-1.00
Rangpur	0.36**	0.14-0.92	0.36***	0.21-0.63
Sylhet	0.57	0.21-1.55	0.31***	0.17-0.57

Note: *p-value <0.05, **p-value <0.01, ***p-value <0.001, aOR: Adjusted odds ratio, CI: Confidence interval.

Discussion

The aim of the study was to explore the extent of victimization among persons with disabilities in Bangladesh and the factors associated with it. We found that approximately 44% of the total persons with disabilities in Bangladesh experienced victimization at least once within 12 months of the survey period. Among them, 98.73% were victimized due to their disability itself. The majority of persons with disabilities were victimized by neighbours, followed by friends and family members. The major factors associated with victimization were respondents' age, occupation, marital status, wealth quintile, and region of residence, with different directions of association based on the age of the persons with disabilities. These findings indicate a higher vulnerability to victimization among persons with disabilities in Bangladesh and underscore the need for targeted interventions to protect them.

We reported that approximately 44% of the total persons with disabilities in Bangladesh are being victimized, slightly higher than the prevalence of victimization of 40% among persons with disabilities [30]. This reported prevalence is much higher than the prevalence of victimization among people with disabilities in LMICs, including Nepal (42.0%) [31] and Burkina Faso (13.9%) [23]. Broad reasons for such a higher prevalence of victimization in Bangladesh could include social stigma and misconceptions, which contribute to discrimination and mistreatment of persons with disabilities [14]. Limited awareness and education about disability rights and inclusion may perpetuate harmful stereotypes and increase vulnerability to victimization [21]. Inadequate support

systems and services for persons with disabilities leave them more susceptible to exploitation and abuse [9]. Economic hardship and social inequality faced by persons with disabilities in Bangladesh may increase their vulnerability, as they often have limited access to healthcare, education, and employment opportunities [30]. Moreover, structural barriers such as inaccessible infrastructure and transportation further isolate persons with disabilities and exacerbate their risk of victimization [32].

We observed varying likelihoods of victimization among persons with disabilities aged 0-17 years and those aged ≥ 18 years, with the former group showing an increased likelihood with age and the latter group demonstrating a decreased likelihood with age. However, we were unable to validate our findings due to a lack of relevant literature. Broad reasons for such differences in likelihoods could include vulnerability and dependency among younger individuals, who may be more susceptible to victimization due to their reliance on caregivers and limited ability to advocate for themselves [33, 34]. In contrast, older individuals may have developed stronger social networks and relationships, providing greater protection against victimization [34]. Developmental factors may also play a role, with younger persons facing unique challenges related to social integration and peer relationships, while older individuals may have developed coping strategies and resilience [9, 14]. Additionally, differences in access to support systems, protective factors, and resources may contribute to variations in victimization likelihood among different age groups. Environmental and contextual factors, such as living arrangements and community norms, may further shape patterns of victimization across the lifespan [33]. Overall, these findings underscore the complex interplay of individual, social, and environmental factors in shaping the vulnerability to victimization among persons with disabilities of different ages.

We identified lower likelihoods of victimization among persons with disabilities who were students. Possible reasons for this finding may include increased social integration within structured educational environments, where regular interactions with peers and educators can

foster supportive relationships and provide a protective buffer against victimization [35, 36]. Moreover, educational institutions often offer tailored support services and resources for students with disabilities, such as counselling and accommodations, which can enhance resilience and coping abilities [36]. Additionally, students may benefit from peer support networks within these settings, where they can connect with others facing similar challenges, receive emotional validation, and access practical advice [37]. Furthermore, the supervision and oversight provided by teachers and staff in educational environments may deter victimization and provide avenues for intervention if incidents occur, creating a sense of safety and security for students with disabilities [20]. Lastly, access to education empowers individuals by equipping them with knowledge, skills, and opportunities for personal and academic growth, enhancing self-confidence, assertiveness, and self-advocacy abilities, and enabling them to assert their rights and resist victimization [36].

We found higher likelihoods of victimization among persons with disabilities who were unmarried, consistent with previous studies in LMICs and Bangladesh [20, 30, 38]. This finding may be attributed to several reasons. Firstly, unmarried individuals with disabilities may experience greater social isolation compared to their married counterparts, lacking the supportive network that a spouse or family can provide [14]. This isolation can leave them more vulnerable to exploitation and abuse. Secondly, unmarried persons with disabilities may face economic vulnerability, with limited access to shared financial resources or potential dependence on a single income or government assistance [38]. Economic hardship can increase the risk of victimization as individuals may engage in risky situations to meet their basic needs. Thirdly, unmarried individuals may have limited access to resources and support services available to married individuals, such as housing assistance and healthcare, further exacerbating their vulnerability [14]. Additionally, stigma and discrimination related to their unmarried status may contribute to social exclusion and marginalization, perpetuating their vulnerability within society.

Persons with disabilities residing in the wealthiest households consistently demonstrated lower likelihoods of being victimized. This trend may be attributed to various factors. Firstly, individuals in affluent households often have access to greater financial resources, which can provide them with more opportunities to mitigate risks and protect themselves from victimization [9, 23]. Economic stability and security may create a protective buffer against exploitation and abuse. Secondly, wealthier households may offer greater social support networks and resources to individuals with disabilities, fostering a sense of safety and security within their environment [30]. Access to supportive family networks, educational opportunities, and community resources may reduce vulnerability to victimization. Additionally, individuals from affluent backgrounds may have higher levels of education and awareness, enabling them to recognize and address potential threats more effectively [4, 22]. Moreover, affluent households may prioritize safety and security measures, such as enhanced home security systems or access to safer neighbourhoods, which can further reduce the likelihood of victimization.

We identified regional-level variations in the likelihood of victimization among persons with disabilities. This variation may be attributed to regional disparities in socio-economic status, as reported in previous studies, with areas experiencing higher poverty rates or economic instability potentially facing greater risks of exploitation and abuse [9, 14, 16]. Additionally, misconceptions and stigma surrounding disability may vary across regions, influencing the treatment and social inclusion of persons with disabilities. Regions with higher levels of disability awareness and acceptance may provide a more supportive and protective environment for individuals with disabilities, thereby reducing their vulnerability to victimization [14]. Furthermore, differences in education enrolment rates and access to educational opportunities between regions may also contribute to variations in victimization rates [6]. Areas with higher rates of educational attainment and enrolment may foster greater awareness of disability rights and inclusion, leading to lower levels of victimization among persons with disabilities.

The findings of this study have broad policy implications. With evidence showing that around 44% of persons with disabilities in Bangladesh are victimized, this study suggests the need for tailored programs to support this vulnerable group at the community level. These programs may include initiatives to ensure their participation in education and income-generating activities, thereby empowering them economically and socially. Additionally, awareness-building programs targeting neighbours, friends, and family members—groups from whom higher occurrences of victimization were reported—are crucial. These initiatives should be adapted to the specific geographical settings and socio-economic factors of each region to effectively address the diverse needs and challenges faced by persons with disabilities.

This study possesses several strengths as well as a few limitations. To our knowledge, it represents the first investigation conducted in Bangladesh examining the victimization status among persons with disabilities at the national level and its associated socio-demographic factors. The study includes a comparatively large sample size extracted from a nationally representative survey. Sophisticated statistical methods were used to analyze data, encompassing a broad range of factors. However, the primary limitations of this study include the analysis of cross-sectional data, which limits our ability to establish causality, as the findings are purely correlational. Additionally, the survey relied on self-reported victimization data, which may introduce the potential for misreporting certain experiences of violence or discrimination. Data were collected through questions posed to the respondents without validation opportunities, demonstrating the possibility of recall bias, although any such bias is likely to be random. Moreover, aside from the factors adjusted in the model, health and environmental factors may contribute to discrimination against persons with disabilities, underscoring their importance for inclusion in the model. Unfortunately, these data were unavailable in the survey, limiting our ability to consider them. Despite these

limitations, the findings of this study will contribute to the development of national-level policies and programs.

Conclusion

This study reveals that approximately 44% of persons with disabilities in Bangladesh experience victimization, with a significant proportion of incidents occurring at the hands of neighbours, friends, and family members. However, the likelihood of victimization varies across different demographic factors such as age, occupation, marital status, wealth quintile, and region of residence. These findings underscore the imperative for tailored programs aimed at supporting persons with disabilities to ensure their dignified lives. Additionally, awareness-building programs targeting neighbours, friends, and family members of individuals with disabilities are crucial to fostering a more inclusive and supportive environment. Such initiatives are essential for addressing the vulnerabilities faced by persons with disabilities and promoting their full participation and integration within society.

Declarations

Acknowledgements: The authors extend their gratitude to the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS) for providing access to the 2021 National Survey on Persons with Disabilities data.

Authors' contributions: Rahman M and Khan designed the study. Rana MS conducted data analysis. Khan MN drafted the first version of manuscript. Khandaker G, Rahman MM and Khan MN critically reviewed and edited previous versions of the manuscript. All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgement: The authors thank the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS) for granting access to the 2021 National Survey on Persons with Disabilities data.

Conflict of interests: The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

Consent for publication: Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials: The authors have made the data associated with this study accessible to interested researchers. To access the raw data file, interested researchers need to submit a research proposal to Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics through the following link: <https://bbs.gov.bd/site/page/b588b454-0f88-4679-bf20-90e06dc1d10b/->.

Conflict of interest: None declared.

Funding: This research did not receive specific grants from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Abbreviations: PWD: Persons with Disabilities, WHO: World Health Organization, LMICs: Low- and Middle-Income Countries, BBS: Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, aOR: Adjusted Odds Ratios, AIC: Akaike Information Criteria, BIC: Bayesian Information Criteria.

References

1. Disease GBD, Injury I, Prevalence C. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet*. 2018;392(10159):1789-858. Epub 2018/11/30. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32279-7. PubMed PMID: 30496104; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6227754.
2. Mitra S, Sambamoorthi U. Disability prevalence among adults: estimates for 54 countries and progress toward a global estimate. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2014;36(11):940-7. Epub 2013/08/22. doi: 10.3109/09638288.2013.825333. PubMed PMID: 23962193.
3. Saran A, White H, Kuper H. PROTOCOL: Effectiveness of interventions for people with disabilities in low-and middle-income countries—an evidence and gap map. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. 2019;15(1-2).
4. Banks LM, Kuper H, Polack S. Poverty and disability in low-and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *PloS one*. 2017;12(12):e0189996.
5. Allen Ingabire J, Stewart A, Sagahutu JB, Urimubenshi G, Bucyibaruta G, Pilusa S, et al. Prevalence and levels of disability post road traffic orthopaedic injuries in Rwanda. *African journal of disability*. 2024;13:1251.
6. Sultana M, Mahumud RA, Sarker AR. Burden of chronic illness and associated disabilities in Bangladesh: Evidence from the Household Income and Expenditure Survey. *Chronic Dis Transl Med*. 2017;3(2):112-22. Epub 2017/10/25. doi: 10.1016/j.cdtm.2017.02.001. PubMed PMID: 29063064; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5627690.
7. Mashreky SR, Rahman AF, Moniruzzaman M, Zaman MMJBSMMUJ. Epidemiology of injury related disabilities in a selected district in Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study: *Epidemiology of Injury Related Disabilities in A Selected District in Bangladesh*. 2022;15(4):16-21.
8. Population and housing census 2022. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics.
9. Rahman M, Rana MS, Khandaker G, Rahman MM, Khan MNJm. National Burden of Disability in Bangladesh and its Socio-Demographic Correlates. 2023:2023.09. 13.23295500.
10. Bunning K, Gona JK, Newton CR, Hartley S. The perception of disability by community groups: Stories of local understanding, beliefs and challenges in a rural part of Kenya. *PloS one*. 2017;12(8):e0182214.
11. Taderera C, Hall H. Challenges faced by parents of children with learning disabilities in Opuwo, Namibia. *African Journal of Disability*. 2017;6(1):1-10.
12. Ledingham E, Wright GW, Mitra M. Sexual violence against women with disabilities: experiences with force and lifetime risk. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2022;62(6):895-902.
13. Emerson E, Aitken Z, King T, Arciuli J, Llewellyn G, Kavanagh AM. The association between disability and risk of exposure to peer cyber victimisation is moderated by gender: cross-sectional survey. *Disability and Health Journal*. 2022;15(1):101170.
14. Rahman M, Rana MS, Rahman MM, Khan MN. Exploring Access to Social Protection for People with Disabilities in Bangladesh. *medRxiv*. 2023:2023.11. 06.23298193.
15. Rana MS, Alam MB, Khanam SJ, Kabir MI, Khandaker G, Khan MN. Prevalence and patterns of comorbidities in people with disabilities and their associated socio-demographic factors. *Scientific Reports*. 2024;14(1):1425.
16. Rahman M, Rana MS, Rahman MM, Khan MN. Healthcare service access challenges and determinants among persons with Disabilities in Bangladesh. 2024.
17. Torsha N, Rahman FN, Hossain MS, Chowdhury HA, Kim M, Rahman SM, et al. Disability-friendly healthcare at public health facilities in Bangladesh: a mixed-method study to explore the existing situation. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2022;22(1):1178.
18. Clemente KAP, Silva SVd, Vieira GI, Bortoli MCd, Toma TS, Ramos VD, et al. Barriers to the access of people with disabilities to health services: a scoping review. *Revista de Saúde Pública*. 2022;56:64.

19. Victoria E-IW. Misconceptions about people with disabilities. *Special needs education from the lens of interdisciplinary dialogue: a festschrift in honour of prof emeka d ozoji*. 2023;1(1).
20. Devkota HR, Kett M, Groce N. Societal attitude and behaviours towards women with disabilities in rural Nepal: pregnancy, childbirth and motherhood. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth*. 2019;19:1-13.
21. Martinez R, Vemuru V. Social inclusion of persons with disabilities in Nigeria: Challenges and opportunities. *World Bank Blogs*. 2020.
22. Ruback RB, Thompson MP. *Social and psychological consequences of violent victimization*: Sage; 2001.
23. Kouanda S, Arelatan J, Ouedraogo HG, Millogo T, Bagnoa C, Busière S, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of violence among persons with disabilities in Burkina Faso. 2022;34(sup1):18-23.
24. Latvala A, Tideman M, Søndena E, Larsson H, Butwicka A, Fazel S, et al. Association of intellectual disability with violent and sexual crime and victimization: a population-based cohort study. *Psychological medicine*. 2023;53(9):3817-25.
25. Fogden BC, Thomas SD, Daffern M, Ogloff JR. Crime and victimisation in people with intellectual disability: a case linkage study. *BMC psychiatry*. 2016;16:1-9.
26. Fisher M, Corr C, Morin L. *Victimization of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities across the lifespan. International review of research in developmental disabilities*. 51: Elsevier; 2016. p. 233-80.
27. National Survey on Persons with Disabilities (NSPD). Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics; Ministry of Planning; Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, 2022.
28. Rahman M, Rana MS, Khandaker G, Rahman MM, Khan MN. National Burden of Disability in Bangladesh and its Socio-Demographic Correlates. *medRxiv*. 2023:2023.09.13.23295500.
29. Kilanowski JF. Breadth of the socio-ecological model. *Journal of agromedicine*. 2017;22(4):295-7.
30. Ekman B, Borg J, Khan A, Bari N, Tanbir M, Emmelin MJD, CBR, et al. Disability, sociodemographics, and discrimination: a descriptive analysis of household survey data from Bangladesh. 2020;31(3):6-22.
31. Puri M, Misra G, Hawkes SJBph. Hidden voices: prevalence and risk factors for violence against women with disabilities in Nepal. 2015;15(1):1-11.
32. Van der Heijden I, Harries J, Abrahams N. Barriers to gender-based violence services and support for women with disabilities in Cape Town, South Africa. *Disability & Society*. 2020;35(9):1398-418.
33. Fisher MH, Moskowitz AL, Hodapp RM. Vulnerability and experiences related to social victimization among individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Journal of Mental Health Research in Intellectual Disabilities*. 2012;5(1):32-48.
34. Hartinger-Saunders RM, Rittner B, Wiczorek W, Nochajski T, Rine CM, Welte J. Victimization, psychological distress and subsequent offending among youth. *Children and youth services review*. 2011;33(11):2375-85.
35. Sulkowski ML, Simmons J. The protective role of teacher–student relationships against peer victimization and psychosocial distress. *Psychology in the Schools*. 2018;55(2):137-50.
36. Grew E, Baysu G, Turner RN. Experiences of peer victimization and teacher support in secondary school predict university enrolment 5 years later: Role of school engagement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2022;92(4):1295-314.
37. Abrams MP, Salzman J, Espina Rey A, Daly K. Impact of providing peer support on medical students' empathy, self-efficacy, and mental health stigma. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2022;19(9):5135.
38. Sarker D. Experiences of people with physical disabilities when accessing microfinance services in Bangladesh: A qualitative study. *Alter European Journal of Disability Research*. 2022;(3):41-55.

