Hate Crime Training of Police Officers in Nottingham: A Critical Review

Dr Loretta Trickett

With Dr Paul Hamilton

Contents

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express her appreciation for the support of the Hate Crime Steering Group in Nottingham for funding this work. She would also like to thank Nottinghamshire Police for their co-operation in facilitating the research. Dr Paul Hamilton has provided support throughout the research and has helped to design the questions as well as commenting on various drafts of the report. He has also made several key recommendations based on the study. The author is most grateful for his involvement with this work and the insights he has provided.

Most importantly, the author would like to acknowledge the contributions made by the individual police officers that she interviewed – all of whom gave up their time when they were already extremely busy. The officers have provided a valuable and informed insight into issues around the policing of hate crime in Nottinghamshire which will also help to inform research both nationally and internationally.

Aims and Objectives of the Research

The aim of this research in Nottinghamshire was to gain a police perspective on responding to hate crime in the region. The research was designed to find out how the police were dealing with hate crime, what sorts of crime and incidents they came across, how they perceived the training provided by the force, how useful they found the hate crime risk assessment forms, how they worked with other agencies, what problems and barriers they may have encountered and how these may be tackled. It was most important to find out about these issues given a number of developments including the publication of the Government's Hate Crime Strategy (HO 2012), two CJJI (2013; 2015) inquiries into Disability Hate Crime and the publication of Police Hate Crime Strategy and Operational Guidance by The College of Policing (2014). Qualitative interviews were undertaken with both response officers and those on beat teams.

Introduction

As gatekeepers to the Criminal Justice System, the role of the Police Force in responding and combating hate crime is of utmost important (Sharp 2001; Asquith & Thorneycroft 2015) yet there has been scant research with police officers on how they respond to hate crime. There

have been studies that have focused on victim's perceptions of the police (Tyson 2013) and a minority of studies on police in specialist roles (see Beadle-Brown et al 2014; Davies et al 2006) but few on front-line police officers (for an exception see Woods 2010).

Giannasi (2014) has argued that strong Police leadership is required to deal with the operational challenges involved in policing hate crime including under-reporting, global influences and trends. However, a key component of strong Police leadership is to provide effective training for front-line officers who are most likely to have contact with victims and this is the subject of the report that follows.

The report based on research with officers from Nottinghamshire Police suggests that the training officers had received on hate crime was piecemeal, overwhelmingly on-line and did not engender confidence in dealing with hate crime; particularly disability hate crime. As important were the findings that the risk assessment forms used by Nottinghamshire Police were considered unhelpful and were not incorporated into the training process, meaning that officers lacked confidence about making actual judgements on risk, on how to safeguard victims and, in many cases, who to turn to for help in doing so. Since this report was initially published last June, Nottinghamshire Police have changed their risk assessment forms following consultation with Nottingham Trent University. The re-designed risk assessment form is being used within new hate crime training for call operators and front-line police officers. Nottinghamshire Police have also embarked on a new initiative of recording misogynistic harassment of women as hate crime and this has provided the context for the training sessions. Paddy Tipping has been re-elected as the Police and Crime Commissioner for Nottingham (West Bridgford Wire 2016) and continues his support for tackling hate crime and for these initiatives. Nottinghamshire Police have also demonstrated their commitment to hate crime by providing support for the role of a Hate Crime Manager.

It should be pointed out that much of the hate crime training is similar across the 43 police forces in England and Wales. The findings in this report together with subsequent actions taken by Nottinghamshire Police are likely to be of interest to other police forces nationally.

It is important to note that there has been little in the way of engagement in either the literature on hate crime or policing with the philosophy of education. The research findings in this report indicate that police officers felt disengaged from much of the training around hate crime. The training described included on-line and classroom based learning which was

underpinned by the metaphors of acquisition and transfer. Arguably, this involves an individualised focus on learning that is de-contextualised (Tennant 1999) from the policing role. The examples of on-line and classroom based teaching involved a mechanistic and linear training environment at odds with policing experiences 'on-the-job' that involved discretion, choices and complexity (Birzer 2003). This helps us to explain the gap between the training and everyday practice discussed by the officers in this report. In a subsequent article (see Trickett forthcoming) the author makes a case for a re-think about how we train police officers and argues for a switch in focus from a pedagogy more commonly used for teaching children to andragogical forms of police training. Active learning approaches (Brookfield 1986; Knowles 1990) can help to better align training with the reality and complexity of policing (Birzer 2003). More emphasis should also be placed on work-place based learning (Heslop 2011) to foster more proactive and preventative approaches to the policing of hate crime drawing on national and localised issues around harassment, community awareness and cultural diversity. On the basis of the research findings in this report the author makes a case for a switch to more effective ways of training police officers on hate crime.

Literature Review

Hate Crime is defined as any criminal offence which is 'perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice towards someone based on a general personal characteristic' (ACPO/CPS 2013).[1] There are five monitored strands of hate crime category including race or ethnicity; religion or beliefs; sexual orientation; disability and transgendered identity. Some police forces including Nottinghamshire Police have more recently begun to include a further category of subculture (Evans, 2013) following the campaigning of Sylvia Lancaster, mother of Sophie Lancaster a young 'goth' who was murdered in 2007.[2] Nottinghamshire Police are currently the first police force in England and Wales to begin recording misogynistic harassment against women as a hate crime.

It is commonly accepted that hate crimes are more serious than non hate crimes. This is due to their personalised and targeted nature which is likely to have a more detrimental effect on the victim and their family (Iganski, 2001; 2009). Hate crimes have been described as 'signal' crimes which attempt to send a signal that the victim and/or their community are inferior and unwanted (Perry 2001) and consequently hate crimes can have a corrosive and destabilising impact on communities. These factors are reflected in the availability of an increased tariff for hate crime offences (Iganski, 2001).

The Coalition Government's plan for tackling hate crime was set out in its 2012 publication 'Challenge it, Report it, Stop it' (HM Government 2012). This plan has been influential in raising the profile of hate crime and making it a continuing priority for the police force nationally as well as other criminal justice partners including the CPS and probation service (NOMS). The plan outlined three core principles for improvement through prevention by challenging prejudice and early intervention, through increasing reporting and access to support, better identification and management of cases and dealing effectively with offenders. Of the 14 recommendations, two of particular importance to policing, were the publication of a Police Hate Crime Manual and updating training for all police staff. However, in November 2013 a subsequent follow-up report (HM Government 2014) suggested that whilst there had been some improvement, much still remained to be done.

---

1 Agreed also as shared definition with NOMS (See CJJI 2015 para 4.2)

The 2012 Hate Crime strategy3 was embedded within two paradigmatic shifts both in policing and perceptions of victims in the CJS in England and Wales. The introduction of Police and Crime Commissioner's in 2012 was in response to criticism that the police had become disconnected from the public that they served. The consultation and subsequent Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act of 2011 involved an attempt to re-establish Sir Robert Peel's principles4 of policing that was '*for and with* the people.

The elected Police and Crime Commissioners took up their roles on 22nd November 2012, replacing the existing Police Authority Framework.5 The role of the PCC is to ensure the delivery of an efficient and effective police force and in order to do this he/she must publish 'A Police and Crime Plan' which includes objectives for policy, identifies available resources and outlines how performance will be evaluated. A large number of these localised policing plans have included a commitment to tackling hate crime including Nottinghamshire under Paddy Tipping.6 In October 2014 PCCs were also given the responsibility for commissioning support services for victims of crime.

The aforementioned changes in policing have been complemented by attempts to improve victim's experiences of the Criminal Justice System. These include The Code of Practice for Victims (MOJ 2015) and The Witness Charter (MOJ 2013). The revised Victim's Code introduced on 10th December 2012 sets out the standards that victims should expect from criminal justice agencies in England and Wales.7 This code indicates that special attention should be paid to persistently targeted and vulnerable victims and hate crime victims often fall into this category.

In March 2013 Baroness Helen Newlove was appointed as the Victim's Commissioner, part of her remit is to evaluate whether the aforementioned framework is having a positive impact on victims. Two annual reviews have been published since this date indicating that there is still work to do to improve victim's experiences. Having examined some of the political and policy developments let us now turn our attention to an examination of some of the core issues in some detail; firstly to the reporting and recording of hate crimes and incidents.

---

3 See also the subsequent update in 2014.
4 See Metropolitan Police Act 1829
5 Paddy Tipping has been reinstated in PCC Elections 2016.
6 See Police and Crime Plan 2015 – 2018.

7 The Code was revised to conform to the European Directive on Minimum Standards for Victims.

Reporting, Recording and the need for improvement

In the year since this report was first published last June, we have continued to see increases in hate crime, the most recent examples include a spike in London and elsewhere in Britain following the EU referendum result. There has been growing concern over these rises in incidents and crimes involving prejudice and hostility. Examples have included Anti-Polish material being posted through the letterboxes of Polish residents and being left outside primary schools in Cambridgeshire (Micklethwaite 2016), graffiti being scrawled on a Polish Community Centre in London (Crerar 2016) and the firebombing of a Muslim business in Walsall (Khaleeli 2016). There have been numerous examples of verbal abuse directed at ethnic minorities in public places (Sherwood et al 2016) and reports of increased levels of concern and fear within many ethnic minority groups (Marsh 2016).

The True Vision Police on-line reporting facility for hate crime documented a 57% rise in the four days following the referendum (Sherwood 2016). The Muslim Council of Britain has compiled a dossier of more than 100 incidents of reported hate crimes against Muslims since the referendum result (see Casciani 2016). Tell MAMA, a third party reporting provider, has reported a significant increase in Anti-Muslim Hate Crime since 2015, much of this being committed by young people (see Sherwood 2016).

There is concern that the EU Referendum has emboldened those who wish to express their hostility and racism because they believe that it is now more acceptable to do so and feel they have support for their views (Chakrabortty 2016). Paul Bagguley, a sociologist from The University of Leeds has spoken of the 'mutation of a white English nationalism which has provided the bedrock for a xenophobia, directed at everybody who is a little different'. This involves:

> *"...a generalised sense of racism oriented at any groups not perceived to be in that narrow category of white English identity (Bagguley cited by Khaleeli 2016).*

These hate crime rises have been condemned by David Cameron in the House of Commons, Sadiq Khan the Major of London, The Muslim Council of Britain, The Polish Ambassador to the UK, The Board of Deputy for British Jews, Amnesty International and the United Nations Human Rights Chief, amongst others (Sherwood 2016). Sara Thornton, Head of the National Police Chiefs' Council has spoken of how the police are having to respond to community

tensions directed at migrant communities (Parveen and Sherwood 2016; Yeung 2016). There are concerns that increased tensions will damage community relations which will continue to fuel racism amongst some sections of the population (see Bagguley cited in Khaleeli 2016). In response to concerns about the rises in hate crime, David Cameron has stated that the Government will be publishing a UK Hate Crime Action Plan (see Sherwood 2016).

During the fortnight before the referendum there were other examples of 'hatred' in action both globally and nationally including the Orlando LGBT shootings and the murder of British Politician Jo Cox. It appears that the man that killed Jo Cox singled her out because he opposed her political views (BBC News 2016). The killing has been viewed as both an act of hatred and an attack on democracy leading to calls for increased security for MPs (Silvera 2016). Recently a British MP has begun a consultation about on-line threats and abuse (Reclaim the Internet 2016; Laville 2016) a high proportion of which have been made against female MPs including Jo Cox (Quinn 2016).

In contrast to the aforementioned attack, there has been reluctance in some sections of the media to identify the attack in Orlando against the LGBT Community as a hate crime (Jones 2016; Robertson 2016). This is arguably illustrative of a failure to recognise hate crime against some minority groups including the LGBT Community, disabled people and gypsy and travellers which affects under-reporting and under-recording (see Leicester Hate Crime Project 2014).

In 2013/14, there were 44,480 hate crimes recorded by the police (Home Office, 2013-2014) this showed an increase of 5 % as compared with the previous year. The breakdown percentage of crimes according to the five monitored strands for that period included 84 % race (37,484), 10% sexual orientation (4,622), 5% religion (2,273), 4% disability hate crime and 1% (555) transgender hate crimes. Around 2 % of hate crimes in 2013/14 were thought to be motivated on the basis of more than one of the protected characteristics for example race and religion. As a subset of all notifiable offences recorded by the police hate crimes made up around 1 per cent of all such crimes in 2013/2014.[8]

In 2014/15, there were 52,528 hate crimes recorded by the police, an increase of 18 per cent compared with the 44,471 hate crimes recorded in 2013/14. These increases were distributed

---

[8] As noted previously it is possible for one hate crime offence to have more than one motivating factor i.e. race and religion which helps to explain why the above numbers total more than the 52,528 and 100 per cent (Home Office, 2014 – 2015).

across the monitored categories with 82% (42,930) being race hate; 11% (5,597) being sexual orientation, 6% (3,254) being religious hate crimes, 5% (2,508) disability and 1% (605) transgender (Home Office 2014 – 2015).

It is likely that these increases are partly reflective of the Government's agenda to improve hate crime reporting and recording. There needs to be some acknowledgement therefore that the police have improved their recording of hate crime and of violence against the person more generally (Morris 2016) during this period and also that the public may have been more willing to report such crimes partly as a result of public awareness campaigns.

Notwithstanding, it is also likely that much of the increase is down to genuine rises particularly in the area of race and religious hate crimes. As previously mentioned, Islamophobia, in particular, has been on the increase for several years (Awan, 2014; Awan and Zempi 2015) particularly in the wake of a number of high profile global events (Hanes and Machin 2014; Travis 2015). On 4th December 2015 it was reported that the Metropolitan Police had witnessed a tripling of Islamophobic incidents in the two weeks following the Paris attacks of November (BBC, 2015).

Previously to this, findings from the combined Crime Survey for England and Wales in 2011/12 and 2012/13 had estimated that there are on average around 70,000 religious hate crimes each year. Analysis of religiously motivated hate crime and racially motivated hate crime shows that Muslim adults were more likely to be a victim of both these crimes than other adults (Home Office 2012 – 2015).[9]

Because of the problems in quantifying the extent of the problem hate crimes against Muslims are now recorded by the police separately from other religious hate crimes in order to improve knowledge (Wintour 2015). Previous measures have included the establishment of a Cross-Government working group on anti-Muslim hatred and the launch of Tell MAMA the first third party reporting service to record incidents and support victims of anti-Muslim hatred. Whilst there has been some controversy about how results by Tell MAMA have been presented in the media, namely questions over whether the bulk of incidents are on-line, this overlooks the extent of the problem and the connection between incitement and actualised

---

[9] Data from three survey years have been combined to give larger sample sizes, increasing the number of incidents available for analysis. For the latest time period, data have been combined for the 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 CSEW; this includes incidents experienced by respondents between March 2011 and February 2015

violence.[10] Inciting hatred on-line inspires fear and suspicion amongst communities (Asquith 2009) and leads to acts of physical violence against Muslims and many other groups. Indeed, in 'Challenge it, Report it, Stop it' the Government highlighted the need to develop the capacity for improved regulation and management of on-line media sites to help prevent the spread of hatred and extremism over the internet.

There have also been significant rises in hate crimes and incidents reported on public transport. Recent Freedom of Information figures suggest that there has been a 37% rise in five years across England, Scotland and Wales, including London Underground (Yeung and Duncan, 2016). Excluding incidents where the race of the victim was not reported, more than ¾ of incidents recorded in 2015 involved non-white victims; albeit the greatest increase in racially motivated crimes in recent years have been against white victims who now account for 24% of the incidents recorded.[11] In terms of perpetrators however, 73% of incidents were by white people, whilst 17% of crimes were committed by black suspects compared to 14% in 2011. British Transport Police have recently run awareness campaigns and have been strongly encouraging victims to report to them (British Transport Police, 2015).

Despite evidence of recent increases in reporting however there has in not been a rise in prosecutions. Indeed, FOI figures for the Metropolitan Police have revealed a drop in police action of 13% for all categories of hate crime over a five-year-period from 2011 to 2015 despite a 72% rise in that period (Davenport and Robbins 2016). A rise in reporting does not of course mean that there will be a rise in prosecutions as there are a number of investigative factors to consider but the drop in action taken gives cause for concern.

Moreover, whilst there have been some recent increases in reporting we do know that there is still significant under-reporting in all of the five monitored hate crime categories. In contrast to police figures, the findings from the combined Crime Survey for England and Wales in 2011/12 and 2012/13 on the extent of hate crime, estimate that on average there are around 278,000 hate crimes each year highlighting the importance of working to tackle under-reporting. It needs to be acknowledged that these are rough estimates due to the different methodologies and time periods involved (Home Office, CSEW 2012 – 2015)

---

10 The Tell Mama Project which was set up in 2012 is the best unofficial source of statistics on anti-Muslim hate crime.
11 These are likely to include ethnic minority groups from Eastern Europe.

Based on the 2012-2013 and 2014 – 2015 CSEW, it was estimated that overall 48% of hate crime incidents came to the attention of the police which was similar to the proportion of hate crimes in previous surveys. Notably the proportion of hate crime incidents that came to the attention of the police was higher than for overall CSEW crime, which was 40%.

Notwithstanding this there are likely to be other reasons for the differences in the proportion of hate crimes coming to the attention of the police compared with overall crime; in part it is likely to do with the type of hate crime identified by the CSEW. For example, 49% of hate crimes were for violence compared with only 19% of overall CSEW crime; violent incidents having consistently higher reporting rates over a number of years.[12]

There are also other possible explanations for differences between the two data sets, for example, in the process of recording a crime, the police can 'flag' an offence as being motivated by one or more of the hate crime strands. It may be for some offences that the victim may not have mentioned a motivating factor when reporting to the police and it is not recorded as a hate crime.[13] Moreover, analysis from a subset of police forces showed that around half of all police recorded hate crime is for public fear, alarm or distress, an offence which generally does not include crime where physical violence is used or attempted against a victim and can include third parties. This is different from the CSEW victimisation survey which will not record where there has not been a direct victim (Home Office, CSEW 2012 – 2015).

It should be noted that there a variety of reasons for non-reporting of hate crime, some of which overlap with the non-reporting of non-hate offences, including fear of retaliation and not realising that a crime has been committed; some victims do not identify hostility and threats against them as hate crime. In terms of police-related reasons for non-reporting the most frequent reason is 'feeling that the police cannot or would not do anything about it'.[14]

It is notable that victim satisfaction with the police is lower for hate crime than for overall crime. Based on the 2012 – 2013 and 2014 – 2015 surveys, 52% of hate crime victims were very or fairly satisfied with the handling of their case, a lower proportion than for victims of CSEW overall where 73% were very or fairly satisfied. Hate crime victims were also more

---

12 See Table D8, Office National Statistics (ONS), Crime in England and Wales – year ending March 2015.
13 This is not to suggest of course that the police would only record a hate crime where the victim themselves identifying a motivating characteristic.
14 It is notable that this is also a common reason behind the non-reporting of non-hate offences but for hate crime it is a reason given by a variety of different victims from the five monitored strands.

likely to be very dissatisfied (35%) with police handling of the matter compared to 14% for crime overall.[15]

Whilst the differences in victim satisfaction with the police for hate crime victims compared with overall crime victims might, in part be due to the types of crimes identified by the CSEW;[16] victims of violent hate crime incidents were still less satisfied with the police (46% were very or fairly satisfied) than victims of overall violent crime incidents (68%).

The combined 2012-2013 and 2014-2015 surveys show that victims of hate crime were less likely to think that the police had treated them fairly or with respect, compared with victims of CSEW crime overall. For example, in 59 per cent of hate crime incidents, the victims thought the police treated them fairly compared with 81% of incidents of CSEW overall.[17] This may be, in part, due to the fact that whilst hate crimes are recorded based on perception they are only prosecuted on the basis of clear evidence of hostility which may leave some victims having their expectations confounded.

According to the 2012 – 2013 and 2014 – 2015 surveys, victims of hate crime were also more likely than victims of CSEW crime overall to say that they were emotionally affected by the incident (92% and 81% respectively) and more likely to be very much affected (36% and 13%) respectively; this trend is consistent over time.[18] More than twice as many hate crime victims said they had suffered a loss of confidence or had felt vulnerable after the incident (39%) compared with CSEW crime overall (17%). Hate crime victims were also more than twice as likely to experience fear, difficulty sleeping, anxiety or panic attacks or depression compared with victims of overall crime.[19]

In terms of worry about future attacks the 2012 – 2013 and 2014 – 2015 CSEW showed that overall 11 per cent of adults were 'very worried' about being subject to a physical attack because of their skin colour, ethnic group or religion. Unsurprisingly, as with other perception questions, this was much higher amongst adults from Asian ethnic backgrounds (16%) or Black and minority ethnic backgrounds (13%) than among white adults (2%). [20] This compares with 5% of adults who were 'very worried' about being a victim of any crime,

---

[15] See ONS Appendix Table 4.1 and Figure 4.3.
[16] As rates of police satisfaction differ by offence type, see Table S14, ONS, Crime in England and Wales, Year Ending March 2015, Supplementary Tables.
[17] (Appendix Table 4.11).
[18] Appendix Table 4.12 ONS.
[19] Figure 4.4.
[20] Appendix table 4.13 ONS.

the pattern amongst ethnic minorities showing a similar split (8% of white adults and 20% of non-white adults).

Repeat victimisation is often common with hate crime victims; repeat victimisation is defined here as being a victim of the same type of hate crime more than once in the last year. Levels of repeat victimisation account for differences between CSEW estimates of incidence rates[21] and victimisation rates.[22] For instance, higher levels of repeat victimisation will be demonstrated by lower victimisation rates when compared with corresponding incidence rates.

As noted in 'Challenge it, Report it, Stop it' there is a significant need to increase reporting of hate crime as offending against some groups is not well captured in police data (and/or the CSEW), hate crimes against Muslim victims has already been highlighted as a particular challenge but other under-reported groups include disabled people, LGBT people and Gypsy and Traveller communities; these problems have long been known by both academics and charitable organisations. Poor reporting by these groups was recently highlighted in an ESRC funded research project by Leicester University which aimed to interview victims that were under under-represented in the police statistics (Leicester Hate Crime Project 2014). The research found that there was under-reporting under all the main strands but included a specific focus on LGB and T[23], Gypsies and Travellers and disabled people.

Based on in-depth interviews in Leicester and Leicestershire the report states that only 14 per cent of LGB victims reported their most recent experience of hate crime to the police. Additional national evidence in the report shows that while victims of transphobia can be targeted up to 50 times in one year, only three in ten reports the incident. The research suggested that some groups had little confidence in the capacity of authorities to act empathetically or effectively.

The report lists a variety of reasons for under-reporting amongst the LGB and T victims including the 'normalisation' of hate incidents, concern about wasting police time, fears about being 'outed' and previous negative experiences with the police.[24] Recommendations made in the report to tackle the issues surrounding the under-reporting of hate crimes

---

21 Appendix Table 4.03 ONS.
22 Appendix Table 4.04 ONS.
23 The study separates out LGB and T.
24 The publication of the report coincided with a major new campaign to raise awareness of LGB and T hate crime. Led by the LGBT Consortium it includes a focus on rural communities where reporting is especially low.

included increased community outreach by police to build trust with LGB and T communities; increasing awareness of how and where to report hate crime, an increase in third party reporting systems;25 and looking at what can be learnt from the reporting of other types of hate crime.

Another group with a long history of experiences of discrimination and hostility against them are Gypsies and Travellers both in the UK and globally (James 2014). This history of prejudice has been documented by academics (Donnelly 2002) who have highlighted the daily problems faced by gypsies and travellers which extend beyond physical and verbal harassment and violence but also include refusal of entry to shops, restaurants and other public venues (Quarmby 2013). Such discrimination and prejudice occurs against Gypsies and Travellers in both urban and rural environments (Holloway 2005). Yet despite this, crimes and incidents against gypsies and travellers are unlikely to be reported (James and Simmonds 2013) to either the police or CSEW researchers.

As part of an overall initiative to tackle the inequalities suffered by Gypsies and Travellers, the Home Office has been improving recording methods, working with voluntary sector parties, increasing Third Party reporting centres and collecting and publishing local examples of what works in preventing and tackling such hate crimes for Community Safety Partnerships. These actions have been complemented by ACPO initiatives which have raised awareness about reporting by producing information materials tailored for traveller communities and by providing self-reporting forms to make electronic reporting more accessible, as well as trying to improve identification methods to improve the prosecution of hate crimes against Gypsies and Travellers LGiU 2012-2015); albeit as acknowledged by academics improving relationships between police and Gypsy and Traveller communities is a complicated process (James and Simmons 2013).

The topic of disability hate crime has remained on the periphery of public awareness, academic research and policy development (Mason Bish 2013; Asquith 2015; Tyson, Giannasi and Hall 2015). Yet disabled people have a long history of prejudice and hostility against them (Sherry 2010). Smart (2001) has referred to a 'hierarchy of oppression' where crimes against disabled people represent the most extreme form of hate crime victimisation. The levels of abuse against disabled people were well documented by Quarmby (et al 2007)

---

in 'Getting Away with Murder'. Quarmby then went on to write 'Scapegoat' (2011) which examined crimes against disabled people within a contextual history of prejudice and abuse. Quarmby stated that her task was to look for motivating factors, geographical clues and commonalities between victims and perpetrators in order to start prevention strategies. She ended the book by arguing that we need a definitive shift in how we view disability and correspondingly crimes against the disabled. There have been a number of other high profile research studies on the extent of the problem and the damaging and repetitive nature of the experiences (see Mencap, 2000; National Learning Disability Survey 2004; EHRC 2011; Khalifeh et al 2013; Pettit et al 2013; Sin et al 2009a; Beadle et al 2014; Sheik et al 2010; Sin 2013; 2015; Chakraborti, Garland and Hardy 2014; Healy 2015).

Disability hate crime is less well reported than other hate crimes (Lane, Shaw and Kim 2009; McMahon et al 2004; Emerson and Roulstone 2014): EHRC 2011; CSEW 2014-2015; Giannasi 2015) both for similar reasons to the non-reporting of interpersonal violence and also for specific disability related issues (see Sin et al 2009). Some factors relate to the police either through a perception that the police would be unwilling or unable to respond in a meaningful or empathetic way (Tyson 2013) and/or a lack of faith due to previous poor experiences of disabled people when reporting to the police (Quarmby 2008; Sin et al 2009; EHRC 2011; Chakraborti, Garland and Hardy 2014). Many disabled people have come to accept regular harassment and abuse as part of their daily lives (EHRC 2011; Beadle-Brown et al 2014; Sin 2013, 2015). There are substantial differences in reporting and recording between forces (Tyson, Giannasi and Hall 2015). Figures obtained by Disability News Service (2013) revealed that South Yorkshire Police who have recently experienced criticism over failing to treat the Craig Kinsella case as a disability hate crime recorded just 7 cases in 2012-2013.[26] West Midlands Police recorded 33 disability hate crimes in 2012-2013. In contrast Leicestershire police who have placed a much stronger emphasis on disability hate crime after the criticism emanating from their handling of the Pilkington case recorded 49 for the same period.

Whilst disability hate crime has been recognised by academics and disability activists as where:

---

[26] *ibid*

"...a disabled person is physically or sexually abused, harmed, bullied or even killed because of the perpetrator's hostility to their disability" (Shah 2015: 12).

A significant problem remains in that that victims, members of the public and criminal justice staff have often struggled to recognise this 'hostility' in practice (Quarmby 2008; Sin et al 2009; Mason-Bish 2013; Asquith & Thorneycroft 2015). There are arguably three overlapping factors here i) the conceptualisation of 'hate' ii) the focus on discrete incidents and iii) the emphasis placed on the relationship between the victim and the offender.

In reality, hostility has been perceived narrowly as only involving the demonstration of 'hatred' against the victim by the perpetrator involving individualised pathology (Sin et al. 2009). This has been aggravated by criminal conceptions of hate crimes as discrete incidents committed by strangers (Mason 2005). In reality disability hate crime is more likely to be repetitive and committed by known perpetrators including family, neighbours, carers and 'friends' (Thomas 2011; 2013) – the latter has commonly become known as 'mate crime' (Roulstone and Mason-Bish 2013). This involves a 'counterfeit friendship' (Landman 2014) where perpetrators initially befriend and then exploit and abuse the disabled person – whilst this type of offence occurs against people with a range of disabilities, it is most prevalent against those with learning disabilities or mental health conditions (see EHRC 2011; Healy 2015). The boundaries between incidents of verbal abuse, derogatory treatment and violence can make it difficult for an individual to distinguish that which is seen to be acceptable as part of the everyday from that which is seen even by others and the law, as an act of violence (Hollowmotz 2012 p54). To address this, a fluid conception of disability hate crime as involving a continuum of violence (Goodey 2007), including murder and GBH through to name calling, criminal damage and threats is needed (See Hollomotz 2012 drawing on Bowling 2003).

Adopting a narrow definition of hostility has resulted in a tendency for police and prosecutors to focus on the 'vulnerability' of disabled victims. Critics have argued that a conflation of disability hate crime with vulnerability is directly correlated to the lack of successful prosecutions (Roulstone and Mason-Bish 2013; Roulstone and Saddique 2013; Landman 2014; Healy 2015). The problems here are manifold in that the prejudicial and discriminatory motivation of the offender becomes lost (Perry 2013) and prosecutions based on hostility are thwarted (Hamilton and Trickett 2014; Asquith and Thorneycroft 2015).

A focus on 'vulnerability' implies that disabled people precipitate their own victimisation in some way simply by 'being disabled' (Sin 2013: 2015) whilst simultaneously generating a vulnerable label for disabled people more generally, marking them out as 'different' to the non-disabled. It also switches the focus from crime and prosecution to 'maltreatment', 'bullying' or anti-social behaviour (Novis cited in Pring 2013). This has then led to actions through social services and housing, such as moving disabled victims and/or encouraging them to modify their own behaviour and routines (Sherry 2010). A focus on vulnerability sends the message that such occurrences are not really criminal and do not require legal intervention thereby (Sin 2013) leaving prejudicial behaviours and attitudes unchallenged.

This focus on vulnerability has come about in large part because of a problematic distinction between vulnerability and hostility as two incompatible motivations (Mason-Bish 2013). Consequently, if a criminal act is committed against a person with a disability due to their perceived vulnerability then it cannot be a hate crime (Roulstone, Thomas and Balderston 2011)

For these reasons it has been advocated that a lens of prejudice and difference is more suited to capturing the experiences of disabled people (Chakraborti and Garland 2009). Perry has argued that 'disablist violence' is a term that encompasses prejudice (Allport 1954) and rightly focuses on the perpetrator's motivation and behaviour rather than the victim's relationship with the offender (2013). This conceptualisation has the additional advantage that it envisages vulnerability as 'situational' rather than inherent. As Chakraborti and Garland (2009) have argued we need a different approach to how 'vulnerability' has frequently been understood in disability hate crime. A disabled person like a non-disabled person can find themselves in a situation of vulnerability if they are in the presence of a person who decides to exploit abuse or attack them. They are 'vulnerable' in the eyes of a person who is motivated to target them based on the perpetrator's own perception of vulnerability because they are disabled. But this is surely evidence of hostility based on prejudice (Allport 1954) – if I choose to victimise a disabled person rather than a non-disabled person because I believe them to be an easier target with less possibility of standing up to me, then I have demonstrated prejudice towards them compared with the non-disabled. Hostility is about prejudice after all - it matters not what form

that takes. The common feature of hate crime is that I am prejudiced against you in some way, that I perceive you as different from me (Perry 2001) and arguably as a lesser person than me.[27]

Perry (2013) has argued that the term 'disablist' violence places this issue of bias motivation and discrimination at the forefront of investigations. This also helps to deal with the problems generated by the term 'mate crime' and is therefore particularly important when dealing with the abuse of disabled people by family and friends. As Perry (2013) rightly suggests, the term 'mate crime' ends up playing on the alliterative function of 'hate'. The focus should not be on the dynamics between two people, but on the bias motivation and discrimination that leads to the hate conduct. 'Mate Crime' therefore misrepresents the reality of what is going on which Perry (2013) has argued is better understood as 'grooming' – which is an 'active' construction of the perpetrators behaviour and which applies to all categories of victimisation.

Other arguments about problems with the concept of 'vulnerability' have been made by Bartkowiak-Theron and Asquith (2012). They suggest that the concept of 'vulnerable victims' has become problematic for the police in terms of the labyrinth of procedures to be followed. They argue that a better approach is would be one of 'universal precaution' that recognises the potential vulnerability of all victims. By working with a concept of 'universal precaution' recognising that all victims can be vulnerable we can better incorporate multi-agency working whilst recognising that the police cannot solve all problems alone (Barkowiak-Theron and Asquith). These points will revisited in the recommendations.

Suffice to say at this point, that the aforementioned problems with hostility versus vulnerability cannot be underestimated. As a result of the failure to focus on hostility, disability hate crime is frequently operationalised at a level that can appear to police and prosecutors as inconsequential and unconnected. Indeed, Police forces have sometimes failed to intervene earlier to prevent escalation. For example, campaigners in the Bijan Ebrahimi case (Quarmby and Novis 2013 cited in Pring 2013} have drawn comparisons between this case and the multi-agency failings in the cases of Brent Martin, Steven Hoskin, Keith Phillpot, Sean Miles and others.

Indeed serious criticisms were made of both the Police and the CPS in the EHRC (2011) inquiry 'Hidden in Plain Sight'; the title of which was chosen to reflect the 'culture of disbelief' that

---

[27] The derogative language used in many disability hate crime cases would certainly imply this see Quarmby 2007, EHRC 2011.

exists around disability related harassment. The inquiry stated that there had been a systematic failure by public authorities to recognise the extent and impact of harassment and abuse of disabled people, to take preventative action and intervene effectively when it happened. Ten cases were reviewed where disabled people had either been killed or seriously injured. Key findings were that public authorities had often been aware of earlier less serious incidents but little action had been taken, the harassment often occurred within the context of exploitative relationships involving a socially isolated victim, if left unchecked non-criminal behaviour and petty crime had rapidly escalated into more extreme behaviour, sometimes resulting in death, victims were often advised to alter their own behaviour rather than perpetrators being effectively tackled, disability was rarely considered as a motivating factor, incidents were accorded low priority and appropriate hate crime policy and legislative frameworks were not applied.[28]

Recommendations were that organisations must demonstrate ownership and effective leadership on the issue. This required better collection and monitoring of data, making the CJS more accessible and supportive to victims, encouraging improved understanding, gaining a better understanding of motivations of offenders and formulating preventative and responsive systems. A notable inclusion here was that all front-line staff should receive effective guidance and training.

In July 2011, Mencap had also produced its report entitled 'Stand by Me' assessing how 14 police forces across England and Wales were responding to disability hate crime. The key points identified here were insufficient time being allowed for interviews with disabled people, a lack of understanding of how to identify different disabilities, discriminatory attitudes needing to be challenged and that disability hate crime should be identified as a specific crime and dealt with accordingly. The report concluded that whilst some police forces were responding positively – a number still needed to improve. Mencap subsequently published 'How to Stand by Me' (2012) which highlighted that 30 police forces had signed up to their campaign. However there have been criticisms that since 2011 the response has been uncoordinated and too slow (Beadle-Brown et al 2014).

The ECHR published a follow up to its 2011 inquiry entitled 'A Manifesto for Change' (2013) which also attempted to track progress made by public agencies on implementing

---

28 The report findings were debated in Westminster on 23rd November 2011.

recommendations. As part of their feedback on this both ACPO and the College of Policing reported that all police staff would be encouraged to complete existing NCALT training packages, joint training would be undertaken with local partners, agencies and third sector organisations and hate crime master classes would be delivered to leaders. Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary (HMIC 2012) also reported on progress including better identifying of anti-social behaviour and its impact and an emphasis on how front line staff including call handlers were identifying vulnerable victims, suggesting that improvements were still needed and that software alone could not be effective in this endeavour.

Calls for improvements in policing have also come from within the police force itself. Giannasi (2014) has placed emphasis on raising awareness and increasing knowledge amongst police officers so that they understand the 'nuances' of disability hate crime and start to look for evidence of disability-related hostility, rather than simply evidence of the crime that has taken place (Giannasi cited in Pring 2014). Steps in this direction have included the Police Hate Crime Manual setting out policing strategy and operational guidance and the True Vision website which enables victims to report on-line.

This leads us to a consideration of the use of the uplift tariff. There is no separate offence of disability hate crime but s146 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 applies. This provides that in order for a judge or magistrate to increase the sentence, the CPS must prove that a perpetrator demonstrated hostility towards the victim either before during or after the offence which was motivated, at least partly, by the victim's disability. There have been a number of criticisms of the low take up rate of this sentencing option in disability cases by academics who have argued for better communication between the police, the CPS and the judiciary and who have also called for improved training on the uplift tariff and establishing hostility (Hamilton and Trickett 2014; Perry 2009). Similar criticisms have been made by disability activists (Pring 2014).

Indeed coverage of high profile cases since 2012 have indicated that despite the recommendations from the ECHR (2011) and the CJJI (2013) there is still little use of the uplift tariff. A controversial case was that of Craig Kinsella, a man with learning difficulties who was kept as a slave in 'squalid' conditions in a garage. He was not fed, having to scavenge for food from wheelie bins and he was subjected to regular beatings and death threats. In July 2013 following a phone call from a member of the public the police attended the property and found Mr Kinsella in a distressed state with obvious injuries. Shocking

images of earlier beatings were found on the family's own CCTV film footage. Inspector Vicky Short explained that without the phone call in July it is likely that the police would have been investigating a murder (Press Association 2014).

The judge in the case emphasised the inhumanity of the defendants telling them that they had treated Kinsella like 'a dog'. He concluded his remarks by saying 'The hatred is simply immeasurable'. Yet despite this the case was not treated as a 'hate crime'. This has parallels with many other cases associated with the term 'mate crime'[29] where victims are initially befriended by the perpetrator before being targeted for exploitation and abuse. Kinsella had originally begun to work for the family cleaning their ice cream vans for £40 a week so that he could keep claiming benefits, but the defendants would accompany him to the post office and withdraw his money (Press Association 2014). Criticisms were made after the main protagonist received just six and a half years for Actual Bodily Harm and False Imprisonment (Bashell cited in Pring 2014).

A further case in which Stephen Brook, a disability activist, questioned the actions of Criminal Justice staff (Brook cited in Pring 2015) involved three men who had avoided being sentenced for hate crime for a second time. Ben Dean, Keian Heap and Jack Clark, were convicted of offences relating to a sadistic attack' on a young man with bi-polar disorder in 2014 during which they assaulted him with a fence post, stamped on his head and repeatedly stabbed him in a ten minute attack, during which he feared that he was going to be killed. The trio had already had been convicted of a separate attack on a young man with Aspergers Syndrome in a Bury Park in 2013.

Before the 2014 attack, Dean and Clark had shouted 'disablist' abuse outside the home of Kieran Clarke – calling him a 'mong' and throwing stones at his windows. Two days earlier, on 2nd October, also in the early hours of the morning, members of the gang had again shouted disablist abuse at Kieran Clark – referring to him as a 'muppet' and a 'schizo.' The court heard that they had a history of chasing and abusing him (Pring 2015). The judge told them they had targeted Kieran Clarke and added:

> *'There is something about people with learning difficulties that you three take serious exception to'* (cited in Pring 2015).

---

29 See also the cases of Brent Martin and Steven Hoskin.in EHRC (2011).

He also said it was:

> 'plain that you have no compassion for others that are different from you and those that you perceive as inferior, even though they are not' (cited in Pring 2015).

There were suggestions that the judge was invited to apply s146 and agreed to do so while the defence barrister declined to contest the suggestion that it had been a Hate Crime (see Pring 2015). But despite the judge indicating that the offence would be treated as a hate crime, he appears to have failed to have increased their sentences (Pring 2015).Stephen Brookes said he was 'deeply concerned' with the way the CJS was dealing with s146. He said:

> ' *S146 is not being used ... It is being missed either by the police, the CPS or the judiciary – each one is failing to grasp the nettle* (cited in Pring 2015).

Another case criticised by activists involved a wife who murdered her disabled husband in a sustained and frenzied attack where she had punched and kicked him, beaten him with a heavy table top and repeatedly stabbed him with broken crockery. The defendant had also exploited her partner and taken his benefits. A local newsagent suggested the victim had visited the shop with apparent injuries in the days before he died and a friend of the victim described how he had suggested his partner had tried to push him down the stairs. The defendant received a minimum sentence of twenty years; disabled activists have suggested this could have been thirty years if the case had been treated as disability hate crime (see Pring 2015).

The case of Bijan Ebrahimi demonstrates how quickly hostility against a disabled person can escalate into murder and, like Pilkington, is a case that has demonstrated police failings. Bijan had been moved by the council from a previous address because of problems with neighbours. Before his death police have taken him to the police station for questioning following an altercation with a neighbour in which he was accused of being a paedophile for taking photos of his children. In fact he had been taking photographs to demonstrate acts of anti-social behaviour around his property. Recorded interactions between Bijan and police staff were suggestive of antipathy towards him. In the days leading up to his murder he had contacted the police on numerous occasions through fears for his personal safety (Morris, 2015) but no action had been taken despite knowledge of the hostility on the housing estate generated through allegations of paedophilia and the threat made by the eventual perpetrator

of his murder. Quarmby (2011) has written of how false allegations of paedophilia have often been made against men with learning disabilities living alone in the community.

Two police officers were found to be in breach of their public duty to Mr Ebrahimi. PC Duffy had refused to speak to Mr Ebrahimi, repeatedly ignoring his calls for help despite being aware of the threat made against him by his neighbour. Andrew Passmore, a PCSO, was found guilty of lying in a witness statement claiming that he had carried out a foot patrol in the area around Mr Ebrahimi's house for an hour (see Pring 2015).

Campaigners have drawn comparisons between this case and the multi-agency failings in the cases of Fiona Pilkington, David Askew and Steven Hoskin. Police failings in the Pilkington case had been referred to as 'institutionalised disablism' by disability campaigners (Disability News Service 2009).The IPCC investigation (IPCC May 2011) found an unsatisfactory use of information already available to the police, a lack of a structured approach to evaluating the reports and a failure to consider the behaviour against the family as hate crime. The case illustrates the repetitive nature of disability hate crime and the failure to link separate incidents. For this reason, as previously argued, the theoretical concept of process (Bowling 2009; Hollomotz 2012) or continuum (Goodey 2007) is better able to capture the nature of this type of offending rather than a focus on discrete incidents.[30]

As stated earlier, problems with disability hate crime have come from a failure to recognise hostility against disabled people rather a non-hate offence or anti-social behaviour. Beth Grossman believes that more needs to be done to tackle 'low level' negativity towards disabled people and suggests a relevant factor is that many people have little day to day interactions with disabled people. A study that she helped to conduct found that 43% of non-disabled people did not know a disabled person (see Mortimer, 2015). This lack of contact and the resulting lack of knowledge, misunderstanding and insecurity leading to hostility and prejudice have been noted by other researchers (see Scior 2011, 2015, Scior and Sheridan ; Scior, Ka-Ying Kan, McLoughlin and Sheridan 2010)

This lack of contact with disabled people is often true of police officers who also lack experience with disabled people. Beth Grossman has stated:

---

[30] Repetitive victimisation is apparent in many of the different hate crime strands not only Disability Hate Crime.

'If you think the police are ordinary people, who just like me and you may not know disabled people then they might not recognise when people come in and report comments that could be a hate crime. ...or if a disabled person comes in and reports street harassment or physical assault if that person themselves is not physically disabled or the person doesn't directly report any disablist language the police might not record it as such, not for any malicious reason, they might just not know' (Grossman quoted by Mortimer 2015).

A recent rise in police recording of disability hate crime has been linked to closer working between the Home Office, the public and the police about what constitutes a hate crime (see Mortimer 2015). But Anne Novis, a co-ordinator of the Disability Hate Crime Network, and the independent Chair of the Metropolitan Police Disability Hate Crime Working Group has said that media coverage of cases where the uplift tariff had not been used were already undermining efforts to persuade disabled people to report to the police. Novis has said:

*'This is echoing the message that advisers and campaigners have been saying for many years about the lack of adequate police response, treating Disability Hate Crime as Anti-social behaviour' (*Novis quoted in Pring 2015*).*

She said national policies on disability hate crime still needed to be put into practice on the ground and she blamed a lack of training by police forces. Novis has said she will use the events surrounding the 'awful' death of Bijan Ebrahimi as a training case study for the Disability Hate Crime Matters scheme. Novis added:

'I hope we will see an increase in recorded cases [in London] across the country in the coming year due to this initiative and all officers become more knowledgeable about Disability Hate Crime. My hope is also that it will influence national practice' (Novis quoted in Pring 2016)

We do appear therefore to be at something of a crossroads in terms of hate crime developments where there have been gains and improvements but more much remains to be done to tackle all hate crime effectively. Indeed, the CJJI follow up in May 2015 suggested that progress made by the Police, CPS and Probation Service since March 2013 was disappointing. In March 2013 the CJJI had outlined seven key recommendations and argued

that new 'impetus' was needed from all three services in order to make sure that disability hate crime was aligned with race and religious hate crime (CJJI, March 2013).

To achieve this disability hate crime needed to be 'operationalised' into everyday processes and practices within the Criminal Justice System. The reviewers found problems in the identification of disability hate crime with some practitioners using policy definitions, others using the definition under s146 CJA 2003 and some believing that hate was required. The reviewers recommended that the police force, CPS and probation trust should adopt a single definition of a disability hate crime. It was also suggested that all three organisations needed to improve the confidence of disabled people in the criminal justice system to increase reporting. Importantly, consideration must be paid to how front-line staff engaged in disability hate crime training to improve investigations and prosecutions.

The key message of the CJJI 2013 review was therefore the need for police forces, the CPS and probation service (NOMS) to understand that disability hate crime has unique features which must be operationalised into practice. However the CJJI noted in May 2015 that real change across the three agencies had not been satisfactory. Whilst there had been some increases in reporting and recording this was not consistent in terms of geography and some police forces still had less than ten reports.[31] Unfortunately, the inspectorate also noted that the approach to deliver effective training had been slow and inconsistent. The original report found that police staff often felt awkward about dealing with disability and asking questions about it, lacked confidence in identifying disability and demonstrated a tendency to focus on the underlying offence rather than looking for evidence of hostility. Police training was found to be patchy and there were different levels of engagement nationally and no overall coherence with a dominant reliance on NCALT.[32] The Inspectorate also found that more use needed to be made by officers of the True Vision website.

Other developments since this update in May 2015 have included an announcement that the Metropolitan Police is launching an initiative intended to treat reports by disabled people of harassment or hostility as disability hate crime rather than anti-social behaviour (see Pring 2015). This action had previously been taken by Lancashire police and whilst the CJJI (2015) has expressed some reservations;[33] it seems that this may at least keep disability hate

---

31 Para 4.19 CJJI 2015.
32 Albeit there was some evidence of good practice i.e. Lancashire Police.
33 Including a risk of further confusion in identification and recording and possible adverse impact on hate crime figures.

crime at the forefront of officer's minds during investigations. Whilst not all crimes against disabled people will be disability hate crimes – the new emphasis will at least focus the minds of officers on looking for evidence of disability hate crime whilst requiring good reasons to rule it out. However, as this report makes clear how to establish hostility and use of the uplift tariff are matters that must be effectively included in the content of police training in order for operational change to be achieved.

This is particularly important given that the CPS has embarked on more training for their staff on improving disability hate crime convictions. The CPS has recently announced that it will include a focus on vulnerability when it is training prosecutors. This announcement came after the Law Commission Inquiry did not recommend extending existing hate crime laws. A CPS spokeswoman said the new disability hate crime guidance "encourages the use of section 146 where possible, and reminds prosecutors that where an application for an uplift under section 146 is not appropriate, the vulnerability of a victim due to their disability may still make an offence more serious and so prosecutors should present the case in a way which enables the judge to reflect this in sentencing (see Pring 2015). This emphasis appears to be an attempt to appease disability groups who have long criticised the lack of use of the up-lift tariff.

However, it was noted earlier that campaigners and academics (Chakraborti and Garland 2009; Hamilton and Trickett 2014) have already criticised approaches that focus on the vulnerability of disabled victims. Indeed, Quarmby (2015) has warned that the new emphasis on "vulnerability" could be a backward step. Even if crimes receive a higher sentence because of the victim's "vulnerability", she said the effect of declaring an offence a disability hate crime was crucially important. And she added that offences often start off with criminals grooming a disabled person who has found themselves in a vulnerable situation – perhaps because of a lack of support – but end up as hate crime (See Quarmby and also Novis cited in Pring 2015).

Quarmby points to the case of Kevin Davies, a young disabled man who was befriended, and then held captive in a locked garden shed for nearly four months, fed scraps of food, and humiliated and tortured by his "friends", while his benefits were stolen. She said:

> "*They say that it is now crystal clear what a disability hate crime is, as opposed to a 'vulnerability' crime. They are convinced that they will know a section 146 crime and therefore they will immediately leap to ask for section 146 to be imposed. I am sceptical. I think we still don't get away from a blurring of the boundaries. Cases start as one*

thing and turn into another, a point made by Ken Macdonald, the former Director of Public Prosecutions, who was the first head of the CPS to take the issue seriously" (Quarmby cited in Pring, 2015).

The CPS has promised to evaluate the effectiveness of this policy but a notable point is that it is not clear how this emphasis on vulnerability in CPS prosecution practice will fit with police training on hate crime. Nor whether the previously mentioned new emphasis in police practice, on treating crimes against disabled people as disability hate crime rather than anti-social behaviour will still place an emphasis on hostility or whether there will be a shift to 'vulnerability'. A further lack of clarity between these two organisations is unwelcome given that they are trained separately and because as police officers in this report suggest that communications between the police and CPS are often infrequent and limited.

The author of this report believes that an emphasis on the vulnerability of the victim is a background step given the aforementioned criticisms around disability hate crime. But she also argues that it adds nothing for disabled victims given that the vulnerability of the victim is already provided for under Sentencing Guidelines for the Judiciary and Magistrates where it has long been understood to be an aggravating factor in *any crime*. Therefore a focus on vulnerability of disabled victims due to their disability is doubly flawed and there is a real need to focus on the hostility of the offender.

What has become apparent in the proceeding discussion is that the Criminal Justice System and the experience of hate crime victims still need to improve. Despite some gains much remains to be done and this is no time for complacency (see Tyson, Giannasi and Hall 2015) certainly given rises since the beginning of 2016. Of utmost importance is effective training of criminal justice staff as hate crime is different to non-hate offending and the consequences have the potential to spread more widely.

This literature review began with the definition of hate crime which sets out the targeted nature of 'hate' based on hostility expressed through crime, which potentially has a more detrimental impact on the victim, their family and their wider community than non-hate offences. It is this understanding which is reflected in the aggravated offences of race and religion and the availability of the enhanced sentences under s146 CJA 2003.

In order to 'operationalise' hate crime into police practice we need a cultural shift in emphasis just as we had with domestic violence. Asquith (2015) has argued that we need a preventative stance in policing in relation to hate crime and that there is also a need for dedicated hate crime officers. The current author would agree with these arguments and Nottinghamshire Police has already has a Hate Crime Manager. It is because of his work and that of the PCC that hate crime has remained at the forefront of policing in Nottinghamshire. But the current author would also argue that in order to achieve a cultural shift around hate crime we need a complete re-evaluation of how we train police leaders and importantly front-line staff. In doing so we must pay more much attention to both the content and form of police training and to the much neglected topic of the pedagogy behind it (see Trickett forthcoming). Indeed, this author argues that without this we are simply playing lip service to the idea of 'taking hate crime seriously'.

In June 2016 the policing report that follows is of crucial importance for several reasons. Firstly because there have been and continue to be rises in the reporting of hate crime both nationally and globally and this is unlikely to abate given recent political events following the EU Referendum and the growth in global terrorism. Secondly, because the Government has announced the formulation of a New Hate Crime Plan. Thirdly, because the College of Policing has recently undertaken a 'Learning Needs' Analysis on hate crime for the police force. Fourthly - due to the continuing questions and debate about the professionalization of the police and the subject of how we train police officers of the future.

In (2010) the Neyroud Review into Police Leadership and Training, made a case to professionalise the police and argued for the creation of a Policing Body responsible for strong leadership, learning and standards. An emphasis was placed on moving away from in-house classroom based learning towards courses on policing that are linked with policy and practice. Other notable points were the need to forge collaborative research between policing and universities, development of effective training that draws on evidence of effective police practice, a strive for national standards and coherence whilst allowing for the incorporation of localised knowledge, an emphasis on clear objectives and an evaluation of training and the development of 'what works' with a focus on vocational training. The College of Policing has recently undertaken a review on whether all new recruits to the police force may need to have a policing degree which has included a focus on the issue of training (Mathura 2015).

A striking feature of the Neyroud report was the lack of evaluative research on police training. This meant reviewers were forced to draw on evaluative research from other professions in order to provide evidence of 'what works' in training; most notably the health service. This lack of evaluation of police training, in particular, the lack of empirical work with front-line police officers on how they experience training and whether they value is indeed surprising – as is the long neglect of the topic by academics in the field of Hate Crime (for an exception see Wood 2010).[34]

To conclude, hate crime is a growing problem in Britain and beyond. The national growth has taken place against a background of budgetary cuts to the police service and other organisations such as the NHS having an enormous impact upon the police as an organisation. Important decisions are continually having to be made about where and how money on policing is spent (Police Federation, 2015).

However, we cannot continue to criticise police officers about their performance in dealing with hate crime if police training is insufficient to instil confidence about how to deal with this specialised offence. In order to achieve the 'operationalised' changes as advocated by the CJJI 2(2013; 2015) and to meet the challenge of hate crime increases within a period of instability and political change, we require a cultural shift in emphasis just as was required with domestic violence, and this must be reflected in police training.

For reasons of austerity, it may be tempting to look at continuing NCALT training on hate crime without a more substantive provision that involves actual engagement with victims and fully aligns training with policing experiences, bringing officers and their knowledge into the learning process. But at this *critical crossroads* and on the evidence of this policing report and this literature review that would surely be taking the wrong direction.

Whether police training is delivered by the Police Force or a Professionalised body through an accredited degree programme, both the content and the form of police hate crime training must change. At this important point in history when we are witnessing huge political changes and increasing societal divisions and whilst professionalization and training is at the

---

34 Wood's (2010) ethnographic study of a Community Cohesion Unit found minimal hate crime training and stated that officers would have found additional training useful. Beadle-Brown et al (2014) interviewed some police officers in specialist roles albeit this did not include a detailed review on the training of front-line officers.

forefront of policing debates, we must now grasp the mantel of improving national hate crime training for front-line police officers as well as police leaders.

Methodology

This research took the form of a qualitative study with 34 police officers of different ranks including response officers, beat managers and PCSOs. A qualitative methodology of depth interviewing was chosen as this was considered to be the best method of gaining information on officer's experiences and opinions on dealing with hate crime and training. The interview schedule was designed to enable officers the freedom to talk at length and in their own words on the topic of hate crime and policing and was flexible enough to capture emerging themes and issues.

Within the social sciences there has been a long debate about the basis of knowledge in quantitative and qualitative research. Whilst there is no one way of doing qualitative research it is commonly understood to involve an interpretative approach, by taking the perspectives and accounts of research participants as a starting point (Ritchie et al 2014; Silverman 2013). There are two important philosophical questions to address when undertaking social research. The first question is to do with ontology which is concerned with the nature of reality - of what exists. The second is a question of epistemology which is concerned with the nature of knowledge and how it can be best acquired.

The underlying theoretical approach used here is known as 'subtle realism' (Blaikie, 2009; Hammersley, 1992) which argues reality has an independent existence of those who observe it but this can only be accessed through the perceptions and interpretations of individuals. This puts the research within an interpretivist frame which stresses the importance of understanding people's perspectives grounded in the conditions and circumstances of their lives. Whilst the approach to data collection and analysis taken was largely inductive and grounded in the accounts of the police officers themselves, a deductive approach was taken to the design and planning of the study and the development of research tools drawing on existing theory and research.

Most qualitative researchers believe that the relationship between the researcher and social phenomena is interactive and so the researcher cannot produce a purely objective account. The approach adopted in this study was one of 'empathic neutrality', a position that recognises that research cannot be value free but which advocates that researchers should try to make their assumptions, biases and values transparent, while striving as far as possible to be neutral and non-judgemental in their approach (see Ritchie et al 2014).

This research was funded by The Hate Crime Steering Group Nottingham.[35] As funders, public bodies have certain requirements of the research they commission– evidence is required to be systematically generated and analysed, with interpretations that are grounded, defensible and able to support wider inference. Research findings also need to be accessibly presented and sufficiently clear to inform policy design and application (Richie et al 2014). One of the issues here in terms of transparency is that despite the research being publicly funded the researchers must explain to the funders that they are acting in an independent and neutral capacity and have to report the issues that are uncovered in the research, therefore, the research findings cannot be contaminated or suppressed.

Whilst it is not possible to generalise from qualitative research findings to a general population, the aim of publicly funded qualitative studies is to produce reliable evidence that has relevance for a wider application beyond the sample. It is important therefore to make clear the basis and boundaries of inferential statements (Ritchie et al 2014). With this study it is thought feasible to suggest that given most police officers in the 43 police forces of England and Wales are exposed to similar training models and that a range of front line officers were included, similar results might be expected if the study were to be repeated with other police forces.

The ethics procedure was undertaken by Nottingham Trent University, the research ethics plans were examined and signed off before the research began. Compliance with an ethical code is required to ensure that social science is conducted in a rigorous manner and potential harm to research respondents, staff and third parties is averted or at least minimised. Researchers must ensure that research subjects are taking part in the research voluntarily and with informed knowledge about the purposes of the research and what it entails (Social Research Association 2003).

Caution is especially required where respondents might have a limited chance to avoid partaking in the study as in when, the research is being done, as here, in an institution. This is because free consent means that consent has been obtained without outside pressure or constraints on an individual from a course of action, such as fear of disadvantage from not

---

[35] This group works to improve policy on Hate Crime in Nottingham and includes Nottingham County Council, the Police, the CPS,, the Probation Service and Victim Support amongst others.

taking part. There were two factors here that may have arguably compromised free voluntary consent. The first was that the research was being conducted within the institution of the police force, the employers of the respondents.

The second issue was to do with sampling technique. The officers were found using a non-probability quota sampling technique as this was considered the most appropriate for the research. A quota sample is one in which units are selected into a sample on the basis of a pre-specified characteristic which here was exposure to a hate crime or hate incident. Names of officers were put forward by a Detective Chief Inspector within the force, as possible subjects for the research based on their exposure to a hate crime or hate incident.

There were therefore two important things to emphasise. Firstly, despite being identified as someone who might be a potential respondent, officers could still refuse to take part in the research or withdraw at any time during an interview or ask for their interview to be withdrawn after the interview and this was made clear both in advance of meeting officers and before the interviews commenced.

These points also relate to the obligation to ensure confidentially. Officers were told that no name would be used to identify their interview instead all officers were allocated a random number. Moreover, if officers wished to refuse to take part they could either choose not to turn up, withdraw from the interview after it commenced or ask to have their interview withdrawn after they had provided it. The officers were told that no-one would be able to identify if they had refused to take part or had withdrawn their interview. In the event, two officers did not show up for interview and one more officer contacted the researcher to say that they did not wish to take part. Other respondents were approached by the researcher from a contingent group of officers that were available to make up the numbers.

Officers received an initial briefing sheet before meeting the researcher and the briefing sheet was explained to them again before individual interviews commenced. Officers then signed a consent form to say that they had understood the nature of the study, who was funding it and that they could refuse or withdraw at any time without this being made known to their employers or anyone else.

It was also explained to officers that each interview would be recorded and given a research number. The recordings were to be downloaded onto a disk which was kept in a locked cabinet in the university office of the researcher. A copy of the disk with transcripts identified by random numbers was delivered by the researcher in person to the postgraduate student employed to do the transcribing. The postgraduate student was trained in research ethics and understood the protocol for the study. Once all interviews had been typed, transcripts were kept in the locked cabinet in the room of the researcher and all audio files were destroyed.

The layout of the report

When attempting to assess whether training actually helps the police in their daily roles it is important to examine the range of crimes and incidents that the police currently deal with. Effective training on hate crime should help the police to identify hate crimes and incidents, investigate the crime appropriately and to provide any necessary support and safeguarding to victims; in order to achieve all of these objectives the police will need to liaise with other agencies.

This report examines the range of hate crimes and incidents that officers encountered and whether and how their training helped them in their daily roles; police officers discussed both probationary and in-service training (Rowe and Garland 2010). Police officers were questioned about their knowledge of hate crime legislation and recording practices, the distinction between hate crimes and hate incidents, how they identified hate crimes and victims (including disabled victims), their knowledge of hate crime investigative procedures including the use of risk assessment forms, their understanding of the motivations of offenders and the need to establish hostility, the requirement to ensure safeguarding of victims and working with other agencies.

The report itself is composed of two sections. The first section examines the level of understanding of police officers on the nature of a hate crime, how they identified hate crimes based on the legislation, and their understandings of the necessity to record both hate crimes and hate incidents. It also looks at the range of hate crimes and hate incidents that the police dealt with. The report then examines training that the police had on hate crime and how they rated this training. The section suggests that whilst officers could identify what a hate crime was in accordance with statutory definitions they found that their retention of hate crime training and its usefulness in relation to specific forms of hate crimes and incidents was often patchy. This section also includes recommendations from police officers themselves and the author on how policing training in this area can be improved.

Building on this, the second section of the report includes a focus on hate crime offences in terms of investigation, the need to establish hostility and associated problems, as well as knowledge of the use of the uplift tariff. It then moves on to examine 'the grey area' of hate crime including the distinction between hate crimes and hate incidents, the overlap of the latter with anti-social behaviour and knowledge of potential resolutions, safeguarding and

risk assessment practices. This section identifies that whilst officers had knowledge of hate crime procedures in terms of the paperwork to be completed and the practices to be followed, the training was less successful in helping officers to deal with the nuances between hate crimes and incidents and the overlap with anti-social behaviour. Moreover, training was not considered to be effective in terms of helping officers to ascertain possible courses of action in different cases, nor in addressing safeguarding needs and identifying agencies that could assist them with these. Let us turn first of all to how officers understood the term hate crime.

How do police officers identify and understand Hate Crime with respect to the legislation and recording rules?

Overall, police officers had a good understanding of what constituted a hate crime; they were asked to provide an explanation to a member of the public who might be unsure as to what a hate crime was. As stated previously, a hate crime, is 'any criminal offence, which is perceived by the victim or any other person, to be motivated, in whole or in part, by hostility or prejudice, based on a person's race, religion, sexual orientation, disability or transgendered status'.

Under police recording rules, police officers are also obliged to record hate incidents as well as hate crimes. A hate incident is defined as 'any non-crime incident which is perceived by the victim, or any other person, to be motivated by hostility to or prejudice based on a person's race or perceived race, religion, sexual orientation, disability or transgendered status'.

The understanding of officers reflected the legal definitions and counting rules and they were clearly aware that hate crimes involved the targeting of the victim on the basis of protected characteristics and they also knew what those protected characteristics were:

> *Police 001*
>
> *….it's any kind of crime that is specifically directed at an individual or a group as a result of something that identifies them individually, be it the colour of their skin, their sexual orientation, the country they originate from...and it's directed usually at that person or a group and the crime is committed because of that reason in the primary instance*
>
> *Police 025*
>
> *It's a personal attack really on another person for specific reasons, generally on protected characteristics as part of the Equality Act, so disability, gender, sexuality, …it's generally a motivated attack on them in one form or another, they're being targeted physically, by throwing stones or writing graffiti, or verbally attacking them*

Police 010

It's a crime perpetrated against a person based on their race, gender or sexuality

Officers were also aware that for recording purposes the offence was perception based and that the incident was based on a characteristic of the victim which linked them to a particular group:

Police 004

...it's done because of someone's race, gender, what their sexual orientation is...the victim perceives that something has been said to them or done to them because of their relationship to the identified group and they feel that they're a victim because of that

Therefore, officers understood that for recording purposes 'perception' was key and that this included the perception of the victim or a third party; this perception also formed the basis for the recording of hate incidents. Whilst these needed to be recorded because the factors behind them were the same as in hate crimes, they often did not amount to actual crimes:

Police 003

It's not always an offence that's taken place but it's something that has happened and the person it's happened to, or somebody has witnessed it or heard about it, and they perceive that the reason for it happening is due to their disability, their age, their gender, their sexual orientation.

Officers were asked about what they thought of the term 'hate crime' itself. The term has oft been criticised by academics and practitioners as being two emotive and as sometimes having a detrimental effect on reporting as people do not always understand what a hate crime is and/or that they can report it to the police (Chakraborti and Garland, 2012). Whilst a minority of officers felt that the hate crime term was sometimes problematic, particularly when used as an umbrella term, it was at least considered useful as a term in common parlance, so that all police officers could recognise that it displayed the features previously mentioned:

Police 015

The label of hate crime is useful I guess because it is commonly used so everyone knows what you mean

Therefore officers were broadly in agreement that the term hate crime was helpful in identifying that an offence was different to ordinary crimes because it involved hostility and targeting based on the protected characteristics under the legislation:

Police 027

…it is different to an ordinary offence because you are targeting someone, singling them out based on something that is personal to them

This meant that the hate crime label was necessary to distinguish hate crimes from non-hate offences as the former were considered to be more serious due to the aforementioned targeting based on selected characteristics;

Police 004

….we have it for a purpose. If someone attacks somebody because of the things that fit into a hate crime; that needs to be dealt with separately…It's not right that because someone's different that they should be targeted because of that…there is an escalating factor to it…So it's right we have it

Police 034
... everyone can get affected by all kinds of crime. Whereas I think hate crime of any sort is something more, for me it's a bullying type of situation…..it's personal, its persistent, its directed, it's not just someone randomly damaged my car or someone's hit me. It's someone's gone out of their way to either do or say something to affect someone else. So to categorise it, I think is important because it's something that needs to be tackled

Almost all officers were also of the opinion therefore this 'targeting' of the victim meant that the offender was more culpable and therefore needed to be dealt with more seriously:

Police 014

...if someone is being targeted because of their colour for example, you black this or you effing this, then yes, I think that says more about the person doing it than about victim and I feel that as police officers we need to stop that happening. That person needs to be able to walk out in public without that happening

Police 001

It's definitely useful, the hate element of it is an aggravating factor as to why someone has committed a crime, it's more specific and it says more about the offender, about their culpability. It's not just somebody committing criminal damage because they are drunk say, smashing a window. It's somebody smashing a window because it belongs to someone with a different colour of skin or a different religion to them. And those kinds of things and those offenders should be taken more seriously

This need to deal with the hate crime offender more seriously also reflected the fact that the targeting of the victim based on hostility meant that the impact on victims was likely to be more severe than in non-hate offences:

Police 003

...I think they are more serious and they should be seen as more serious. I mean someone getting punched isn't right at the best of times but if someone believes they've been punched because they're gay or they've been punched because they're black, then that affects the victim a lot more rather than being in the wrong place at the wrong time on a Friday night. It will have a much bigger consequence on the victim

Police 020

…it's more personal isn't it? ...it's the same with being punched and stabbed...it's going to hurt more...there's a different amount of pain. The same in terms of hate crime, it makes it that bit more painful for the victim

Police 025

At the end of the day, I think it does have a larger impact on the victim. If it's something that they can't help and they're being targeted for that, you know, it has a devastating impact on their lives. And I'm not saying that normal crime and anti-social behaviour doesn't affect people, it does, but I think it's easier to get over if it's not targeting you for something that you are, so it should be taken more seriously

Many officers also felt that the hate crime category was useful as it helped the police to realise that there was more to the crime/incident than might at first meet the eye:

Police 023

It is helpful because otherwise… I guess if it goes to court…that element of it might get missed out ….but it would need to be left in there just so that even if it's being handed over, you would look at the job then and know that hate elements is there, as opposed to it just being an assault or criminal damage, because there is more to it

This meant that recognising something as a hate crime might help the police to get at the underlying problems and tensions:

Police 012

...it's certainly got its place simply because if someone's being targeted, whether because of the colour of their skin or something like that, it can potentially help us to then think, right, well what are these underlying problems...especially in something like a neighbourhood dispute...sometimes it is a useful tool to think, right, that is something where I can identify the reasons why this persons got the problem with you...let's try and address that

Police 021

I think it has to be there....I guess it tells you what the root of the problem is or why what has happened has happened. We do go to a lot of things where just damage has happened and you never really know why and it's really hard to get to the bottom of it. But I think with hate crime it just adds that sort of extra knowledge

The hate crime category was also deemed useful in this way because it indicated to the police that victims might have particular needs that needed to be addressed:

Police 019

The hate crime category helps in particular areas, because if a certain family is getting abused on a certain street then it might help to tackle the problem they are having. Because if we can show the problem they are having is because they might be an Asian family or a black family or a family from a different minority group, then we can look to supporting their needs more as people. Whereas if you just treat them in the same way as others they might not get the support they need

Moreover, it was also felt by some officers that the hate crime label sent out a message to people that that did not have to put up with abusive behaviour and that action could be taken. This point was raised by two of the three ethnic minority officers in the study:

Police 022

Yes, definitely it's needed. Without it…some people would just think, well that's just how it is...myself being a black person, sometimes people are going to call me a black bastard...but now you've got this hate crime …and a definition, you can think 'Well, hang on, that's not right, I don't have to take that, there's something that can be done about it

Having identified that officers felt that the category of hate crime was necessary and important let us turn now to the range of crimes and incidents that the police dealt with and then a consideration of the problem of the under-reporting of hate crimes.

The range of hate crimes and hate incidents dealt with by officers

Overall, officers stated that they dealt with much less hate crime than other types of offending, and this is in line with national figures. However, in terms of the hate crimes and incidents that did come to their attention, the officers discussed a wide range of situations.

In their discussions, police officers drew a distinction between those crimes and incidents where a particular victim was specifically targeted and those where abusive language and/or threats were used during a disagreement of some description and they suggested that the bulk of offences and incidents took the form of the latter:

Police 034

…it's normally been a feature of another incident...for example a shop theft, where someone's been refused purchase of alcohol, cigarettes, and they've gone out and used a racist word...someone has been assaulted and someone has said something...as in whether they have called them 'gay' or whatever or whether it's a race thing. There's always two things I think, two things combined to make it a hate crime generally...you need the crime or the incident but generally there is something else as well…the two I've just given are the most common ones...a theft or assault with a hate crime element...but lots of them are disputes, they are very common, taxi drivers outside, so and so refusing to pay and he's made racist comments, so it's those types of jobs...and with homophobic, it's normally just an odd comment made, with another offence, so someone has been assaulted and someone said something as opposed to someone's persistently targeting me because I'm gay, very rarely do you see that

Police 005

You find that a lot of the jobs that you go to, there's almost two distinctions with hate crime, you get the people that are racist and they for whatever reason dislike a particular type of person, or people that are different to them, and then you get people that may have been in an argument with someone and they want to say something hurtful and they target the first thing that they see, so if they have black skin, it's something derogatory about that, if they happen to be short fat and bald, it's something about that

Of all the hate crime strands, the highest number of crimes and incidents dealt with, again in line with the national figures already mentioned, were racial. The bulk of these offences involved public order offences, including both known and unknown offenders, but there were also assaults and/or criminal damage. The range of offences is touched upon in the following quotation:

> Police 019
>
> *...... there was another incident where this chap has got into a parking altercation with somebody and he was a black gentleman and the other chap had called him a black something. And that was put down as a public order incident in the end… I have not really dealt with major cases but you do get them where families are harassed day in and day out because of certain things like disabilities or religion or stuff like that. Most of the jobs I have dealt with have been people calling people names. I had one the other week where someone stuck a note on somebody's car, it said something about don't park your car here and then put a load of email addresses on for different UKIP offices, it was like 'Go back to your own country, UKIP'.*

Many such crimes and incidents were to do with the night time economy and occurred when victims when in the course of their employment. Particularly common were racist remarks and incidents against ethnic minority taxi drivers, as we have just seen, but also doormen and bar staff and, sometimes, ethnic minority shopkeepers:

> Police 001
>
> *You would imagine in the city centre, you would get a lot, because of the mixture there…..a lot of it tends to be in the city under the influence of alcohol and the majority of mine have been door staff, where somebody has got so irate that they are not being let in, they are so drunk and the only way they express their anger is to use a racial slur against the door member*

Therefore, officers stated that the most common form of racial hate crime that they dealt with involved a disagreement between two parties, where racial language was used, including those parties that were known or sometimes unknown to each other:

Police 003

I've had one which I charged and it went to court, where this chap was standing in his front garden and a woman went past with her kids and she was on the phone and the kids were doing something outside his garden. He basically said to her, 'Could you control your children?' She was on the phone to a friend and she turned round and said 'Oh hang on a minute, some Paki twats just talking to me'... And he obviously phoned us, we found out who she was, she was arrested and charged. So that went to court, it was a Racially Aggravated S5

There were also more rarely some examples of unprovoked verbal abuse from strangers:

Police 022

..I had an incident where an Asian woman was walking with her children through a park and she was subjected to some racist abuse. Another with a security officer that was kicking some kids off a building site...and he was subjected to some racist abuse. I think there's an African fella as well, had some abuse from his neighbour, being a kind of multicultural area, St Ann's is predominantly a black and Asian area, yes, you are going to come across a lot more than where I worked before, the first incident with the Asian family, it was black youths, the second incident with the security guard was white youths and then the African fella, it was his black next door neighbour, so it depends on the area you're policing

In some racial incidents that were reported, no offender could be identified, an example was where a member of the public had heard racial abuse in the street but could not say who it was, where it came from or identify any other witnesses; such cases were treated as incidents:

Police 004

Hate incidents….I've probably dealt with several in the past, interestingly enough, only a couple of them has been the victim, a lot of them have been third party reports, from people that live in the city, reporting people running down the street shouting abusive names...the last one I can remember….was from someone living in the flats in the city who reported hearing a group of males running down the street shouting 'Paki', but there was not identified victim or perpetrator from that....there's similar

things, the names aren't as abusive but it's like, 'You should piss off back to your own country, that sort of thing.

There were a small number of ethnic minority officers in the sample (3) and they had received racial abuse in their lifetimes and during their time as police officers:

Police 034 (Asian)

Not so much lately, I did earlier in my career, I've got 11 years in the job now, I'd say a handful of times, I've had direct racial abuse....

Police 022 (Black)

I've never had anything within the job. Any colleagues or anything like that....I've had a couple of racist incidents when I'm in uniform; I'm not particularly bothered by it. I just get on with it. But I appreciate whilst it may not bother me, you know, it isn't right and it may bother someone else

Police 026 (Asian)

Yes, growing up I had a few racist incidents, I wouldn't say more than most, but it happened....I have heard all of them, it needs to be challenged but it doesn't really affect me, I suppose I have always accepted it, it's something that happens and I will move on, I know some people find it difficult...as a police officer, I think it's happened once...we had an incident, we were going to seize a car that had been used by the boys around here...and we had a group of boys come over as we waited for the truck, possibly the boys that were driving it, we couldn't say at that point, and they were giving us quite a lot of lip, and, as they were walking away, I didn't hear it, but one of my colleagues did, one of them shouted something and put Mohammed at the end of it...my first initial is M, that's about it

Abuse against the police generally was common with many officers suggesting it was simply 'part of the job'. However, two officers in the sample stated that whilst they had received general abuse from the public in terms of being police officers, that they had also received more specific abuse from members of the public which related to their ethnicity. The next quote from one of these respondents, a white officer indicates what he considered to be a racial slur from some black members of the public:

Police 016

The thing about racism, it's not just white against black, it can also be black against white, Asians against blacks, it's a variety really…I have been called honky boy for being white, and it's like, 'Why are you calling me that, honky boy?' It's a racist term….the person that was saying it had a smile on their face - it was from a black person

The following quotation from a black officer indicates how he had received abuse from black members of the public who were suggesting that he was 'selling out' by being a black man in the police:

Police 022
...abuse from the public...I've had it more from other black people, in St Ann's, it's a majority black area and I'm very well received in fairness by say 90% of the people, but some people, you know, you get little comments, 'Sell out', 'Bounty' those kinds of derogatory comments, but I've had that throughout my career

The ethnic minority officers that had been on the receiving end of racial abuse stated that although they had become hardened to it themselves, they could emphasise with members of the public that had experienced such abuse:

Police 034

I can emphasise I guess, whereas maybe someone else is like, it's only words, whether it's because they don't see what the issue is or why someone's rang it in. I can see how it would affect you and the reason why someone would report it and how it does make you feel and I guess I could emphasise better having experienced it

Some other non-minority officers, who had been on the receiving end of abuse for being police officers also suggested that whilst they had become hardened to it, it helped them relate to members of the public who were verbally abused:

Police 013

"Well, we become hardened to it, it just goes over your head, but you know what it's like when someone is verbally abusing you and constantly fffing at you"

Moving onto religious hate crimes and incidents, whilst there were examples of these they were less common than racial crimes and incidents; albeit in some examples religious and race incidents overlap, an example being Islamophobic crimes and incidents which included specific targeted offences:

Police 029

..we had some stuff once at a Mosque, criminal damage and stuff, which was obviously targeted

Police 010

I know my colleagues on the Hyson Green beat, it took them a little while but they were dealing with somebody for causing problems and damage and arson at mosques in the area ….We're trying to establish this person for whatever reason is targeting mosques, they've got particular hostility towards mosques and Muslims …the impact on communities there could be horrendous.

Turning to hate crimes and incidents based on sexuality, there were some homophobic incidents dealt with by officers, these often included gay and lesbian people being targeted for abuse when walking around town, particularly if with their partners, much of this was abuse from strangers. As with racial incidents, there were also examples associated with the night time economy with gay people getting verbal abuse and threats when at a nightclub for example and again such incidents usually involved strangers:

Police 002

You occasionally get gay people getting homophobic abuse in the street, if they are with their partners for example, or sometimes if they have left a nightclub which is perceived to be a gay venue

Police 011

Yes we get quite a few homophobic incidents from the gay nightclub in Nottingham, NG1 that tends to be mostly verbal public order kind of stuff…

Less common, were homophobic taunts and threats relating to a disagreement and/or those from individuals known to the victim:

Police 005

I think that the last one I had was a homophobic one, where somebody had been refused a drink in a pub, the barman was quite openly gay, these were regulars that had drunk in the pub a few times and on this occasion he [the customer] was drunk and the barman didn't want to serve him anymore. I think he called the barman a faggot…. And that was more of an example, of, he's focused on the first thing he's seen

Police 023

I have not dealt with hate crime that much, it's normally the name calling and that type of thing...there was an on-going one and I think that went to court, there was criminal damage, it was a homophobic one, there were quite a few tensions between a group of friends and it wasn't very nice, but that was the general reason why it was happening

As in other forces nationally, there were less disability crimes and incidents than examples based on race, but of those discussed by officers, there were a variety of these crimes and incidents. Common examples were name calling and harassment in the city and surrounding areas and on public transport of people with learning disabilities and/or mental health problems:

Police 014

There's a young female who lives in my area and her mum has called in on behalf of her daughter a couple of times because she suffers from dwarfism and she gets people making nasty comments to her when she's out

Police 024

There is a lady on my beat who has a slightly troubled past, she's got disabilities, she can't read or write.... She has learning difficulties, she's not quite as old as she is....she walks around with a pretend doll that has a name...and she feeds it, it sleeps by her bed in a Moses basket and she buys it clothes...and looks after it…and the kids in the area were targeting her, throwing stones at her, calling her names, throwing stones at her property, they know when she's out in her garden and stuff like that …when you asked me if I'd been to any disability ones, she will pop into my head straight away, none of them stand out like that one does, because I know in that case there's no doubt in my mind that's what they were doing to her. And they were doing it to her because they were kids and she was an easy target because of her disability

Police 005

I had one which was a disability one which was a young girl coming back from school and there were some other kids from another school that had been shouting abuse at her because she walked differently because of her disability, so that was called in

The following quotation provides an example of a man who is verbally abused for talking to people in the city centre:

Police 001

I believe there is a gentleman who frequents the city centre and walks around a lot. I can't be specific about what his disability is, but I think he might have an element of Down's Syndrome from having spoken to him...but he just enjoys walking around the city centre, he tries to be friendly to people, says 'Hello' to everybody. And there are always one or two people that don't want to be said 'Hello' to and they end up saying something to him, that becomes a disability hate crime, because he gets upset about it, he is offended

Neighbourhood incidents and disputes were also common in examples of crimes and incidents against disabled people and some of these were complicated because of competing accounts which will be considered shortly.

As well as crimes and incidents against people with learning disabilities and mental health problems, there were also examples against people with physical disabilities and also against elderly people who had some sort of physical and/or other disability such as dementia, as a result of the ageing process, many of these were considered opportunistic and included instances of targeted offending:

Police 022

Well you do get a lot of burglaries that will prey on elderly, vulnerable and disabled people

Police 026

The one we tend to come across is that some elderly people tend to get targeted and many elderly people have some kind of disability and I suppose they are thinking, it's easier to steal from them....another one was a disabled lady got her wheelchair stolen, the issue with that is that I am not too sure if she was targeted because she left the wheelchair outside and it seemed like an opportunistic thing, it's happened to a few other people on that street. They leave their wheelchair outside and it gets taken…the next day I saw a lad in a wheelchair, just playing around...now they have a disability, it's a wheelchair, so they know the person had a disability and they took it anyway, it's a hate crime I suppose but was their thinking I am taking from a disabled person or there is a wheelchair and it's not locked, I am just going to take it?

Such crimes against elderly people, those with learning disabilities and those with mental health problems sometimes took the form of 'mate crimes' (Mencap, 2010; Quarmby, 2011)

Police 016

It's the weak who get picked on, the experienced criminals pick on the young and the young pick on the weaker. It's that domino process isn't it? So we have sometimes have issues with people with learning difficulties, today a lad came in, poor lad, he said 'I have come to the police station today because it was me who stole a bike…he has been given some money, but that's the kind of thing you come across…it's the kind of thing that doesn't get reported because he doesn't know any different, so he wouldn't report that he's been colluded into perverting the course of justice

We saw earlier that generally officers felt that the hate crime category was needed to reflect the more serious nature of hate crimes. It was felt by some officers that disability hate crime could have a particularly detrimental impact on victims and this will be examined shortly.

Having now examined some of the hate crimes and incidents that officers encountered, let us now turn to their views on the need to record hate incidents and whether they thought that this was useful.

Understanding the distinction between hate crimes and hate incidents

As we saw earlier, the police are required to record hate incidents as well as hate crimes and officers were asked whether they found the distinction between a hate crime and a hate incident useful and whether they thought that there was a need for the hate incident category. There was a divergence of opinion here where some officers stated that most situations would actually involve a crime anyway so that the hate crime incident was often not needed:

> Police 020
>
> *....if there has been a hate incident, nine times out of ten there will be some offence that it will fit into. So for me there isn't much of a distinction between the two. I don't know if you can give any particular examples of which is one and not the other but generally if it's a hate incident there's generally an offence with it that can fit into it, whether it's just a public order offence...*

Other officers stated that even if the incident did not amount to a crime the hate incident category enabled you to offer safeguarding:

> Police 005
>
> *...well, obviously if it's a crime, you're going to foremost deal with the crime and offer support around that because of the hate element. If there is no crime, obviously you're not going to deal with it, but you're still going to offer the support...so I guess it is useful for that reason*

Overall, therefore, officers felt that the hate incident category was helpful to the police in building up a picture of the pattern of offending, which was important to understanding what was going on and in identifying safeguarding needs:

> *Police 007*
>
> *It's difficult because with the cutbacks, the police should be dealing with crime but for intelligence purposes it is still useful to have it*

Therefore, as hate incidents were kept on the police database and also gave other officers a better picture of what had already happened and what action had been taken or needed to be

taken; they enabled monitoring of the situation. Some officers suggested that the hate incident category was also useful in this way for covering the 'greyer area' of hate crime:

Police 019

Sometimes, I think there is a grey border sometimes; it can almost verge on the area of being a public order incident. If someone has felt harassed or distressed by what they have been called or the way someone has behaved then a lot of the time it can go into crime… some incidents are quite obvious but I think in the bigger picture, you can see it's not necessarily down to just what they are saying...and some victims may say they want it recording but they don't necessarily want any further action, so you might put it down as a hate incident. I am not saying if someone has gone out and assaulted someone you would put it down as hate incident. But if someone has said well they called me this name but I just want it recording, I don't want anything else doing about it....that sometimes happens where it sort of overlaps with anti-social behaviour

Notwithstanding the usefulness of the hate incident category and the reasoning for having it, the downside was that many officers felt that the hate incident label was often overused due to recording and monitoring practices. The initial recording is based on the perception of the victim or a witness and/or what the call handler's assessment of the initial call is. Some officers noted that once incidents were initially recorded they would remain a hate incident/crime and be treated accordingly even though sometimes when officers attended it was not considered to be hate related. Some officers were of the opinion that the practice of recording based on the perception of the victim or any other person meant that sometimes the factor of hostility was presumed (certainly prior to investigation) as was the associated increased impact on the person:

Police 024

I think sometimes it can be very quickly labelled a hate crime when it's probably not, because it can be an easy way to slide the buckle onto a Beat Manager or a PCSO. So they go it's a hate crime...the victim clearly thinks it's aimed at them for their religion or whatever so therefore it's a hate crime because the individual's saying it is. But we need to know what else has happened... sometimes I think if it's not blatantly obvious, I don't mean we should sweep people's feelings under the carpet. But unless it is

definitely a hate crime and you can see it and you've had input with the families or there is something to say this is definitely a hate crime... maybe we should not classify it as a hate crime until we have enough evidence to go this is a hate crime, until the beat team have had chance to investigate

There were also examples, particularly in neighbourhood disputes where officers felt that some people had tried to accuse other people of hate crimes in order to get them into trouble. An interesting example is provided in the next quotation

Police 019

It was a bit of an ongoing thing, the thing was with these it had started a year ago and the neighbour had complained about the kid being raucous and kicking the ball against the car....it wasn't even the lady that had gone out, it was the bloke who had gone round there to do some work at her house who told this lad don't kick the ball against my car. And as a result of that the parents had then phoned us saying that she had purposefully sent this chap out to have a go at the young boy because of his disability, because he was autistic. But it wasn't that at all, it was just the fact that he didn't want the kid kicking the ball against his car. I don't think the bloke or the lady even knew about that. And then the family had started this vendetta against her. But this poor lady anyway herself was chair bound. I kind of felt with the situation that they were probably using what they were saying to try to get this lady evicted even though she had done nothing wrong....I felt the parents were trying to use or say or make it into a hate crime...

A further point was that some officers felt that the necessity to record any 'hate' incident, often increased paperwork and time and encouraged victim expectations of prosecution which often led to dissatisfaction when hate crimes could not be established due to lack of evidence. Aligned to this was a suggestion that some members of the public had realised that hate crimes were a priority area for the police and attempted to use the label as they perceived that they would get an improved service. Both of these points are apparent in the next quotation:

Police 007

I feel like we make a rod for our own back because we're promising the world which we can't deliver. We should serve everyone regardless of fear or favour anyway, so whether you're a victim of a burglary and a disabled person or non-disabled, you should get the same service…in either case, you would still do what you could to meet their needs…but people do call in and if they think they're not getting the right response off the phone then they'll say, 'Oh he called me this'…because there's a perception that we will deal with it quicker and differently and again they expect a different result…but, if there's no evidence then it's not going to be dealt with as a hate crime

Some of these officers suggested therefore that if recording was based on perception, it should be limited to the perception of the victim or a police officer. It was also suggested that it may be necessary to downgrade some offences earlier on where it was unlikely that hostility could be established and that the initial recording should therefore be revised unless hostility and impact could be shown:

Police 005

I do think you could do with rather than it being a broad umbrella of someone perceives it a hate crime… I think it should be i) the reasoning behind it and ii) how it's affected the person

Having acknowledged the perceptions of officers that the hate category was sometimes over-used, let us now look at officer's observations of the reasons for lack of reporting which is a significant problem in this area.

The under-reporting of hate crimes

Having stated that some officers felt that the element of hate was sometimes overplayed in crimes and incidents, officers did recognise, in contrast, that such crimes and incidents were often under-reported by members of the public. An understanding of the reasons why hate crime is under-reported is important here because it indicates police knowledge of particular problems and issues when dealing with members of the public and acknowledges what some of the barriers to the reporting of hate crimes might be. When asked to identify possible reasons given by police officers as to why someone might not report a hate crime or hate incident, officers gave a range of responses and sometimes these coalesced. Many of the suggestions that police officers identified as reasons for victims not reporting including a failure to realise that this was a hate crime, a reluctance to involve the police, not wanting the trouble of reporting and having to attend court and/or fear of retaliation. Some of these reasons were specifically related to perceptions about the police and what they could or would do:

Police 026

I think there is a general apathy towards what the police can do, so they can't be bothered reporting it and because they think they can deal with it themselves

Police 034

If I could put myself in that position, if something happened to me, would I ring the police? Probably not, due to the fact I'd think what could be done, that's no disrespect to the police force, just knowing with regards to resources...with my experience....I have a much more realistic expectation. Some people ring the police thinking their whole lives can be solved. I know what can and can't be done, so I would weigh it up, Can someone be identified? Is there a likelihood of prosecution? If the answers no, why bother? That would be me

Police 018

It depends on your view of the police as well because some people view the police as we just deal with crime and if they think, they've not been physically assaulted, not

had criminal damage, committing an obvious crime, perhaps they think it's not for the police to deal with, but then who else deals with it?

Other reasons were to do with perceptions of the victim such as them not understanding when something amount to a hate crime or where they had simply learned to live with the abuse and/or did not want to bother the police:

Police 019

I think that some people are more tolerant to things, somebody could be a victim of hate crime every day of their life but they may not report, they may not think it is a police problem....even though if they reported it, it would be put down as a hate crime, they think, I will deal with in my own way. And I think some people are just used to it, they are used to certain people being ignorant in their life and they just accept it

Police 021

You will get people that will phone up and say they missed the bus or other people who say 'I don't want to bother you but...', so you get both kinds of extremes really

Police 022

I think that a lot of it is that people just wouldn't bother to report it…it was like in my Dad's day, it was just how it was...you didn't let it bother you, people were just racist to you sometimes…. So I think a lot of it is, 'Well it just happens sometimes, doesn't it, I'm going to get it sometimes

A further reason was sometimes to do with perceptions of the offender and the general public in terms of possible comeback and/or retaliation for involving the police:

Police 021

I don't know, I guess they might feel scared, certainly in Radford, people will say 'Oh, we don't talk to the police, or 'we don't talk to them on the street'

Sometimes officers felt that there were a combination of reasons including issues around the police and this was particularly the case in the under-reporting of disability hate crime. As we saw earlier, officers felt that disability hate crime was rarer than other forms of hate crime especially racial hatred but many officers felt that this was partly because of a greater reluctance to report by disabled people. Officers stated that disabled victims might be unlikely to report for similar reasons to other hate crime victims i.e. a lack of confidence in the police based on knowledge about past performance. It was suggested that whilst the force's response to hate crime had improved, disabled people's knowledge of past performance, particularly in the area of disability hate crime, might affect their willingness to report:

Police 004

I think another problem I can see is that the police response, particularly in the past, might not have been as good as it might be today. You might get some resistance there, I think to report it

It was suggested that disabled people might believe that the police would be unable or unwilling to do anything and that they were sometimes perceived as unapproachable:

Police 005

Certain things tend to get reported to us, muggings, car theft, because people need crime numbers for insurance...most people don't like calling the police, most of the jobs we get are from the same addresses and callers. Most people in day-to-day, don't call us for things perhaps they should call us for, it's not hard to believe that if someone was called something and they were disabled, generally they probably wouldn't think to call the police. They might just think it wasn't very nice but that it was only words and so there's nothing the police can do and so wouldn't bother reporting it

Police 003

Embarrassment maybe, they don't want to say that's the reason for it, And also, it's got to be very difficult hasn't it, to say to a stranger, I think this is the reason why I've been assaulted because I'm in a wheelchair, it's very personal isn't it? And we

[response officers] aren't very accessible...I mean it would probably be easier to tell a PCSO who goes around and is more accessible in the community than it would to a cop who whizzes round in a police car all day. Because we're not very approachable, we don't walk around on the streets in our hats anymore, we're always rushing around, we've put barriers up about such personal matters…they probably don't think we'd take them seriously, probably don't think we would do enough...a lot of people say, it's a waste of time to ring us

As we saw in the last quote, unwillingness to admit that disability might have been the reason that the victim was targeted was a perceived reason for not reporting. Indeed, it was suggested that victims may not want to disclose a disability to the police:

Police 004

…, and you may get them not wanting to record that they are disabled as they don't want that as a factor in there. So, we might not record it correctly. I've got a friend who is disabled, you see him walk, you can tell. But he refuses to acknowledge it, to the point where he has built up a wall in his mind and he's blocked it off. He doesn't want to go there ever and you can't approach it with him...and he's in denial...he doesn't want people to know he is disabled, he doesn't want to acknowledge it to himself and if he was ever attacked, he would never tell you he was disabled

It was suggested by some officers that disabled people might be more willing to talk to other agencies than the police, either because of lack of faith in the police and/or worries about what involving the police might entail:

Police 013

I think probably a lot more people with a disability will talk to other people than the police, I think we probably haven't got a very good record for dealing with people with disabilities or hate incidents, I suppose in the back of their mind, they think not much is going to be done, as in it's not going to stop the problem. So am I making it worse? If I were disabled, if I was going to call in, am I making a bigger problem for myself? If that police officer goes to speak to that guy or woman, am I just making myself a bigger target?

This fear of retaliation and/or fear of bringing further attention to themselves in the wider community through police involvement was perceived to be particularly problematic in the area of 'mate crime' given the close connections with carers and/or 'friends':

Police 034

I mean I can think of one incident where a disabled lady, I think it was her brother was the carer and she was claiming assault…and the only difficulty there was that he was the carer. So to remove him from the address or to take any action against him would have meant that she didn't have a carer - there was no-one else…so that's an example of an issue that person had

Therefore, getting people to see the action of someone that they knew as being exploitative or abusive was sometimes difficult in 'Mate Crime' situations and this point will be revisited in Section Two under hostility. This was related to the point that sometimes victims failed to realise that what was happening was an offence:

Police 023

…perhaps with disability hate crime if they have learning disabilities or mental health issues they may not understand what is happening or realise it is an offence

Because of the aforementioned reasons it was suggested that a lot of victims of disability hare crime often simply took it for granted as part of their lives and tried to tolerate and ignore abuse:

Police 025

I don't know why it's under-reported. I'd like to think that everyone would report it, but again it depends on that person. You tend to find, particularly if it's a mental disability either they don't know that they should report it or that they're the sort of person that is so introverted that they just want it to go away, it's that kind of attitude a lot of the time

Police 023

People just put up with it, which is really bad...

Whilst many officers did have a good understanding of some of the issues behind low reporting of hate crimes, therefore, if this could be contextualised into training about communication with victims and safeguarding issues as part of a more holistic conceptualisation of hate crime as a 'process' then this would be beneficial and this will be discussed in Section Two.

Having recognised that hate crime was generally under-reported, officers were then asked what could be done to increase the reporting of hate crime. As will be seen in Section Two of the report which discusses the work of the beat team, many police officers in this role did attempt to be proactive in generating reports of hate crimes, particularly amongst the elderly and disabled people by being 'present' in their area and making themselves known and 'approachable':

Police 030

Hate crime, it's like any crime, sometimes people might be embarrassed by it, they might not want to share the problem with other people. But if they feel there is an outlet, and I think sometimes on Beat Teams, you do meet different characters on your beat and you make sure everyone is OK. And sometimes you can sense if someone is not happy or they have an issue and say 'Is anything wrong? Is there anything you want to tell me about? and if they are more familiar with you, they may disclose more than they would otherwise

Some officers also felt that the police had made great efforts to improving rates of reporting and offered a variety of ways for the public to get in touch with them:

Police 025

I think the police have done loads to try to make it easier to report crime over the last few years, there's so many different methods now....there's ALERT, you've got 101, Facebook, they're really reaching out as much as they can

Police 021

I think most people know the number for the police, if they want to ring they will. There are quite a few different ways of getting in touch with us now, we have Alerts

Scheme, we have Twitter, Facebook...I know if you go onto the website and click on an officer it will give you the link to their email... if people call us and say 'Can you ring me back?' and we will always phone them back. I think the ways are out there if people want to get in touch

It was felt by some officers however that there was a role for third party reporting:

Police 020

I think it is the police's job, but I think again, maybe other agencies could help, we do need to record it because it's making people's lives miserable, it's not pleasant and who else would people turn to, if they could not turn to the police? It's just I'm not sure who else they would really think could do anything?

Police 013

I think probably we all need to be taking more of a front role, I think, in this sort of recording. I don't think it should be just down to the police, because I think ultimately it's whoever that person can speak to. You can be the nicest police officer in the world and you wouldn't get nothing out of some people simply because you're a police officer, but you can be a GP or a Community Nurse or librarian for instance, somebody that can just set up a bit of a rapport...

Therefore, third party reporting might be useful if i) the police actually received the information and ii) something practical was done with it:

Police 025

I think third party reporting should be an option and its necessary in some cases but then again, it opens up a door to creating a lot of unnecessary work for one reason or another and you do need to get the information

Police 013

....so Third Party reporting might be useful but it's that data protection thing isn't it? Everyone's scared to death of giving information out

Moreover, third party reporting venues were not manned 24/7 like as phone lines to the police are and they might generate more work for little gain:

> *Police 018*
>
> *Third party reporting…well you've got the ASB hotline in the city and they will record some of it, but I don't know how you can encourage people to report to them. ASB hotline is a good idea, but I don't think it is manned 24/7...I've heard a rumour that they're going to try and get a control room where you've got social services sat in with us, ASB hotline, 24 hours a day, because a lot of these things finish Monday to Friday 9 – 5 pm...so third party reporting could be good but it is limited and we need the information passed on*

Having examined under-reporting and police perceptions of reasons for it, we now turn to a particularly contested area of under-reported hate crime, that of disability.

Identifying and understanding Disability Hate Crime

As stated earlier, officers dealt with less disability hate crime than race, in particular and they suggested that this was because it tended to be under-reported, for these reasons officers suggested that it was more 'unique' than other types of hate crime:

>*Police 001*

>*Disability hate crime is probably more unique than some of the other ones because it's identifying or hating somebody as a result of a physical or mental disability, something they may have had from birth or even something they have picked up over the course of their life. Disability hate crimes - I find very few and far between in my role within the police, whether that's people are under reporting them.....*

>*Police 026*

>*I think it gets perceived differently ...because I think disabled people aren't necessarily as opposed to say a religious group...they never seem like they are part of a specific disabled group. So I don't think they get targeted in that way when you are comparing them to say religious or race hate crime…..I think people sometimes can overlook the fact that it's possibly a hate crime because it's happened to a disabled person*

Because disability hate crime had been identified in the CJJI (2013) as being of particular importance, officers were asked some additional questions about it. Some officers stated that they had little or no experience of dealing with it, for this reason, for those officers it wasn't the first type of hate crime that sprang to mind. Indeed, a minority of officers did not include disability hate crime when providing their initial explanation of the term hate crime, albeit they did have knowledge about it when questioned and they knew that disability was one of the protected characteristics:

>Police 010

>*I think it probably tends to be less well reported, it's like me when I've kind of clawed through all of the answers when I'm talking to you, I hadn't immediately gone to that one. There's no particular reason for that other than I think the reporting of it is a lot*

less frequent and so, in my opinion, doing this job, you tend to retain the thing you're doing the most. So when you first get your training and throughout your career if you like, you tend to have a better working knowledge of what you're dealing with regularly

This important point about lack of exposure will be revisited in the discussion on training but suffice to say here that an important source of learning for police officers is actually dealing with particular crimes and incidents 'on the job'. Therefore, if officers did not put much of the training provided by the police into practice then it sometimes became difficult to retain:

Police 004

Some things you don't retain and that stems from the fact that a lot is thrown at you, whether it be new statutes, new procedures and policies….and some things inevitably you're going to drop. Hate crime is not something I've dealt with a lot of and it's one of those things that I'm in danger of dropping. It's not that it's not important to me but you just don't deal with it all of the time so you become very skilled on what you have to deal with and how you engage with those people and how you resolve some issues...it's like a lot of things, it just doesn't get dealt with a lot and because of that it starts to slip from your mind about how to do it

Lack of exposure also sometimes meant that officers had little experience of some other protected groups under the hate crime legislation:

Police 001

….everyone's background is different, prior to joining this job there were certain elements of the community that I wasn't aware of, simply because I had never come across them in my day-to-day life. It's not me leading a sheltered existence, I have lived in quite a wide community but there were elements of say, the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered community that I wasn't aware of, until joining this job, simply because I hadn't met anybody from those groups or have any interaction with them

This point about exposure and the corresponding point about how to keep officers aware of the issues around particular offences of which they have little practical experience will be examined more fully in the context of training.

Notwithstanding that disability hate crime was less common than some of the other forms, in particular, race, when questioned about it officers stated that it was the same as the other strands, that it similarly involved a targeted/characteristic as the essence of the crime in question and that it needed to be treated in the same way:

Police 020

I would say it's exactly the same, again it's something personal to someone, it's as simple as that. For me, there's nothing different whether it's the colour of your skin, or whether it's your faith or whether it's a disability, it's all directed towards someone personally

Police 007

Well it's the same in terms of hate crimes because you're being targeted, or if you believe you're being targeted…because you're disabled, you're effectively being picked on because you're disabled

Police 018

I suppose it is the same, say if someone called someone a name because I'm on crutches or in a wheelchair, that to them would be offensive and would be a hate crime, the same as being called a racist name, there's nothing they can do about their disability, the same as you can't change the colour of your skin, you can't change the fact that you have to use a wheelchair, it's a very personal thing, hate crime

Some officers suggested that disability hate crimes and incidents which involved taunting of disabled people, such as those with learning disabilities, was something that some young people did for 'fun':

Police 005

I think they're probably slightly different as they would tend to be more opportunist…so you might get someone who's walking down the street, who walks differently and they might get something shouted at them, but it would be more of a spur of the moment thing, 'Oh look, isn't this funny? I'm going to shout this, as opposed to somebody whose disabled lives here, I'm going to break the window…and it tends to be kids, cos rightly or wrongly, kids tend to pick on people that are different to them

Police 013

…I think as people…as a human race, I think we're scared of people that are different. I think homosexuals or gays, physical disabilities, mental disabilities, we're very fickle animals…and what we don't understand we put in a corner or put into a box because we don't need to know about it. But we can poke sticks at it or poke fun at it, when we want to, because 'they're different' or 'they're out of the ordinary' shall we say. And I think it's just a lack of intelligence basically that people just choose to look at them as different when they're not.…and it saddens me really, because…it's so easy to point and pick fun at people for whatever reason and a few seconds of words can have a lifetime of change on people, obviously the victims, it's just like a downwards spiral on some people

Police 030

…maybe young people making fun of someone as I mentioned with one of the victims with learning disabilities on my patch

As stated earlier it was felt that hate crimes were therefore more personal than non-hate offences, and that therefore the impact on victims was likely to be more substantial. Some officers felt therefore that the impact may be particularly detrimental if the victim had a learning disability:

Police 024

The person that you're targeting does not understand why you're targeting them because they don't have that capability to reason and rationalize it in their head and see why people are doing it. They can't understand it. And I think when you can't understand something, to me personally it is the most upsetting, I think that will hold you back more. Whereas I'm the type of person who goes 'OK, you don't like me and you don't like me for that reason. I know why you don't like me, I don't agree with your opinions' - but if I don't understand something I struggle a lot more to deal with it and so would others I think

As we can see in the next quotations although officers suggested that disability hate crime tended to be under-reported they recognised that the range of disabilities and the potential scale of such victimisation was vast:

Police 003

I think it can take a lot of different forms, I think it's a very big umbrella isn't it? Disability hate crime? I'd say it's probably more far reaching than the others, I'd say probably more people would come under that

Police 009

It's still a hate crime; it's still under the same umbrella. It's very broad isn't it what a disability hate crime is? It could be someone in a wheelchair, it could be someone who has got Alzheimer's or Asperger's, it's still a hate crime

Having examined the range of hate crimes and incidents and police perceptions of their advantages and disadvantages let us now survey the types of training that the police officers had experienced and see if and how it helped them in dealing with the hate crimes and hate incidents identified

What sort of hate crime training had officers experienced and how did they evaluate this training?

With regards to training it is important to establish whether the training that officers had on hate crime actually helped them when dealing with hate crimes and incidents in their daily working lives. The College of Policing has published their commitment to the training of all front line staff on hate crime, including call handlers, as well as police officers, to help them to recognise and record hate crimes, much of this recent training has been through NCALT. In discussions with officers about training the issues that came up were to do with police receptiveness, retention, value and applicability and context and these will be examined in due course

As we have seen, officers were able to articulate the key features of a hate crime and the legislation that identified it. They were also aware of the need to record both hate crimes and hate incidents and some of the reasons for under-reporting. However, when asked whether they could recall specific details of hate crime training that had informed their knowledge only a minority, most often newer recruits, could identify training that had stuck out for them and/or specific details of it:

Police 012

On hate crime, really I can't think of any memorable training, if that makes sense

This officer goes on to say:

From what I had, I certainly had the diversity training when I joined...but I think you're probably talking about ten years or so ago and I can't specifically think of any parts of training days where it's been put down to just hate crimes and certainly not disabled crimes, I can't really think of any

These officers stated that they must have retained knowledge albeit they could not link it to any particular training that they had experienced:

Police 003

I joined five and a half years ago, I'd say that I had diversity training and since then...I potentially have had more training but I wouldn't be able to tell you when it was, it doesn't stand out for me if that makes sense…

Police 034

We get so much training, it's hard to say whether specifically I've had any in terms of hate crime, I've had a day or an afternoon of hate crime. I can't sort of think off the top of my head....there's going to be a little something which you're going to retain and use that in your job. But for me I've never made the connection say, 'Oh Yes, I did that on the training'

Notwithstanding this, all officers could recall some type of generic Equality and Diversity training when they first joined the police and it was this that had largely informed their understanding of what a hate crime actually was. Some officers also recalled refresher and training updates including, at times, some more specific forms of hate crime training delivered by police trainers and/or outside agencies.

Police 025

Specifically hate crime, I can't really think of much that's specific to hate crime. I've had a lot of NCALT training on the Equalities Act and we've had NCALT training on the new anti-social behaviour powers that are coming in and I suppose they cross over in that hate crime falls within those two areas of training

Police 023

I had training last year because I have only been in the job for a year, we did have a bit more of a specific element like a slide show and a presentation on hate crime, but it was very low key and not many slides to it...but we definitely had Equality and Diversity and went through the different characteristics....

One of the issues in recalling training was that officers often felt bombarded with training and sometimes found it difficult to keep up with the sheer amount of emails, NCALT training

packages, legal changes and updates. This meant that keeping on top of changes was sometimes problematic for officers:

> *Police 003*

> *…we had a conversation this morning because I'd read in the interview information about there being a change in the policy ...last year and I said in our response room 'Is anybody aware of that?' and everyone just looked at me and I was like 'Ah, I might have to try and find that before this meeting today but I couldn't find it. ...so I wasn't aware that there'd been that change...*

Indeed, this was related in part to the fact that most police training was done on NCALT and this tended to be the most frequent and recent training on hate crime, that officers had experienced. In terms of positive benefits for individual officers however, only a tiny minority of officers in the sample had anything positive to say about NCALT and this was simply that they could refer back to the training packages if they needed to check something and/or refresh their memories. This was particularly the cases with those packages that involved video examples:

> *Police 021*

> *...they are quite good, they don't tend to have much waffling and they are quite to the point and a lot of them have little videos and things that help. And it's often you will be reading things that you have already dealt with and you read the pack and you think ok that's kind of, I can apply that to that*

As the officer suggests NCALT offers the opportunity to go back and check knowledge. In the following quotation the police officer makes the point that NCALT offered the opportunity to revisit points which other forms of training might not and that it might therefore be more useful in refresher training:

> *Police 030*

> *The thing with them, in terms of the personal delivery, are that if you are unsure of any parts you can revisit. So I think in terms of usefulness they are always there to access or even as a refresher....so if it's something that you are not dealing with on a*

day-to-day basis I think it's almost like a knowledge area you can return to....there might be some areas that you want to recap and go over again...

Some officers stated that they understood why the police force put such a heavy reliance on e-training; particularly during the current climate of budgetary cuts, in that, it was a cost-effective form of training delivery that could be provided to all officers and did not necessitate pulling officers off duty to attending training courses in person, as officers could fit computer training into their working timescales:

Police 010

I've got to be careful here because I don't want to just be negative. I can see that they're useful…for the force, providing you can get access to a computer and you can sit down in a quiet environment and get the time to do it, I can understand from the organisation's point of view that it's probably, you know, they can tick a box and say this officer's had this training.....

Overall, however, the feedback on NCALT was overwhelming negative in terms of personal benefits for officers and this is problematic given the heavy reliance on NCALT packages by the force in the area of hate crime and associated training including vulnerable victims and anti-social behaviour. A frequent complaint was that officers found these training packages to be boring and repetitive and that they really struggled to retain the information. A common claim was that officers simply clicked through the information without really taking it in:

Police 022

It's poor….it's just not a good way of learning, I think there's an Equality and Diversity package but because it's on a computer screen ….it's not a good system, important training needs to be on a training day with some kind of human input

Police 005

They're useless, absolutely useless; they may as well not do it

Police 023

> *NCALT ....if you are busy, you do it more of a scan read and I would say it does not get fully retained...it's probably not the best way*

The lack of human input with e-learning packages was a key reason that officers felt they found it difficult to engage with this form of training and did not really retain the material despite the inclusion of film clips:

Police 010

> *[commenting on external training] It was a bit more human I would say and that's the bit that's missing isn't it. In NCALT you can have the audio on and even the voice sounds disconnected. It is a bit, you know; please pay the parking fee, that kind of voice. And it's the human factor that's missing I think*

Some officers found it particularly difficult to retain the information from this form of on-line delivery; because of either their preferred learning style and/or a personal condition such as dyslexia which sometimes made it almost impossible for them to engage with the material despite the inclusion of on-line questions to test their understanding:

Police 024

> *E-learning needs to go, it's pointless, terrible...I honestly can't remember most of it...we've had an e-learning package on Equality and Diversity and we've had an e-learning one on mental health....I don't retain it when I'm out and about, I don't even retain after I've read the first three things. Our e-learning kind of goes, you have three pages of information then you have a knowledge check... Well by the time I've got to the knowledge check because I can't process it, I don't know what I've read. So I went to my Inspector and said I got 20% on the test, 'Will you're going to have to do it again...I can't keep doing it, it's not going to say there*

A significant number of officers felt that the 'click-click' nature of the packages and the tendency for officers to view them in that way was also partly to do with the fact that they often had a number of NCALT packages to be completed in a given time period:

Police 013

....in fact I've just done one today, so this one I did, I haven't learnt anything out of it, it was just the fact I had to do it, you've got a deadline.

Police 022

You don't retain it, not me personally or a lot of cops, because like last week, I've had to do four NCLATs, that had to be in by end of month, there was a foreign conviction one, a money laundering and two others, but you've got a timescale to do them in, so you'll just go, 'Bang, Bang, Bang', just do it as quick as you can, you don't retain any of it

Police 034

I think there's a lot to take in, in the short term there's a lot of pressure to do them especially around your work and you're not given a specific time to do it...you do that alongside running out to jobs...and you're trying to get through it. As opposed to, do you know what, I'm going to sit down and take everything in and that's no disrespect to the training it's just because of the pressures of the other work we've got to do

This meant that NCALT training on hate crime often got 'lost' in a wealth of other packages and similar comments were made about emails which were perceived as placing a heavy reliance on officers reading the information, understanding it and retaining it:

Police 026

I think the problem with hate crime training on NCALT is that it gets shoved in there with a lot of other NCALT training. There is a lot that you end up having to do....we have had an influx recently and it was one of quite a few packages that we had to do very quickly

Many officers suggested that this meant that they often did the training packages during a quieter moment during their shifts but that this was often when they were tired and in a police station with lots of distractions and that engagement with the material was even more difficult:

Police 014

I think they're rubbish. Because they say you must have this NCALT package done by this time on the computer...but you can't take it in. They don't realise that not everybody learns looking at a computer screen in a noisy parade room with people passing by, the lighting's poor, the control room is shouting, and you're expected to fit this in...

Police 012

They're not great in the sense that half the time it's you having to fit it in at two o'clock in the morning when your minds not really on it and its quite easy to almost do a click, click, click all the way through type of thing. You get a knowledge check at the end and then it's a bit of a haphazard guess, I think it's going to be that, this and this.

Therefore, this need to get through the material and the 'click, click' nature of it often led to officers themselves seeing the training as a 'tick box' exercise both for themselves and the force. Officers tended to view NCALT as something that simply needed to be seen to have been done, rather than putting value on the content and why it was important for daily policing. Indeed officers stated that when discussing the training they often joked amongst themselves about *how high a percentage they had got* and shared tips about *how to get through it even quicker*. The next quotation includes references to both points and is indicative, as the officer suggests, of the lack of value that officers placed on this form of training:

Police 010

...on that point, when you sit in a room with people, it's like we've all had an instruction, you must have undertaken this training by this date. So, of course, we're 'Oh, have you done your NCALT training? Yes? How many percent did you get, you know....and if you click that button you can get through it a lot quicker. And OK, you can laugh about it and all that but it's kind of missing the point isn't it?...nobody really talks about whether it was useful...people tend to be a bit dismissive about it

Keeping these factors in mind, a number of officers stated that they felt that the nature of the training packages suggested that the force did not take it seriously enough and yet, despite this, that it provided the force with the opportunity to say that officers had been trained because they could point to the fact that the officer had done the course. Yet, whilst some officers felt that the training was often a 'tick-box' exercise for the force, it potentially left them vulnerable as officers because they felt that they had not retained the training and that it was of limited help in their daily policing. Therefore, if they got something wrong the force could put the blame on the individual officer for failing to follow guidance provided. In this way the training was doubly problematic in that it provided the officers with little practical knowledge despite creating an expectation that they would have it:

Police 025

I hate it; it's not fit for purpose. It doesn't really sink in to be honest. To me it just feels like it's a tick in the box in the way that the employer is covering their back should we mess up so they can turn round and go 'You've had the training' - when in actual fact we've just looked at a few screens.

Police 010

…..for me I'm a little bit concerned... it's ok ticking a box, this officer has sat in front of a screen and undertook that training, and it even monitors how many percent you got in the knowledge check, but for me the important thing is about retention and the way that knowledge that you've taken on board is then used in your day-to-day role. I'm not sure the retention bit is as good maybe as it perhaps would be if we were doing proper workshops.

The sheer amount of training officers had to do within a given time period was not simply a complaint in relation to NCALT packages but was also a complaint which surfaced in relation to training days. Some officers stated that there was simply too much training in one session which reduced their ability to retain the information being provided:

Police 013

...they seem to be cramming so much in now to a training day. The last one I went on was to do with some sort of filling in MG5s which we've already done... there were about eight things to look at that day. By the time you got to number six, number one was out of the window and you were just wanting to go home really...

The timing of training was also important, in addition to officers claiming that they had to fit in NCALT during their shifts, some officers also complained of having to do training days during time off:

Police 003

But the training day is an issue where it's perceived to be a theft of rest day because it takes a rest day, well if you're off in blocks of four it takes one of those up. So the participation of the crowd, shall we say, sometimes is lacking and I think that sometimes rubs off on trainers

 Whilst it appeared that this was actually to do with having to fit training around officer's shift patterns, and that officers had been allocated that time elsewhere, it is an issue that needs noting. Lack of receptiveness to training is not unique to the police but is something that trainers have to deal with and it is an issue that needs addressing in the design of training, despite the challenges posed by budgetary cuts.

Another criticism of training was that many officers also stated that the examples given in training, NCALT packages in particular, did not help them with the nuances in their policing role and that the examples used were often too clear-cut. As we have already seen, the majority of incidents that the police dealt with in this area were far from straightforward but *messy and complicated*. Therefore, it was felt that the training was not particularly helpful to officers when they were dealing with the 'grey' area of hate crimes and hate incidents and this point will be revisited in the second section of the report. For many of these reasons some officers felt that training which drew on officer's experiences and the sharing of these would be more helpful to them than the more hypothetical and abstracted examples on NCALT:

Police 009

…its better I feel if it's a question and answer kind of session so you can discuss it with people. I learn more now that I'm older by doing and talking, discussing things and stuff like that, rather than looking at a screen, clicking on buttons, like 'If he said this what would your response be sort of thing?'…but when we go to an incident it's not like that.. there's always a spanner in the works that you don't know about. And sometimes if you're speaking to a group, somebody else might have experienced something similar or you might go to a similar incident and use their learning to help you sort of thing. So in terms of the equality training and things like that recently, it seems to me it's just something we've had to do rather than something that it's been thought about properly in terms of the impact. And the amount of times we do spend going to hate incidents and things like that, it could have perhaps been done a bit better.

The points about the need for time and space for discussion in training and the use of actual policing examples which drew on officer's experiences were important for several reasons. A frequent complaint in relation to all types of training was that officer's experiences were not utilised sufficiently in training, whilst this was obviously a complaint levelled at NCALT training, it also re-surfaced in discussions about the other two forms of training used by the police force; namely 'in-house' training by police officers and training using external agencies and recommendations are made for including officers in training sessions. In a subsequent article the author argues for a review of how police officers are changed in terms of the underlying learning philosophies behind NCALT and in-house training sessions.

Turning now to 'in-house' training by the police service, this received more mixed reviews than NCALT, albeit the aforementioned criticisms were still present. A number of officers claimed that some police trainers relied very heavily on power point presentations which they found boring and that their role was largely passive, to listen to the trainer with limited opportunity to partake in the training:

Police 023

...you go over to central for a day...and it's more of a presentation to go through rather than doing it yourself...it tends to be trainers as well, our trainers are a bit, the

chap that did the vulnerability training, we had him for the Anti-Social Behaviour thing... and they were a little bit mind numbing, because it was like PowerPoint slides ...it feels like PowerPoint slides that you're clicking through ...it's probably the trainers point for being a little bit power pointy...especially if they're just reading the slides, it's the most annoying thing in the world and your mind switches off, even if it's on an interesting subject, if someone is teaching you and they're just reading PowerPoint slides… and they're like, 'Oh, we'll send you the PowerPoint out'.. And I'm thinking, It's not really that helpful, it's just like a little crib sheet with this is the new legislation and flowcharts

In another quote, this officer suggests that there is a need for variety in training and the repeated use of one form of training on a topic such as videos can also be detrimental. Notwithstanding the training here was on another form of crime, the need to offer variety within training sessions is informative and will be re-visited in the recommendations:

Police 018

Well, you need variety within a training session, we did some training on hacking recently and after the third video ….I was thinking…'OK, I can only take so much more of videos with American voiceovers talking about hacking

The proceeding quotes have indicated that it would help officers if they had more opportunity to get involved in the training they received and also had the chance to engage with other officers both in the training sessions and at other times. This was important because police officers suggested that they often felt 'patronised' in training sessions and that their own experiences were neither incorporated nor valued:

Police 004

…and it's sometimes seen as people giving us delivery on a subject we probably know more about and it's difficult because as much as you want to listen and engage, you can't

Other issues that affected retention here were, as we have already seen, too many subjects delivered in one training session. In the next section we will see how despite training by external outside agencies being the form of training most valued by the police, even here,

police officers sometimes felt patronised and felt that their own experiences were not incorporated or valued and that sometimes they were being lectured to (this complaint also surfaced at times with regards to internal trainers also):

Police 007

I don't think officers are always receptive to outside trainers because they'll say, 'Oh you've never been a cop, you don't know what it's like'

These points about feeling patronised and undervalued in training were also linked to the suggestion that much training for the police was often perceived as being in response to some kind of mistake made within the police or some identification that they were not dealing with hate crimes (or other offences) properly, that police officers were incompetent and their experiences and knowledge was irrelevant. Consequently, training was often interpreted as a kind of criticism which reduced police perceptiveness to the benefits offered by the training:

Police 012

I think sometimes when you get the experts to come in, it can also be a bit of a lecture, more this is what you're doing wrong...and you're there thinking, well hang on a second, we're the people who actually go out to speak to the victims

Police 007

…..a lot of the learning seems to be a reaction or a change of law because of something that has gone wrong...it always feels like its learning because what you've been doing before is wrong, you always feel like you're getting knocked at training. Does that make sense? It's like, 'Oh we're doing this now because you've been doing stop searches wrong the last 15 years and you're all going to get the sack'

As a result of this some officers felt that police training was often reactive rather than being properly thought out in terms of how it was continually developed and delivered:

Police 006

Our training schedule, dare I say, it's a bit hit and miss. It's almost the fact that whatever is highlighted right now, stop and search got highlighted, the Stephen

Lawrence enquiry, that was at the forefront of what the police needed to look at. ...you would find that through the next year or two our training would go around that...in the last few years we have had the Windsor report….again it highlighted issues, that's where our training goes. So although we have intensive training to begin with, on race hate diversity equality and all of that, after that it is driven by whatever is highlighted and the force itself tends to rely a lot on on-line learning

This perception of training as implied 'criticism' is important because as well as influencing perceptiveness to training it was also connected to police morale. Officers were acutely aware that the only news stories covered by the media tended to be negative in relation to the police and that this was an issue that contributed to a lack of faith in the police by the general public and was also a factor in under-reporting. The lack of positive stories about the police and praise for good practice bears consequences for the morale of police officers, which is particularly problematic when officers are affected by the current climate of budgetary cuts which exacerbates the usual strains and demands of policing:

Police 010

It [training] should include good news too because we are very good as a force at saying how poor we are at doing things and not very good at saying, actually we did a really good job there

Therefore, all of the aforementioned issues coalesced to undermine police receptiveness to hate crime training and the value that they placed on it by contributing to police cynicism. The issue therefore of how to make officers actually value the training they received rather than seeing it as something functional that simply needs to be seen to be done, is incredibly important. Cynicism has been highlighted as part of police working culture (see Reiner) formed in part due to the demands of the job. Whilst police culture is not monolithic (for a useful analysis see Chan), elements of police culture do need to be considered it may undermine the benefit of the training provided. The author deals with police culture in a subsequent article but suffice to say here that cynicism towards training is a factor that needs addressing in training design and implementation. Of course, cynicism about training is not unique to the police but officers suggested that such cynicism was commonplace:

Police 010

Sometimes there's a tendency I think with police officers for us to be a little bit cynical about training and dismissive and not take it seriously sometimes or use it as an excuse, 'Oh, I've had to come here today and I could have been doing this'...We're very quick to be cynical sometimes.

Police 007

I think police officers always see learning as a chore, not something which is embraced.....

The fact is therefore that good training needs to break through such cynicism by helping officers to see the utility of the training in developing their policing skills and also helping them to feel that the force is 'on side' – the aforementioned officer alludes to the need to break through cynicism in training delivery:

Police 010

I think that some of the cynicism ... sometimes I think it's a coping mechanism with cops...not all of the time but a lot of the time, if you get cops in a room they'll start talking about the job and they'll either get really whingey and cynical or they'll start laughing and I think both of them are probably part of a coping mechanism. To get cops stepping back from that and focussing, right, you know, stop whinging...and enjoy the fact you're here...and approach it positively and constructively. We do manage to do it but sometimes we're very good at doing the other stuff before it. Does that make sense?

The aforementioned points have indicated that in general officers felt that the training delivered to them on hate crime was largely functional and 'abstracted' from their everyday working lives. There is a need for police officers to feel that the training they are getting is of value to them in terms of their daily policing work and also their longer term careers but also to make them feel that *they are valued* within the training experience. The use of police experiences and actual cases in training, including examples of good practice within the force itself and more positive news about the police and good feedback from the public, could help to increase police receptiveness and engagement whilst also improving police morale and

reducing scepticism to perceived criticism. A focus on what is going well and how to increase that still further could help to engender a more proactive and preventative shift in training rather than a reactive one, which is how some police officers tended to evaluate current training models. This is especially important in hate crime because effectively dealing with hate crimes and incidents often involves an emphasis both on community and prevention which will be examined shortly.

An emphasis on raising the value of training to officers must concede that a lot of police knowledge is gained from experience on the job. Obviously this is not surprising given that employees learn on the job in most work environments. However, it is particularly important in the context of policing, given the huge variety in the policing role especially given the very wide range of hate crimes and hate incidents that the police may have to deal with. An important part of learning for officers therefore is to help officers to draw on their own experiences and those of colleagues, both good and bad.

Providing officers with opportunities to learn from the experiences of other officers and to talk to them would be valuable, in particular, learning from officers on the beat team who have often had experience of dealing with hate crimes/incidents and anti-social behaviour. As it was some officers did discuss cases with other officers, particularly in situations when they had not had experience of a certain incident or had not experienced it for a long time:

> Police 004
>
> *I think a lot of our learning is cascade. You look at the last person to have done something on your shift as an expert, that's the way it's looked at. 'Oh, I know someone who's done that, you contact them, 'What did you do for it?'. A lot of learning is done that way, it's not the best, but it does happen*

The last quote reveals how talking to other officers was sometimes relied on when officers had little experience of dealing with hate crimes and talking to Sergeants was particularly valued:

Police 033

Well, you would usually ask your Sergeant because you have to talk to him about it anyway and sometimes other officers at the station...but we don't have a time when we can get together and discuss cases really

It is important that opportunities for officers to share and reflect on experiences of dealing with hate crimes and incidents are built into training programmes in constructive ways. This is particularly important given that some officers, response officers in particular, may have little opportunity to discuss crimes and incidents with other officers outside of training.

Finally, officers felt that the training only got them so far and in addition to the training they needed more support when actually dealing with hate crimes and hate incidents:

. Police 026

There is only so many times we can keep going over the procedure and sometimes forgetting it, I think it's a case of getting the support when we come across hate crime

A number of officers felt therefore that the training helped them to know the legislation and the procedure but that this was not enough when dealing with hate crimes and incidents:

Police 005

Like I say, I've retained the practical application of it so I know if I go to someone that's reported a hate crime why it's classified or is it classified, what I need to do extra to let's say a normal criminal damage than one that's classified as a hate crime let's say. So I know the differences and the extra stuff so I suppose from that side it is but that's about it really.

. *Police 030*

Basically it helps you by identifying the procedures to be followed and the characteristics, the definition, but it would be helpful to have more training about the

details, the distinctions between crimes and incidents and different ways of approaching victims

Police 014

.We need more training on other things on what is an actual offence ....at what level should we be taking something on…some name calling in a street, but the person's not bothered about it, but at what stage should be saying 'Look, unfortunately we think you've committed an offence'... more really on what is a non-crime incident to an actual crime....and where we should be looking to prosecute

Keeping these points in mind, it would be helpful for officers to talk to a dedicated hate crime person when they are faced with a potential hate crime situation and these points will be revisited in the second section and the recommendations which will both draw on the role of Nottingham's Hate Crime Manager. The point about shared experience and input from a dedicated hate crime officer can help provide officers with some sort of exposure to hate crime examples. However, this will only involve secondary exposure by association and it is imperative therefore to consider how to build more actual exposure to hate crimes within training models. This is particularly important given that exposure to hate crimes and personal experiences were highlighted as being integral to developing the knowledge of officers on hate crimes. Yet, as we have seen, hate crime is less well reported than other types of crime and some officers had little or no experience of dealing with some types of it. Let us now turn our attention to forms of training which received the most positive reviews from police officers, that which involved the use of outside agencies including experts and victims of specific types of hate crimes.

Which training received the most positive feedback?

Having reviewed negative feedback on training, this section of the report looks at positive feedback from officers on both training and resources on hate crimes. Training which officers found memorable had certain key features not least of which was that which had practical utility in their police roles and their longer term careers.

The training on Equality and Diversity and other forms of hate crime training that received the most positive feedback in terms of the practical value placed on it by police officers was training on specific forms of hate crime which used outside agencies including experts and victims. The following quotation involves an extract where a beat manager is recalling some of the most memorable training he has received during his time in the force, whilst this is tangentially related to hate crime, as it involves a potential terrorist attack, more commonly dealt with under terrorist offences, it still provides a good example of valued training. There were two types of training that were memorable to the officer. The first because it was coupled with his work as part of an NVQ, which meant that there was an emphasis on him actually being personally involved with the training. The second was because it involved both the use of outside experts who provided expert knowledge from which the officer felt he learnt and benefited. These factors helped the officer to remain interested in the training and feel that he really benefitted from the training experiences:

Police 022

You have a training day every now and again and a training day is well received. I think if I look at that NVQ, I remember at the time...we had a folder and we got time to do it at work but I did have to do some of it in my own time. Initially I was like 'Well, I've got to do police homework and do it in my own time' but it was very tailored to tell you exactly what you needed to know...and I thought it was very well structured that particular course. I think that a lot of the courses we do are just bang, you need to do it, it's given to a trainer to learn, you know. Why not get somebody in who knows about this kind of thing to deliver it to you, somebody who's passionate about what they're doing? ...and that gets a lot more attention. I remember doing a course, when I worked in London and it was say if there's a chemical attack, and they had some experts from the field come in and talk to us, some scientists. It was just really interesting because they work in that field and they had our full attention

and I can remember a lot of what he talked about because it was just interesting and knowledgeable

In this particular example therefore the officer places emphasis on the expert knowledge he was exposed to but also his own role in learning as he was more involved in the learning process when he had to engage with the material and do tasks as part of his NVQ which meant that his engagement with the material was much higher than with other training courses.

The use of external agencies with expertise was especially valued as being helpful to officers when dealing with people with learning disabilities and/or mental health conditions. Therefore, the use of external agencies is largely examined through the lens of disability hate crime and mental health, as this tended to be the area where it was most valued, albeit other hate crime areas were mentioned. Disability hate crime is an area of particular concern and, as we have already seen, it is particularly poorly reported. There are two reasons why disability training needs to be robust i) firstly, in helping the police to make an initial assessment as to whether a person actually has a disability and, if so, whether this might be a disability hate crime and ii) secondly, to assess what support needs the person has, including the best modes of communication to help facilitate the investigation process, and also what safeguarding procedures might need to be implemented.

However, the whole area of learning disabilities and mental health is often problematic for officers as unsurprisingly, they lack medical knowledge but also because they often have little exposure to such conditions in their personal and professional lives; of course, this lack of experience and exposure is not unique to the police. However, exposure is critically important given that large amounts of police learning takes place on the job.

Before we look at how exposure to victims with different types of disability can help the police let us first look the understandings of officers about the range of disabilities, the need to establish disability and how they could go about doing this.

Keeping these points in mind, officers were asked about their understanding of disability, the range of disabilities and what issues might arise in the policing of hate crime and incidents involving disabled victims. When answering these questions officers suggested that the two

main issues were identifying the best modes of communication with the disabled person and/or identifying and implementing safeguarding needs and sources of support.

Whilst the need to identify disability is paramount, the spectrum of disability and mental health conditions is wide and given that officers are not medically trained this means there are inevitably difficulties in identifying whether a person has a disability or mental health condition or not.

When asked to explain what they understood by the term disability, the officers suggested that it covered a range of conditions which usually meant that the person had more difficulty doing or understanding things:

Police 004

Someone not able to do certain things be it physically or mentally...or someone is challenged in doing the same things that an able-bodied person can do, because a disabled person may be able to do something that an able-bodied person can do but it's a lot harder for them and it's more of a challenge...it's not all physical, some of it is mental or learning disabilities

Police 001

I would give it the English Dictionary definition of a disability. It can be anything from not functioning a hundred per cent in society, or it could be something physical, somebody has lost an arm or leg or has something like diabetes...it's very wide. Say the autistic spectrum, that's a humongous umbrella...and so many conditions are just lumped under autism

Therefore, police officers noted that the range of disabilities was very wide and covered all age groups:

Police 003

..you can have very severe disabilities and you can have very minor disabilities

Police 016

To be fair, old age is a disability isn't it? On the estate in Clifton where I work, old people there tend to become victims because they are vulnerable and the disability there is that they are old and not as quick as they were, quick-minded or physically strong

Police officers were then asked what they might anticipate if they were called to an incident and told that the potential victim was disabled:

Police 020

A full range of things really, whether it's a disability of someone's bodily functions, in terms of whether they can walk, whether they are in a wheelchair, whether someone's got a hearing difficulty, whether they can understand what you are going to be saying. It's so wide ranged it's hard to sort of say one exact thing. I'd be expecting anything and that's the thing, if someone has got a disability, it could be absolutely anything. It could be that they have no issues at all, I get there and there's no issue at all in terms of communicating or I probably won't even notice that they have a disability, but it could be something quite obvious

Given this vast array of disabilities officers suggested that because you could be faced with anything it was important to attend incidents with an open mind:

Police 010

The main thing is to go with an open mind...disability can conjure up 'Oh, they're not going to be very mobile' but it might be nothing to do with mobility...they may be classed as disabled because they have ADHD

Police 023

It could be various things really, being disabled, it could be someone whose wheelchair bound but then you could be dealing with visual disability of someone who is deaf. I have been to a job before where someone was hard of hearing. And you have got learning disabilities...but then I guess on the way you are thinking of how

you can communicate with them better so they are understanding you. So you can change your ways to suit their needs to try to help them and get the information out of them about what has happened

Inevitably therefore the provision of training for officers on disability is hindered by the huge range of disabilities that victims may suffer from. The range of disabilities arguably also includes mental health conditions and officers had many experiences of dealing with people with mental health problems both as victims and as perpetrators. In terms of mental health this was often because the police were sometimes the first and only organisation available at certain times such as evenings or weekends.

When asked if they would feel comfortable identifying someone's disability most officers suggested that their ability to identify disabilities was very limited:

Police 008

I wouldn't feel comfortable coming back and saying this person is disabled for those reasons because we have no medical training

Most officers gave similar answers as to the sorts of disability that they might have some chance of identifying including physical disabilities and those which might be visibly apparent such as Down's Syndrome:

Police 005

Down 's syndrome, yes, but only because there's certain physical and facial features that makes it easy to spot. I might be able to tell you that a person is disabled in some way or that they have some issues, but I wouldn't feel comfortable definitely saying that they were

Identifying other disabilities that were not clearly physically identifiable was however much more difficult:

Police 003

If it was like a severe or noticeable disability then I may be able to identify it myself, but if it was a slight disability, like slight autism, no, I would never be able to tell if someone had slight autism

Police 021

I think it can be difficult, I think that there are a lot of disabilities that are hidden, Asperger's, Autism, dementia even. On a lot of the training videos, it gives examples where people can appear drunk but actually it's something else and you are very careful when you are speaking to someone that you are not making a judgement on why they are the way they are

Police 012

Certainly, something like Down's Syndrome is much easier because there is more of a visual guide, MS, my wife and I have a friend who's got MS…but you wouldn't know and again unless they were to give you some sort of visual clue or something to say, 'I've got this'. But when it isn't something that you can visibly see or you get from communicating with them, you wouldn't necessarily put two and two together and think that

A minority of officers who did have personal exposure to people with learning disabilities and or mental health conditions found that these experiences helped them when policing both because they had more empathy and sometimes a greater ability to recognise some disabilities:

Police 004

Identifying disability is hard, because a lot of them are broad and they cross over and I think unless you've had some first-hand experiences, it's difficult because I don't think it's necessarily something you can be taught or simply read from a brief….and that's what you look for. Because I wouldn't really know that way, it's only because of the fact of exposure to my son because he has autism and then after, like little

support groups he has been to, it's increased my awareness, exposure definitely helps, without that it becomes difficult

Police 013

I have a son who's got cerebral palsy although he's not physically disabled... mentally he's a lower age than what he is. So it's opened my eyes up to the groups that we go to, of the different ranges of disabilities you can actually be amongst and dealing with

Police 021

My son has got autism and in the last six years I have had to learn a lot about it

Given the problems in identifying disabilities and given that disability might not be disclosed, therefore, any exposure to people with disabilities was valuable to the police, some of these experiences had come through volunteer work:

Police 030

I come from a background where my partner is a social worker on the a scheme which cares for adults with Down's Syndrome and so on, with that background my wife set up a couple of play schemes...and I have assisted as a volunteer, so there is a knowledge of disability from that, so I have a mindfulness on a day to day basis when I am out policing

Police 023

Yes and no, with a couple of those, I would only know some because I have some exposure before the job, I was doing volunteering for Mencap, so those experiences would come in, where we had people with Down's Syndrome etc. But I wouldn't say I was 100% confident. But I would like to think that you could pick out someone that perhaps has a certain disability and suit their needs and try to work with it

Other officers had gained valuable experiences in dealing with disabled victims through their policing role, this was particularly the case for beat managers who often regularly visited

sheltered housing centres and venues where disabled people, the elderly and people with mental health conditions either lived or congregated:

Police 003

Since I've become a police officer I've become much more aware...because disability, before I became a police officer, I'd think of it as quite black and white, you know, somebody in a wheelchair but I think now I'm much more aware of the spectrum and how you can go from the extreme to the very minor

Police 006

…. I suppose the older you are, the longer you've been in the job you get to recognise a lot of the signs of different forms of autism. And we have a special school that's on my beat area and people with severe autism go there and they will scream and shout and be uncontrollable but on the other hand you will get someone who won't talk to you at all and just sit there and not do anything. So from a personal point of view, I think I am able to spot the signs of a lot of those

Police 015

I have got connections with Pegasus, it was introduced through Smile Stop Hate Crime, a group of us attended and I have met a number of disabled people through that and through my work on the beat team and that has definitely helped

As an officer suggests in the following quotation, information on disability was not always available on the Police National Computer:

Police 001

I have a family member who is on the extreme end of the autistic spectrum and again, this is the only reason I know about autism because I have first-hand experience. But I would imagine if I was to bump into that family member in the street, he doesn't speak at all, he could find himself being arrested for not providing details, simply when he can't. But the officer wouldn't know that because we don't have access to medical records and that on the streets. And if it's not on our police national

> *computer, not everybody is recorded there; if you have never been arrested we have no details of you. If you don't have a driving licence, we have no details of you*

As indicated by officers in the following quotations therefore, without exposure to victims and/or people who may have knowledge about a person's disability, recognising disability is often hard:

> Police 019
>
> *I dealt with an incident in the last couple of weeks with a kid that was autistic ...you can't always pick things like that up without talking to someone, like the parents*

> Police 001
>
> *It would be difficult identifying multiple sclerosis, I have no dealings with it and very little knowledge of it, and I have no reason to research it myself in my day to day life or within my policing career*

> Police 006
>
> *[recognising disability], I think that's a hard one, it's probably known to the individual themselves, but walking down the street, you pass two people and think those two people are the same, one could be suffering from a disability that is unknown to us. So, I think, on something like that, unless you are connected to the person, or you are a family member to that person, it would be hard for us to say it's a disability hate crime without disclosure*

Having stated that it was important to establish whether a person was disabled and if so what kind of disability it was, this was said to be particularly the case because of the need to communicate with the disabled person and because of identifying any safeguarding needs, both of which would usually necessitate contact with other agencies:

> Police 025
>
> *I'd say the main one to be aware of would be a mental disability because that's going to give you communication issues possibly, tailoring the way you talk to them with their disability to understand what you're asking and what you're saying as well*

Police 034

The only complicating factor is around whether someone has specific learning difficulties, they can't understand you or you can't understand them, that's when it gets difficult and that's when you would have to arrange for carers to come out, whether it would be an appropriate adult, and that just makes it lengthier...and it's the same with mental health, if they can't understand, the biggest difficulty is trying to understand someone and if someone can't express what's happened to them and they can't communicate...again, you just have to look for support workers, whether its family members who may be able to understand them better or if there is a different way of communicating with them, it's the only avenue we have I guess

Often the call handler will have noted down that the person has a disability if the original caller (i.e. the victim or another person) had mentioned it or the call handler had identified it from other information. If that information was available then the police could use it to bring up the subject of disability and explore it with the victim in order to gain further information and police officers gave examples of doing so:

Police 019

It's like any job we go to, you will be given an initial account by the call operator…but in any job we have to keep an open mind because 9 times out of 10 when you get there, the job is probably completely different to what you have been told it is. So you have to go there with an open mind and address things when you get there…just because somebody may be reported as being disabled…you are going to go through the same investigational procedure. You have to take into account their needs, like if they were deaf; you might have to think about how to tackle that, get a sign person in. But you can only deal with things when you get there and are faced with them

The College of Policing has recently highlighted that police officers might sometimes be embarrassed about questioning members of the public about disability. A minority of officers suggested that there may be some reluctance about direct questioning for fear of embarrassment or causing offence:

Police 025

... I don't feel comfortable just asking them straight away…there's no easy or polite way of doing it is there? You don't want to offend them…some people will be happy to talk about it, whilst others will not…it depends on the person and on the officer as to how well that goes

Police 019

…..the thing is, I think some people are reluctant to ask because they get embarrassed or feel uncomfortable about it, but that's the only way you can get proper information by speaking to the person and asking the relevant questions

This officer goes on to suggest that whilst you may be able to pick up the information from other sources, it was still important to ask the victim as they may not have revealed their disability to anyone else:

They may turn around and say 'No'…but they could have a condition they have not reported to anyone and say 'I don't feel particularly well at the moment', or 'I keep having this and that' and you might be the first person that they tell about it. So, it is important to ask the person themselves, if they are capable of telling you

However, even though a minority of the officers stated they would use more direct questioning, in reality, they still used 'round about' questioning techniques, which is how all officers usually tried to get the information. Indeed, these were standard techniques that the police officers would use if they had not got information about the nature of the disability or if the police officer when responding to the call and/or when meeting the victim for the first time, suspected that the person was disabled even if the information had not been forthcoming earlier.

Police 004

I'm not one to shy away from a difficult conversation because you have to have them…if I don't, I'm not doing my job right…I always try and build the rapport and get a feel for them, and think 'OK, this is something, I've got a question mark in my

mind and you have to just come out with it….I'm not dead direct, but the questions direct in a soft manner, if that makes sense

Police 005

I'd probably do a more general question…it would be more a general question, so 'Is there anything that makes you more vulnerable, or this person's made reference to your mental state, 'Do you have any problems, or is there anything that would lead this person to say that towards you? - rather than be sort of direct

Police 007

Perhaps I would ask the question, but I'll perhaps ask it in a way that I might tag it on to the end of another, do you class yourself as 'White British', have you got any disabilities that we need to be aware of?

An alternative and/or additional way of obtaining the information was to ask victims about whether they were getting any support from family members or outside agencies, as noted in the next quote it was important to establish whether a person was disabled as an appropriate adult might be needed for some disabled victims:

Police 001

…we tend to focus on the incident first as to why they have called us there…in the first instance you want to be talking to the person, …going through that with them slowly and surely…and as part of that conversation, disabilities or any problems the person may be facing naturally come out. It's down to the officer's questioning styles and there will come a point where most officers will look at a person who has a disability, or someone who may have the mental age of a child but be an adult and realise 'Hold on I don't think this person can give us a statement on their own'…and then you will start calling the hospitals or other organisations and say 'Do you know of this person, is there anything I should be aware of, have you had dealings with them? Because you don't want to be taking a statement from someone who really needs an appropriate adult, because it can cause issues later on

In terms of the agencies approached, officers would look at the police database to locate if there had been any previous reports and contact with the police but then also contact social services to see whether they were aware of the person and whether they had any particular needs or issues:

Police 003

First off, you'd talk to them, you'd ask them questions and you can normally get a bit of a vibe by listening to them and asking them questions. We have previous incidents, you can ask control room to see if we've been there before, whether there's any jobs that are flagged up…and you can then get a vibe from how that job was marked off or what the update was also to see if there was anything we need to be aware of…witnesses, people who have seen what's happened before we got there. Also, we've got a good relationship with Social Services and people like that, so if it's in 'looked after' accommodation, we'd be aware of that and then you'd talk to the staff and find out exactly if there is a disability, how severe it is and then you change and adapt your response to what the situation is and what the needs of that person are

GPs were also sometimes approached albeit issues of Doctor and Patient confidentiality often meant that little co-operation was afforded to the police so that officers still ended up having to try and get the information in other ways:

Police 025

It's a very difficult one to be honest…I suppose the best option if you think they might have a disability is to try and get their GP's details and contact the GP, but therein you've got a problem with the Data Protection Act, in the sense that GPs are usually very strict with what they will tell you. …there's not really a set process in place, where you can go back to the station and go I think this person might have a disability, so I'll go and check. There's nothing like that currently anyway….maybe getting in touch with Nottingham City Homes…for the most part, I think, when I've been in the situation where I'm not sure why they're answering the way they're answering, or because of their behaviour, I just try and tailor the way I talk to them…it's trying to help them in the best way that you can. There are questions that

you can ask them, as well, like 'Do you need any help?', 'Would you prefer to write your answers'? - if they are really struggling to talk

Family members, neighbours and/or other members of the community might also be approached:

Police 019

I think the first one is just talking to the person and asking them the relevant questions like, 'Are they on any medication, are they under a doctor for anything? if you have got suspicions about things. And then you could try and speak with family members, if you were really concerned to see if they knew anything, probably speak with social services. Check previous records to see if they are on records. It's just about making general enquiries and asking the person really

It is important to note that outside of these strategies the police had little other opportunity to identify disability in that they were often entirely dependent on the victim and/or third parties for such information and the quality of it. Gaining such information was often time consuming and frustrating for officers and it often involved them having to ring around different agencies to find out the information:

Police 001

The one we use quite often for St Ann's, is Nottingham City Homes, they tend to have quite a lot of information like that. And then with mental health, you have got your GPs, Nottingham City Homes we share quite a lot of information with, GPs we have a bit more trouble with when it comes to the mental health side of things, it's even just getting that initial referral, just to see if they have been diagnosed with anything, we often find that the agencies will simply tell you to go back to the GP, so you end up going back to square one every time, we have had that with one of the residents and it's just a nightmare, and I wouldn't say GPs were the best

Pegasus was a resource that had been used by a minority of officers and those that knew about it had found it very helpful:

Police 013

If it doesn't feel right, as in the person doesn't appear to be responding to questioning and things like that, I'd be hoping that if he's on the PNC that might help. One of the things that I try and promote is a thing called Pegasus...if a person is on Pegasus, we can access this…and then it will give us their details, their disabilities and helpful hints as to people we can contact things like that

This beat manager goes onto say that local knowledge of the area and its inhabitants was something that beat managers could draw on to help identify people with disabilities:

There again, that's the good thing with being on the beat team, you get to know your area and you get to know, not all the vulnerable people, but you get to know the core group, or little pockets of where people are…so you get to know people, you can probably reel off ten people in your area that have got a problem with how to interact with people…whereas response cops don't have that beauty, because of the workload that they have

Police 030

I think it's just a combination really, I think from a visual presentation and also from asking the questions. And often if they are a bit confused, you can say 'Is there anyone I can contact on your behalf? Or someone I can speak to? They may have a contact number for their carer. Sometimes, there is somebody out in the community with them, or they may be known to some of the local shopkeepers or cafes…so they may be readily known in the community…so there is always that opportunity to find out from someone else

Therefore identifying disability was considered to be more even more difficult for Response Cops, who often had much less time to spend with victims and who might lack local knowledge:

Police 003

It is really hard, because 9 times out of 10, you're walking into a room with somebody and you've got to, very quickly, take a gauge of the situation…a lot of the time, you do

just assume, if they are not forthcoming with information. For some people you can ask the same question over and over again, it can be more noticeable, that they don't understand…I think it's difficult because we are now in the business of 'fire-fighting' policing, so we're in, we're trying to sort it out and we're out…if I wasn't able to identify straightaway that there was a mental health problem or there was a disability, then I think you maybe don't give it the time that it deserves. I think half of your brain is sort of, on the next job, so potentially we don't give it enough time…we don't potentially get to the bottom of it straight away, it's awful to say isn't it? Which is really good when the beat team come in and they take over and do the more in-depth assessment

Police 018

…for things like autism or learning difficulties, until you start talking to someone, it's really hard to identify that unless they come out and say 'Look, I've got this condition'…but it's hard to interact with someone if you don't quite know why they're being stand offish or a bit cagey and I'm like ' Have they got something to hide?' Because, you've ….also got your police officer's hat, going 'Why is this person being like this?'

More resources for the police are obviously needed here; it is crucial that the police are able to have information to help them to identify disability and sources of support for victims. Such information must be made available so that the police can plan for management of the case, decide on how to best communicate with the victim and, if necessary, make sure that support is available. It is also important to help the police to comply with the Victims Code. As the following officer points out most officers are continually learning 'on the job' and learning how to deal with people with disabilities is part of this:

Police 023

For me personally I learn from doing the job role and being out there

Police 003

I think the training on Disability Hate Crime helps to a point…I genuinely don't know how you would train us to be ready for every circumstance. The main point is that

you use compassion, empathy, listening and you've got that anyway, I don't think you need anything further to deal with someone who is disabled. It's just from experience that I've learnt to pick up on things. I've not had lessons or training that's said 'This is what someone looks like with a learning disability, it's just you learn as you go…by meeting people and talking to people and dealing with people with learning disabilities and then the next time you meet someone like that you're able to recognise it a bit better because you've dealt with it two weeks ago

As the officer in the last quotation points out dealing with disabled people requires empathy, which is need for dealing with all victims, but developing empathy with disabled victims also requires learning about and being able to identify their needs and to offer support for these. Therefore, a number of officers stated that they did not feel that you needed to take a different approach in dealing with disabled victims but you did need to recognise what their needs were. For this reason they learnt by dealing with disabled people on the job and/or by meeting and talking with them in training. Whilst, as the aforementioned officer suggests, it is impossible for the force to train on every different disability, it is possible to provide more be-spoke training on broad types of disabilities and in doing so, help officers to locate possible sources of support for disabled victims. It is this awareness that can help police officers to become more empathic to disabled victims because they will have a deeper knowledge base about how to meet their needs.

These issues about identifying and supporting disabled victims are most important in terms of training of police officers especially because it was felt by a number of officers that much more could be done to help the police to identify people with disabilities in terms of providing more resources for officers:

Police 006

The training doesn't tell you where to go to find this stuff out or who you can get involved to actually help support the victim

Providing more resources here is even more important for response officers, who as we have seen, may lack the localised knowledge that might help members of a beat team to identify disability:

Police 019

When you are on response, it's very easy to get into a mind-set of dealing with things in a certain way, because to us…it's just a job and we go from job to job. And we deal with victims, not necessarily the same, but we deal with the jobs as a process. And I think it would probably be handy to have some kind of training on other support agencies that may be available to ethnic groups and other minority groups. We get a lot of training on groups that are available for domestic violence victims and how to deal with them but you don't necessarily get the support or the training for other crimes. Disability crimes, you would say, go to social services or your doctor, but who else is available for them?…luckily now we have got the triage car if someone has mental health issues. And you know what to do, you think, 'Oh yes, I can call the triage car and they can come out and help me with this person and tell me what to do'… Which is good, but if somebody has not got a mental illness but they might need help then its like, 'Where do you go?'

There was some praise for training in this area and suggestions were made about how to build on this training and make further improvements. Certainly the police found the use of outside agencies most helpful to them in the areas of disabilities, especially learning disabilities and also with mental health issues:

Police 001

The exposure training has been useful to make us aware...if you've lived in a small village with nobody who has disabilities, or have been to a school where it is not prevalent then you wouldn't be aware of such cases. There are going to be people out there and it's been helpful to know what to look for, what you can do for people, how you can help him or her

Exposure through either experience and/or training was therefore key to officers' confidence in dealing with disability hate crime by providing 'exposure' to such victims and helping them feel more comfortable about dealing with disabled people and through identifying best practice:

Police 026

The thing that sticks out is getting to talk to people, it just makes it that much more real. We went through what to do when hate crime comes up......it's just when those people came in and we could have a discussion with them and really get to know why they were associated with the characteristics. And they talked about incidents of hate crime that they have had to deal with, it's happened to them. Because it was just the most practical way for us to have hands on learning almost without having to a hate crime

Police 010

I've got no training for example on how to communicate with deaf people, we got offered the chance to volunteer to do it at training school, Makaton I think it was called, I really regret not doing it now, it would have given me a valuable experience through meeting deaf people and learning how to communicate with them

Therefore it was exposure training and actual resources that were identified as being useful to the police in identifying disability and possible support for victims. Therefore, training which gave them exposure to victims and helped them to recognise a disability, to understand issues around communication and which helped them to identify sources of support both for the victim and for the police received most praise. Although exposure training by outside agencies was particularly valued in the area of disability it was also considered important with people under the other hate crime characteristics and that was why some officers had found their Equality and Diversity training useful, particularly newer officers, as it had provided access to members of the protected groups:

Police 023

We did have Equality and Diversity at the beginning and went through the different characteristics. It was a presentation and a workshop and I think for the Equality and Diversity one they had different tasks that they would get you up and get you involved...and they did bring in people from the community and we had about three or four people in….they were from groups with the different characteristics. There was I think a person from the transgendered group...one was an Asian lady, so that was the

race side of things...and it gave use the chance to ask questions and it was giving them the opportunity to say how they wanted to be treated and from the transgendered group...just to explain things, so that was quite good and quite useful

Police 018

Yes, meeting victims is quite good. I remember when I was at training school on our Diversity week and we had a deaf lady come in and she was saying deaf people, if you handcuff them you take their mouth away, they can't speak to you, and that was food for thought actually, it stays in your head doesn't it?...the deaf lady coming in, and talking to you, I'm like 'I remember that'...and it's helped me in dealing with a deaf perpetrator who has learning difficulties and struggles to lip read...

Exposure type training therefore helped to provide the police with knowledge on some specific types of disability and encouraged officers by giving them 'signs' to look out for and tips on how best to communicate with victims. Whilst it is not possible to train the police on every type of disability there is certainly a demand for more of this type of 'bespoke' training based on different disabilities and mental health conditions as well as input from members of other victims under the protected strands.

This is important because the experience of many offices was that hate crime training and their Equality and Diversity training had simply not equipped them sufficiently for dealing with a range of disabilities nor did it help to signpost them to potential sources of support for victims:

Police 002

It wouldn't have helped me in terms of knowing where to go for advice

Indeed, the training on identifying disabilities and mental health issues in terms of who to turn to for support was considered weak and as a result officers tended to learn this by 'trial and error' and often had to spend considerable amounts of time chasing around other agencies to find this information.

Therefore a large number of police officers suggested that there was a need for them to be provided with more information in training on agencies that could help them when

identifying disabilities and dealing with victims, particularly disabled victims, in terms of communication issues, supporting and tackling safeguarding issues. Certainly there needs to be a greater range of resources for the police here and there would appear to be a need for an improved use of technology and the development of applications so that the police can have access to such information at the touch of a button. Currently officers have to spend far too much time on the phone to other organisations in an attempt to get such information:

Police 022

It's difficult because it's not something we would deal with a lot, or you don't have great training to prepare you for it…I wouldn't have a problem asking about disability but there could be a better way of identifying disabled people or providing support…if I'm dealing with someone who has possibly got mental health issues, then I can call adult social care, or QMC, so, yes, if you knew you had that support network for disability then officers would use it, but if I was dealing with a disabled victim, I wouldn't know who I could call, social services maybe, I wouldn't know

Certainly much more needs to be done to help officers in this area and training must include an emphasis on this:

Police 005

A lot of the training we get is generic, so it's not in Notts you need to do this or in City Division, you need to do this, you need to ring these people or that number, you need almost geared training, so that you can sort of say 'Well, OK, if you come across this you can ring this number to get support from social services…funnily enough, I dealt with a job yesterday…where the children's disability North Team made contact, it was about an offender actually, but I never even knew there was a disability team out there until they actually rang up and said 'Oh, we've been made aware of this' and asked if we could liaise with them. That sort of thing would be more useful

Police 013

It is helpful to know of other agencies, we had someone come in to talk to us about all the avenues they can cover if we forward an address to them, it was to do with elderly people, and that would be helpful as we have a lot of elderly people on our beat

There were some successes in terms of resources for officers which could be built on and developed in this regard. Two resources in relation to disability which were mentioned by a by a tiny minority of officers, were Pegasus and Pocket Comms; both of which could help them to both identify disability and communicate with disabled people and identify support needs. Pegasus and how to identify vulnerability are discussed in the following quotation by a PCSO:

Police 018

...recently I had a day's training for vulnerability and they said there's this new thing this Pegasus card which identifies, or it's a code on the card or something, But you can ring a number and it will tell you what their learning difficulties are or what their disability is ...they carry a card and they can show you this card, you can ask them for this card and they will give it you and you'll understand why they're behaving as they were a little bit more. I think the Pegasus is really helpful...and during that training it was talking about the vulnerability of victims. I think it is the C51 form and you can identify vulnerable victims that way...they mentioned interacting with vulnerable victims and this Pegasus quote just stands out in my head cos its quite a good idea...the chap at the training said you can ask people for that nowadays and there was the pyramid of vulnerability as well...I was like right, I'm going to take that to work and put it into my folder of important things

This same officer was the only one in the sample who mentioned Pocket Comms and the officer felt that out that this was really useful when trying to communicate with victims and members of the public. It might be helpful therefore if this resource could be more widely publicised, the officer in question suggested that whilst they found it helpful when dealing with people with disabilities, it could also be helpful when trying to communicate with people who spoke a different language and/or come from a different culture:

Police 018

I normally carry this thing on my kit, it's called Pocket Comms, which I've left at the station but I could have shown you that..... it's like pictures of things and you've got description for even simple things like food, like a prawn with an X through it. It's

quite good and you can point things out which is good for people that don't speak
English

Keeping this in mind, an external resource for dealing with people with mental health issues that was really valued by police officers was the triage car, particularly given that the police had a number of dealings with people with mental health issues, both as victims, but sometimes more frequently as offenders or ordinary members of the public:

Police 009

......a lot of the times when we get regular callers and things like that saying they're going to self-harm, the triage car does go with an officer and a nurse and I feel that helps a lot. Because obviously they've got more skills, they know if someone is more vulnerable than somebody else and they know when to signpost people. I think that works, definitely, yes that's a good idea

Whilst the 'Triage' car was valued by officers, due to demand, it was not always available to them when they needed it in busy periods. The current budgetary climate means that money for resources is more limited but it is certainly important to build on resources that police officers are already finding helpful.

In addition to resources for the police, it was felt that far more resources also needed to be made available to officers to give to victims. It would appear that the police used to have more leaflets for victims than they currently have:

Police 014

Yes we do have hate crime leaflets....they tell you what a hate crime is, how to report it, what Notts Police will do, which are quite good. It's something you can give to people but it seems that we are short of them...when I first came here, 5 years ago there was a massive box of them, but they've gone and we don't get anymore. And they are useful so we could do with more of those to help people with identifying sources of support

Such information on sources of support for victims also needs to be more successfully incorporated into training to help signpost officers to appropriate agencies with the necessary expertise that can help to support victims with specific needs. It must to be recognised that

hate crimes and incidents are not solely the responsibility of the police and better links to other agencies through a multi-agency approach would benefit them enormously.

Through identifying more sources of support for the police when investigating crimes and trying to support victims this will mean that the training is not simply focused on the legislation but that it also helps officers deal with the minutiae of different forms of hate crimes and incidents and associated victims. This point will be revisited in Section Two of the report which discusses multi-agency working.

Finally, some officers did suggest that they sometimes did their own research to help themselves with aspects of their job both in the area of hate crime and elsewhere, to look for solutions, particularly when they were exposed to something of which they had more limited experience. The following officer who was a beat manager went on to discuss how he went out to seek help with a particular case and through exposure to experts he found that help invaluable because it gave him information on the disability of the complainant and highlighted ways that he could help him:.

> Police 009
>
> *I had a chap who had quite severe Aspergers who was experiencing a lot of issues with neighbour disputes because of his Asperger's, because he was very reclusive and he didn't like noise and things like that. And it became an ongoing thing where he'd phone up frustrated because they're making noise next door. It wasn't excessive but it was still really frustrating him to the point where there was potentially going to be fighting and stuff like this. So I spoke to the Aspersers team at Highbury Hospital. I went down to speak to them, got some really good background about what it is and how you can help him and we worked it out in the end and we sorted it out. And I felt that was invaluable doing that. Obviously you can't do it for absolutely everything*

> Police 013
>
> *...I go onto the P & LD quite a lot...I seem to be getting a lot more jobs like harassment but it's quite different harassment to just the normal somebody stalking you sort of thing, so I've had to try and find that. And obviously P & LD was brilliant because although there are so many different harassment laws, I got there in the end.*

> *The trouble is, you don't always have time to sit at the computer looking for X, Y and Z.*

As the officers make clear here doing this sort of research is time consuming and they do not always have time to do it, which further indicates the need for more support for officers in this area. Having examined the range of negative and positive evaluations of training let us now turn to recommendations from officers about improving training on hate crime.

Recommendations from police officers on improving hate crime training

Overall, when asked to make suggestions as to how police training could be improved police officers stated that there needed to be a more human emphasis in terms of giving the training a more human touch:

>Police 010
>
>*I think that the training needs to go back to being more human again. Obviously, I'm mindful, that not just the police, but any large organisation is probably suffering dramatically because of the austerity measures and demands going up and resources are going down…but regardless of this, training does need to become more human again*

The most frequent suggestion on how imbue the training with a more human touch was that of providing officers with more exposure to victims and people with different backgrounds and different cultures/religions which would help officers to learn about crimes against such people, the particular impact of such crimes, barriers to why people might not report, and better means of identifying communication and safeguarding of those particular groups. Hearing back from victims about their experiences was also highlighted as valuable by some officers albeit this needed to include positive as well as simply negative examples as indicated by the aforementioned officer:

>*Police 010*
>
>*...personally...say for instance if we're talking about hate crime, the most effective training I think would probably be to get groups of us in a room but have people that have been victims coming in and actually giving kind of first-hand accounts... I reported something to you, generically, the police x months ago and this is the experience I've had, both positive and negative*

As stated earlier, exposure training and the use of experts was particularly valued by the police in the area of disability. Similarly Mental Health was also an extremely important area for the police and one in which they felt they needed better and more detailed training. Quite simply officers did not feel that the generic equality and diversity training, hate crime training and vulnerability training that they had experienced had equipped them for dealing with

disabilities, particularly learning disabilities nor for dealing with people with mental health issues and that hate crime training needed to be more bespoke and specific and, most importantly, signpost officers as to 'where to go':

Police 009

Sometimes on the training days. If there's input from outside agencies I feel that's better because they're experts. I'm not an expert, I just try and muddle through it the best I can. ...the diversity training was all more to do with the Equality Act and how it works with the police and how we need to treat everybody the same and stuff like this. It wouldn't have helped in a situation where somebody had mental health problems and it wouldn't tell me what to do or signpost me to where I need to go...we deal with a lot of people with mental health issues which are more and more prevalent with better diagnoses, like ADHD and those sorts of things, I think better training from external people would help

Similarly, it was suggested that exposure to other groups that might experience hate crime outside of disability would be valuable to officers when dealing with hate crimes and incidents. The following officer who was black but who grew up in a predominantly white area explains why some of his early police training was particularly important for him:

Police 022

I did an NVQ which was a few years ago, in a role where we were working in a lot of multicultural areas in Birmingham, Aston where the riots were, Lozells, places like that, so the job came up with the idea to give us an NVQ in Equality and Diversity, so I did a little extra there...and I think it was very in-depth and it focused on a lot of things that I wouldn't be aware of, like a lot of practices and religions for example, Asian culture and how some of their religions work and what they believe in and stuff. And it was interesting because that's not stuff I would necessarily know because I grew up in a majority white area...and I was partnered with an Asian guy, who is still a friend of mine...and just from speaking to him, you know, we used to sit down and talk about our cultures and we learnt a lot about that from each other. So having someone from that community deliver that training to you was really valuable

However, exposure training was much less frequently recalled than NCALT training and many officers felt that if the police were to improve training then this was a way to do it and that it could also be used to bring in members of particular and sometimes 'hard-to-reach' communities (see also Leicester Hate Crime project, 2014). Such training could include accounts from people that had been victimised such as people with physical or learning disabilities, mental health conditions, gay and transgendered victims and those from particular ethnic and religious backgrounds, with an emphasis on both positive and negative experiences. Such training might also help police officers to better understand the barriers to the reporting of hate crimes and incidents. It was felt that better use could be made of training days in this regard:

Police 019

To me, it's just like, we are given allocated training days, so why not use these training days to do better training like meeting members of the public, you could also use them to do the on-line training with other officers as well

We have just discussed the need to humanise training through meeting victims and/or members of the general public. Exposure to external agencies and victims was not the only suggestion as to how to 'humanise' training however. A further aspect was to increase police receptiveness by providing more opportunities to engage with it and benefit from it. As stated earlier, whilst the majority of officers discussed issues with NCLAT and difficulties with retention, it was particularly problematic for officers with a diagnosed medical conditions like dyslexia. As part of 'humanising' training it was also suggested that, where possible, there needed to be recognition of the different learning styles of officers:

.   Police 024

…there are three of us…that have been diagnosed quite a while ago and they've had bits and bobs put in, but obviously with dyslexia it's all different, how your brain works. So you have to do it on a one-to-one basis...my Inspector talks to me about it and stuff like that. My Sergeant is so switched on to the whole thing...he knows when I've hit the breaking point...or I'm ready to throw the computer out of the window...and he'll come up to me and say you need to take a break, if you say 'Yeah, but I've got to get this done' then he tells me I have to take a break

Due to the particular difficulties faced by this officer they also go on to point out that attempts to improve e-type training might not benefit some officers:

> *But the other thing they tend to do is put you all in a big room and try to do the e-learning on the big screen. Let's read all this and talk about it, pointless. You can ask me any questions you want in this room full of people you don't know with PSD listening all the time…Although it saves money and it kind of saves time, it doesn't really because no one goes out with any knowledge. If you're going to train people I think personally you need training stations. I know that's going to take a lot more effort and probably a lot longer time and it's costly and I get that. But for proper training you need to do smaller groups and you need to do it more personally in stations with people that you already work with, that you're comfy with.*

The officer suggests that a more personalised response to learning which involved the officers more but also worked with their strengths and weaknesses would aid retention. This was another recommendation for training with a more human touch but also training that truly involved officers and *worked with them*. The officer goes on to suggest that the use of training within particular locations where officers actually worked meant that training could be delivered more effectively with insight used from Sergeants about their officers:

> *When I've got five minutes after training, my Sergeant asks me to think about everything that I've got from it and then we'll sit down and he'll fill in the gaps...and my Sergeant knows that because he knows his team. The guy that stands in the middle of central and babbles on for two hours at exactly the same tone and then goes 'Do you want to break for a cup of tea or work straight through?' Work straight through because none of us are listening to you anyway mate. We've all lost the will to live and it's not at him personally. ..he knows nothing about us, he could stand there in a middle of a field and tell that training to a bunch of cows and they would come away with just as much as we did. Because he doesn't know us, doesn't know our learning styles, where we work, how we work. He thinks he's there to say exactly what's written on the sheet because that's what we should know*

The officer goes on to suggest therefore that for officers with particular learning issues the knowledge of their Sergeant is invaluable:

...instead you could email the sergeant with choices and go here are our three choices of training your staff, put your staff on one of them...your sergeant could ask you which one you would get most out of, he could come up to you and say 'I reckon you're probably going to be better at that one, have a look'... your Sergeant and your team know you and they know how you learn, the people that are sat in that room are the people that are going to get something from it. You're not just wasting your time talking to people who are not processing it at all.

Certainly more diversity in hate crime training is required in order to accommodate those officers with particular learning issues and, as we saw earlier, some variety in training on particular topics is desirable more generally. As the following officer suggests however whilst there is a need for variety, this comes at a cost in terms of time and money:

Police 025

I know it's very difficult for them in terms of obviously the budget costs, the time, the constraints of doing it, staffing issues, because you're abstracting cops and PCSOS...but it's difficult because hardly anyone is positive about NCALT. Some people enjoy it and can take it on that way. I'm not one of them, whereas for me, I think classroom based learning is better, where you can interact a bit, but there are people who hate that as well....so you can't really accommodate for everybody, I don't think without spending ridiculous amounts of money...if you are offering variety, then it's going to come at a cost, either in time, like abstraction or money

These issues are not helped therefore by differences between the roles of response officers, beat managers and PCSOs, shift working patterns and the constraints of budgetary costs. Yet despite this the aforementioned points must be considered in order to get the best benefits and therefore real value for money from the training offered by the police force.

Finally, as we saw earlier, two issues that came up as criticisms of training were that officers often felt that training was in response to criticism of the police and that police experiences were not valued or incorporated which meant that receptiveness to training can be reduced. Therefore, the aforementioned points about the need to 'humanise' training will also need to facilitate more opportunities for officers to become more involved in the training process and to have their experiences incorporated in order to build on working knowledge

with other officers. Whilst many officers went to their Sergeants to discuss hate crimes and many found this helpful, outside of this, opportunities for sharing information with other officers, was often limited. It is most important that positive stories are used in this inclusion of police practice in order to bolster police morale during training sessions.

Therefore there are several important points to take from this discussion of training in terms of increasing its value and effectiveness with officers. Firstly, the training needs to be more representative of the full range of crimes and incidents that officers are actually dealing with and in the next section; the author suggests that drawing on the work of Bowling (2003) and conceptualising hate crime as a process in training might be useful here (see also Hollomotz 2013).

The second and related issue is how to make best use of officer's own experiences in dealing with such incidents and enable them to become more involved in the training experience. This is likely to give them a better grasp of the nuances of the policing role and the more fluid examples of hate crimes and incidents that they may encounter whilst also placing a *value* on the work of officers that includes them within the training experience and which should help them to feel more *valued* with the training process.

The next section will argue that in order to achieve this a more holistic view of the role of police officers in dealing with hate crime is needed which puts an emphasis on prevention, community and maintaining order and dealing with hate crimes from beginning to end. These issues in training could be better addressed through an acknowledgement of the different roles and demands on officers whilst also highlighting the roles and responsibilities of other agencies. It will be suggested that the notion of 'process' might be helpful here, both to contextualise the actual *form* of hate crimes and incidents for some victims and also as a *metaphor for the investigative process* from beginning to end and the role of all police officers and other agencies within it.

Understanding motivation, establishing hostility and knowledge of the uplift tariff

As previously stated, the police are obliged to record hate crimes and hate incidents on the basis of perception: whether that of the victim, a witness or another third party. In contrast, to actually prosecute a crime as a hate crime requires the police to establish hostility on the part of the perpetrator based on one of the protected characteristics. This requirement means that the police have to try and establish hostility and gather evidence of probative value in this regard. Some of the problems for the police therefore lie in obtaining sufficient evidence to establish hostility, as although something might be recorded as a hate crime, unless clear evidence is available then the CPS will often not be able to prosecute as hate crime:

Police 034

People find it difficult to grasp evidence and you need evidence….just because you think someone's done something…doesn't mean you can prove it…'I know 100% that person has done it', 'He said he was going to do it', but 'Has anyone seen him do it?', Was there CCTV? Is there a witness? If there's none of that, they [victims] find that difficult

Police 001

That/s the important thing for us, we work on evidence and beyond reasonable doubt in the majority of criminal cases

As a precursor to asking officers about establishing hostility, officers were asked about why they thought that offenders committed hate crimes, based on their own knowledge and experiences. The main reason given for racial, religious, homophobic and transgendered hate crimes was ignorance. The majority of officers that cited ignorance felt that such offenders were often poorly educated or narrow minded and intolerant:

Police 034

The first thing I'd say is its complete ignorance…hatred I suppose…whether its alcohol fuelled or politically fuelled…Look at the EDL at the moment, I was up at the protest at Rotherham a few weeks ago, I don't know how many people protested…1,500?..How many of those people actually knew the facts? How many of

those people were just out there because it was Asians compared to any other paedophile?...It simply comes down to hatred and ignorance and an opportunity to shout and express what they're feeling

Police 009

Its ignorance I think when people are different and don't conform to their norm, whatever the norm is that they've decided. They choose to be homosexual, or they practice different religious beliefs and it's not what these people expect people should be like, and they're easy pickings for them, and it's not just the poorly educated, they just have a very limited world view on what the world is like and want to pick on people that are either different to them or vulnerable, with no real reason behind what they are doing

Some officers suggested that such forms of ignorance and intolerance were often passed on through families:

Police 004

Clearly there's some that are motivated from the very origin, some of that will be education, probably with their peer groups and elders. Like my step-father was really racist…but even at an early age I used it as an example of how not to be rather than follow that example…I think I was lucky that I had black friends….it made me realise probably what he was saying was 'That's not right, you're wrong there'. But clearly there will be a lot of people that don't do that from a young age and will follow, 'Oh yes, this is what my parents think, that must be right' and it starts from there and just gets worse.

Police 012

I think it is just a dislike of people, plain and simple, whether it's been born out of how my dad used to think…and it's almost just a mentality of 'I just do not like that person'...again, whether it's because of how they've been brought up or something to do with that…to give an example, my Nan isn't overly keen on Germans simply because she lived through the Second World War…it's just I've got that mind set and

> *I do not like that person because of their race. Or someone who's stood outside a gay club, I do not like that person because they are gay*

Other reasons that were given here involved fear and anger and looking for someone to blame:

> Police 001
>
> *Anger sometimes, most public order is anger…we are still bordering on that last era where people still know of these words…they have heard them as children…and then when they are so drunk, they are so angry at an individual...they use the most offensive word they can think of…they look at the person and say, you have got this colour of skin…I am so drunk I can't control myself and I know a word that will offend you, I have had people who I have interviewed who have said 'I don't normally use words like this. Why have you said it on this occasion? I was so drunk and so angry*

A further reason in racist and disability hate crimes was possible jealousy that 'someone else might be getting more benefits and/or 'ousting' them in another way:

> Police 007
>
> *It's the jealous sibling isn't it? …because our society, with the social housing estates, is a benefits society largely….it creates people looking at the table to see who is getting the bigger slice…*
>
> Police 016
>
> *Usually hate crime has stemmed from something else…and it's built up into this sense of injustice…and it comes back to the fact of social skills…And it's not taught in schools, the schools don't teach the kids how to live their lives or debate properly*
>
> Police 030
>
> *I think some of them it's either anger or fear of being displaced from where they live, be it in their community, in terms of race*

In general, police officers felt that the motivation for crimes against disabled people was somewhat different to other hate offences and that there was often more to disability hate crimes than might at first 'meet the eye':

Police 020

I'd say with disability, you've got to be very vindictive and nasty …very rarely have I met someone who's said 'I really hate disabled people' for no other reason than that they're disabled…whereas you do get 'Oh I hate all black people, I hate all Asian people' …I don't generally get people saying 'Oh, I can't stand disabled people, I'm going to shout some abuse at them. For me, it's pure ignorance when it comes to race or something to do with sexuality but with disability there's another factor to it

The most frequent reason given by officers for crimes against disabled people however was that they were viewed as an easy target by offenders, with no comeback for them from the victim and that they were more 'spiteful' offences than other categories and more akin to bullying which was even more unacceptable;

Police 016

… I don't think it's a common thing to hate somebody because they are disabled. When people tend to hate, it's from fear mostly and you don't fear a disabled person because you don't see them as a threat. It's a different kind of reaction because the person who is against a disabled person it's an easy score for that person because they know there is no comeback. So it's like I don't hate you but I am going to take the piss out of you or be bad to you because I know there is no come back on me.

Police 001

I would say committing a hate crime against someone with a disability. I believe it takes another level of motivation in the human psyche. Because let's be honest somebody with a disability is at a disadvantage and in some cases in the first instance, it feels like the school yard bully picking on the smaller kid just to make themselves feel better. That's the impression I have got from most of the cases that I have dealt with, it's just like a big bully picking on someone who was smaller and potentially weaker than them or who they perceived to be

Police 024

I think it's different because I think disabled hate crime…you are dealing with people that are more vulnerable and in certain aspects not able to understand it properly or hide their disability. Therefore, you're not having a go at John Blogs because you don't like everybody with one leg. You're having a go at John Blogs because he's the only person in front of you that you can find something different with. So it's just an easy target

Many of these features were considered to be prevalent in the bullying of disabled people by kids:

Police 004

…they probably perceive them, in the offender's mind 'Oh, you're less than me, you're lower than I am' and I've got someone I can exert some control on, to a certain extent. And someone I can easily vent my frustrations on and not have much in a way of response from you. You're not about to come and lay me out….and some of it clearly will be as part of a peer group, looking good to the peer group. I mean perhaps they might not harbour those thoughts but because of the peer group...

It was also suggested that many of the 'bullying' type examples behind hate crimes against disabled people gave some people the opportunity to improve their own self-esteem whilst masking their own 'vulnerabilities':

Police 016
People are bullies…it's something about them, about focusing on another individual, so they are making their weakness into a strength by picking on another person. They are putting a cloak on themselves by throwing that out to somebody else so distracting, like a magician would work but when he is hiding something. And that's what hate crimes can be about with young kids....and it's also a distraction from the fact that they want to be part of the group associates by doing this and that's what happens I think.

Police 003

...I think, it's very small minded people and...it sometimes makes them feel better about themselves to be insulting to someone else

It was stated by a number of officers that the targeting of a disabled person based on their perceived vulnerability and/or perceived inability to retaliate meant that the culpability of the offence was more serious:

Police 018

Disability is a hard one because they're targeting them generally, not in a malicious way because they are a racist, sort of their generic beliefs; it's more of targeting them because they are vulnerable and because they can be exploited. And to me that is awful, it's like targeting old people, you don't do it...being racist is wrong, but targeting someone because they are vulnerable or can't defend themselves...it goes against everything

Officers frequently stated that the impact for the victim was likely to be particularly damaging. This was considered to be the case for many disability crimes, particularly when disabled people were treated as being a 'lesser person' in relation to the perpetrator and/or there was a focus on their particular disability, as a result, these crimes were even more personal:

Police 024

I imagine disabled people that do understand it know that and that must have such an impact on them, that you're looking at me because you think I'm weaker than you. You think I'm less of a person than you are and again that must be really awful to deal with. You're directing it entirely at me, it's solely me, it's not my culture, it's not my religion, it's not my ethnicity, it's me.

Similarly to other hate offences, some officers cited ignorance as a possible reason behind offences against disabled people:

Police 010

I suppose disability hate crime is slightly different but it's still people having a bias or hatred or anger towards somebody and using whatever element to make it worse…so instead of just being nasty to someone you're also throwing in, I don't like you because you're black or you're disabled, it's still kind of ignorance and hatred directed towards somebody because they're different to the person that's dishing it out

Police 003

I think it's a lack of understanding and sometimes a bit of fear because they don't understand and they're different…a lot of people don't understand disabilities so instead of talking to somebody and finding out what your disability is, and how does it affect you and how does it make you feel, it's easier to put it in a box and block it off and be rude and dismissive rather than actively addressing it, some people I think are a bit afraid and would rather walk away and be rude than actually talk to them

There were two reasons given for this ignorance i) that many offenders had little exposure to and experience of mixing with disabled people and ii) that disabled people were considered by some members of the public as 'scroungers' who were falsely claiming disability benefits and cars and parking spaces. Some officers suggested that such ideas were not helped by stories in the media which disability charities have also suggested have contributed to crimes against the disabled (see Hamilton & Trickett, 2014):

Police 002

…the media don't help do they? Always on about benefit scams and suggesting that disabled people won't work

Selfishness and irritability were also cited by a couple of officers as a reason for incidents against disabled people in that some members of the public got frustrated with disabled people taking up more time to get on and off public transport and being perceived as getting preferential treatment such as taking up seats on buses and trains and parking spaces in car parks and on roads:

Police 014

…well disability places on a bus…I've heard people when I've been off duty complain about that…or disabled parking spaces. I went to a job a long time ago where a disabled person had tried to park in a parking space and it was being taken up by a fit and able bodied member of the public and he complained to him and he got abuse

Police 030

…and with disability, it can sometimes be intolerance and impatience with people, you are in my way, I am trying to get passed

These perceptions of police officers about the motivations of offenders bear similarities to the perceptions from victims on why they feel they were targeted (see EHRC 2011a; The Leicester Hate Crime Study 2014).

Keeping motivations in mind, officers were also questioned about the need to prove hostility in hate crime investigations and whether they thought it was useful.   The majority of officers here felt that there was a need to establish hostility in such cases:

Police 005

It's needed because just because of perception it doesn't mean it is a hate crime, just because one person is white and one black for example, and one of them perceives its hate crime, does not mean it is a hate crime without the hostility

Before moving onto this, it is important to note that some officers pointed out, in line with some of the examples of hate crimes and hate incidents that they had discussed, that it was important to differentiate between those cases where 'hostility' was the driving factor behind the crime and those where there was already an incident and a comment was made during it which made it 'racially aggravated', for example:

Police 005

…..let's say for arguments sake that someone was spray painting swastikas on the door of a Jewish family for example. So you would say that is clearly the reason they're doing it, because of the fact that they are Jewish. So that is racially motivated and targeted let's say. Whereas if someone just gets into an argument with a Jewish

guy in the pub and he makes some reference to the Nazi party or something along those lines….they're not been targeted because of that, but obviously it's an aggravating factor because they've said this, as opposed to the reasoning behind it

As we saw earlier, many hate crimes took the form of a one-off incident where the victim did not know the offender. In such cases, particularly where the offender had used some sort of verbal abuse such as racial, religious, homophobic or words that were related to a person's disability, there might be evidence used to establish hostility. Some cases also involved a disagreement between two parties where racial language was used and officers suggested that where racial abuse or language was used then the usual offence was public order, sometimes racially aggravated. We will return to this point when we consider officers' knowledge of the uplift tariff. However, in other cases it was suggested that evidence of hostility might be more difficult to obtain and this was particularly the case with disability hate crime:

Police 023

…if it was someone feeling hostility because they were in a wheelchair, it might be quite hard to prove that, unless there was a witness, or specific language used, again, if its someone with learning difficulties, abuse in the street, unless there's a witness, it's quite difficult to prove

Having said that a small minority of officers felt there were ways to establish hostility in disability cases where explicit reference to the disability was not used:

Police 030

I haven't had anyone that I have taken to court…but I think that if you can demonstrate that somebody is being picked on because of a physical or mental health issue, 'You are holding me up' 'You are in my way', 'Can you move?', people aren't taking into account somebody's disability, be it physical or mental. And sometimes aggressiveness, you will see with a racial attack sometimes that is evident as well with disability

However, most officers' knowledge on this was not strong and this is an important point because the CJJI (2013) has suggested that there is a range of ways to establish hostility in disability cases, including where there was evidence that the perpetrator has selected a

disabled victim for exploitation due to a perception of vulnerability. There can be no doubt that this issue needs to be better addressed in police training; confused understanding is apparent in the next quotations:

Police 023

There is another one, he is disabled but it is one that wouldn't automatically spring to mine because of his vulnerability...his bungalow was being used for drugs, people coming around, using and abusing him for that really. Like I say, because he was wheelchair bound, there was that level of vulnerability, but that wouldn't be one where you would automatically think there was a hate crime element to it, it was more that we thought he was being exploited

Police 001

It's not always about hostility though. You can be abusive to someone and not be hostile towards them - you can be calling them names on a day-to-day basis and just doing it because it makes you feel better. If you have a psychological problem or a worry that you don't want to deal with, the only way some people deal with it is by taking it out on others, they make themselves feel better by making someone else feel small

Indeed, it was stated by officers that 'mate crimes' which often involved disability or elderly people could be particularly problematic when trying to obtain evidence of hostility:

Police 011

Yes because the example I've given about taking control, about taking advantage of people. You might not be able to prove any hostility because that person is generally trying to, well giving an impression of caring and looking after for that disabled person and you wouldn't ever be able to prove that hostility there.

This was particularly the case when the victim could either not see a problem with the behaviour and/or did not wish the 'perpetrator' to be spoken to by the police, the following quotation from a beat manager provides an example:

Police 030

There is a lady....I have been to see her personally myself and the difficulty is she is obsessed with this person and gives them money...they have a social worker and there is a support mechanism in place....I read an incident today that had come in from her address...and it's a similar thing but she doesn't see any wrong in giving him money and she is 'But he is my boyfriend and I love him'. And sometimes it is plainly obvious to us what is happening. And we look at encouraging them to go into semi-independent living where we could put a few more control measure in place to stop this person coming and banging on the door asking for money which they don't see as a problem and that's the difficulty sometimes, where if we are trying to take something like that to court, we know what the person is doing, they are just fleecing them for their money. It's almost trying to give that person a warning, we know what you are doing, but the difficulty is sometimes with the person not being willing to make a complaint, it can be difficult

The following beat manager also suggests that such cases are difficult when the victim does not want the police to approach people and that this is often because they consider the people to be their friends and/or just want to be like other members of the public:

Police *010*

I got the feeling that certainly one particular chap…he had mild learning disabilities, he wanted to feel like he was part of the community and included and not different to everybody else and by us making a big thing of things, he was worried about what might happen to him when the other party found out, he didn't want to get them in trouble. I don't think he wanted to be treated any differently and when it came down to it, it was like 'I gave them the money myself and they will pay me back and they're my friends'… And I thought to myself well yes, Is it my place beyond a certain point? Obviously there's a point where it is definitely my place to do it but to a point I've got to give that person the choice. They're not actually coming to harm, they're just being exploited, and I've got to give them the choice do they want to make that official or not. And do everything you can to safeguard them but the choice is still in their

hands. We get other agencies involved but if they won't give evidence it can be hard to establish a hate crime or incident....

In such cases beat managers tended to get other agencies involved which could provide some sort of solution as the next quotation indicates:

Police 007

I had another one where it was a chap, he had learning disabilities and he'd been giving money to some people for a holiday, they were taking him on. Now it would appear that he's given quite a lot of money over quite a long period of time and it was just to go to Skegness....Social Services got involved, I went down to speak to them, we had a little meeting about him, and the difficulty was I said is because this chap didn't want the police to go and speak to these people. So I've never really been able to establish without speaking to them but I said at the moment 'You're telling me he's giving money to them each month, has he been forced to give them?' 'No'. Ok...but he's now said he doesn't want to go on holiday, that's the thing, he doesn't want to go on holiday with them so he wanted his money back. They were saying well we've all paid this deposit, you can't just suddenly say you don't want to go on holiday. I think it probably was a bit more sinister than that but they'd been keeping a log of how much money he'd been giving them so it was all kind of very hard to prove otherwise. But this chap didn't want to give his statement, and didn't want the police to pursue the matter, so the result was obviously Social Services were aware and we got Metropolitan Housing involved and he has now somebody goes in once a week to deal with his finances and helps him through. And safeguarding has been put in, he's not going to be a victim again and he's happy with that...

The availability of evidence including the perceived quality of witness statements was also problematic in some of these 'mate-crime' cases and this again meant that the police often drew on the support of other agencies to attempt to find solutions:

Police 014

I've been to two recently where two elderly people, it come in through a third party report on Crime stoppers, which said Mrs X lives at this address and her carer is in control of her money and she's spending her money. She's buying cheap food and pocketing the rest of the money...and the woman's got dementia. And it's quite hard to

investigate because if she's got dementia what is she going to know about her personal finances anyway, she's only got one sister, when I investigate that one, who's 76 herself so I don't know what help she's going to be. But I don't know if it's right but the way I deal with most hate crimes, and the one I'm dealing with at the moment, is there's other agencies, there's a multitude of agencies out there now that can help you and the police are not always the best people to deal with it.

Certainly establishing cases for prosecution is more complicated in these cases but this does not mean that they are not potentially hate crimes nor that evidence of exploitation does not amount to hostility; moreover, there are, as some beat managers identified other ways of safeguarding and trying to find solutions but does appears that this is an area that requires more emphasis in police training.

There were also further problems relating to hostility, outside of 'mate-crime' such as when sometimes there was evidence of hostility but nobody was willing to make a statement. This could be particularly difficult in cases where a third party had reported the crime or incident:

Police 014

An example of a couple of years ago now ....a member of the public called in a job that I had to do. It came in as a hate crime where I had to deal with it....the guy was living on a housing estate...and he called in to say that when he was looking out of his window, two white girls that lived next door and they were a bit troublesome, he said one night that an Asian male came to deliver a pizza and as he was delivering the pizza the girls were hanging out the window calling him a Paki, this type of thing, and he found that quite offensive. So he called the job in and I had to investigate it. I went through my inspectors and everything and I managed to trace the man [victim that had been abused] through the phone number on the side of the pizza car and spoke to his boss and him and they didn't want to report... The pizza delivery man said 'Yes, they're just a pair of idiots, I get it all the time, I don't want to take it any further'...We explained to him that it had still been reported as a crime. And although he was very nice about it.....he wouldn't report it. So that made the person who reported the crime as the victim. So when I tried to explain that he just couldn't understand that, he was going 'What do you mean I'm the victim? I'm not the victim, it's the person who was abused, I've only reported it because I felt sorry for him... I spoke to him on the phone and I asked him if

I could go round and see him, or he would come in and see me at the police station, because he'd perceived it to be a hate crime and the person who had been abused, they don't want to talk to us ...But he wouldn't

A further problem pointed out by this beat manager and others was in cases where cases there were conflicting accounts, in the next quotation he discusses what other measures he took in such cases, albeit the evidence was still not available at times:

Police 014

I think one of the problems you have when you go to some of these hate crimes is the neighbour will say he's called me a black this or a Paki this. And you go and speak to that person who is accused of doing that and they'll be as nice as pie to your face and they'll say I've been here 20 years, I've never had a problem with any of my neighbours. He's come in, he's noisy, he's done this, I haven't called him any of these names. And you think I'm a bit stuck here because I've got no evidence, one word against another... And that can make us look bad as well, you know, you go back to this person and say look, unfortunately there's no evidence. 'Well you should believe me, I'm telling you.' And you think well I'd like to believe you but...I need the evidence. So as well as that I will speak to neighbours as well and 'I'll say look, are you aware this is happening? Can you just keep an eye on things? If you do notice anything will you let us know?'... and they call it cocoon watch, you know, you put them in a bit of a cocoon and you speak to the neighbours as well. There's lots you can do. It's not always easy, it's whether you've got the time and evidence

These issues about understanding how to prove hostility and what evidence might be appropriate were not helped by the lack of information on the use of the uplift tariff and this will be examined shortly. After a consideration of what might amount to hostility, officers were also questioned about how they might establish hostility in cases where there was not clear evidence of it. Invariably, this firstly involved the questioning of the victim:

Police 012

I mean certainly the victim is the first port of call, and if there is someone else there with them...and one of the questions might be 'Do you think it's because you're in a

wheelchair that this has happened….Do you think this has happened because of your disability?'

However, as previously stated, whilst the victim's perception is paramount for recording purposes it is only a starting point for establishing hostility; the following quotation therefore highlights how once the victim had been questioned, officers would then move onto wider questioning including the offender themselves:

Police 034

You ask them [victims] directly, it's victim led, so if the victim says 'I believe that this is directed towards me because of a, b or c' then it becomes a hate crime….if the victim says 'It's because I am black or Asian, this is why this has happened' then you've got to take on what they are saying as to why they've been victimised, as with any investigation, you'd ask the offender directly if that was what it was and take it to the CPS. There's no rocket science behind it, if the victim says this is why, you'd do the investigation per normal, if it's at the victim's house then you'd ask the neighbours if they've got any issues, if they've seen anything and then, if not, when I come down to interviewing the actual offender, ask them directly at some point, if they've got an issue with someone's personal characteristics

The questioning of the offender therefore was a crucial component of establishing hostility:

Police 001

Get them placed at the scene in the first instance, get them to admit they were there, set the stage. So, 'Ok, you were there, what did you say?' More often than not they will say, 'I didn't say anything', but if you have got the statement of the injured party and any witnesses around, you say 'Well this person has said that you said this? Did you? Yes or No? Yes. Why did you say that? Why did you say that specific word? What do you perceive that word to mean? ...Why did you say 'black', why did you specifically put that word in there? Why couldn't you just say it without the 'black' word in there? Do you have some problem against black people?' And you go through your standard questions and try and dig into their psyche and see

However, as some officers pointed out without independent evidence it was often difficult questioning offenders about hostility as they were unlikely to admit to it in interviews:

Police 004

If you have got a report and you don't directly witness it...you have to play devil's advocate, sit in the middle and try to establish what's happened…OK. Well you're saying one thing; they're going to tell me something different. But if you go to see that person and there's clearly hostility, it makes our job a lot easier because you can document it. I went to speak to him, this is what I heard, this is what he said, this is what he did. While it may not always prove the case, it can lead you towards it, but you can go and see that person and they can be nice as pie. It is difficult…that's where the hostility can come in, if they're hostile, particularly when you first meet them in interview then you can throw a few questions in and see how they will respond to them. If you don't get that, it is difficult…it would probably be pointed out…what did you notice about the victim that might have been different?...Say in relation to my [disabled] friend, 'Did you notice anything about him? You know, physically. Did you see him walk? How was he walking? How did you feel about his walking?' Just try to identify if that's why he'd been a victim or if it was an aggravating factor. A lot of these though, you get 'No Comment' to, which is really difficult And then you'd just use evidence of hopefully independent sources you might have, 'Well, they said you said this'

A minority of officers suggested that because an offender was unlikely to admit to being racist, for example in an interview, that questioning the offender on these issues was not that important in these cases, particularly if you had other evidence:

Police 003

I don't think it is helpful...because... in the case of the chap in his front garden, I think the fact that he heard her say 'Some fucking Paki is talking to me' and I had a witness to that, that she said that, should have been all I needed. The fact that I had to go into interview with her and then start asking her if she was racist... Who is going to sit in interview and say yes officer I am racist...They're not and everyone comes out with 'I can't be racist, I know somebody who's black'... And it is just not even worth the tape

it's recorded on because who is going to sit there in interview and say 'Yes, I did punch him because he's in a wheelchair'.. They're not and they will never say to you, yes they do it in the heat of the moment, they do it for whatever reasons they've done it for but they will never sit down with me in an interview room in a police station and admit that that is the reason why they did it.

Moving on now to how hostility is treated under the law, whilst officers were aware of the need to establish hostility for hate crime prosecutions, they were often less sure of how this played out in practice. Many officers were aware that there were specific racially aggravated offences but on the other areas of hate crime, however, including homophobic and disability hate crime, they appeared less clear about how the crime was classified. As stated earlier, officers were aware that hate crimes usually involved an underlying offence and that what made it a hate crime was the specific targeting of the victim based on a protected characteristic. And yet, some officers remain unsure about how such offences would be presented and whether an increased sentence might be available.

This meant that although many officers had previously suggested that hate crimes were more serious than other types of offending as the offender had targeted the victim on the basis of a personal characteristic and so, the perpetrator was more culpable and as a result, the impact on the victim was likely be more personal and severe, they often remained unaware of how this would be indicated to the offender and the victim in terms of prosecution and sentencing and whether an increased sentence might be available. Indeed, many of the offences were prosecuted as public order, assaults or criminal damage despite being initially recorded as hate crimes due to perception based recording practices.

Therefore awareness and knowledge of the uplift tariff amongst all officers was weak but this was particularly the case with Response Officers and PCSOs who claimed to know little about the tariff and suggested that it was something that would usually be picked up by officers dealing with the case at a later stage:

Police 015

I don't know what S146 is to be honest

Police 020

I mean we've got, there's racially aggravated offences . . . I'm trying to think, there's one specific for racism...For example, it's a public order offence, if there's a race element to it, it's then a racially aggravated public order offence which obviously increases and makes it that bit more severe. I'm not sure that's the case with, whether it's homophobic or disability... I don't think we've got like a homophobic aggravated public order offence if you know what I mean; it would just be a Section 5 wouldn't it?

Police 009

I'm sure it is useful to somebody but it's never been fully explained to me what goes on from there. Normally if we have a hate incident that we'll attend it gets passed onto the beat team...But I've never had someone come back and say this is what we've done and this is the sentence

It was interesting to observe that even where officers had pursued cases where the uplift tariff was used which was rare they still appeared unsure about how the sentence worked under the hate crime legislation:

Police 005

I don't know much about it, 'Is that when you make it aggravated so you raise the aggravation?...Well yes, I do think that is helpful, because when I charged that lady with racially aggravated S5, the CPS took it very seriously which I think is right

Perhaps these findings, in part, are not surprising given that it is the CPS on review of the evidence, who decide whether to apply for the higher tariff and they are working to the 'realistic prospect of conviction' test as the following interview extract from an officer indicates:

Police 001

I can't say I have used it personally, though there is a chance I may have done and just don't remember. If the crime is racially motivated, homophobic or disability, then we will bring that to the attention of the CPS. They review the evidence and they

make the decision to charge the more serious offence. And then it's for the magistrates and the judges to review and make a decision. It will be brought to their attention by the prosecutor or court clerk, who will say this is a racially or otherwise motivated offence, you can apply for the more serious punishment, outside of that, I can't say I've had any dealings with it

Notwithstanding these findings it would surely be useful for officers to have more awareness of the sentencing options when they are investigating as it may help them when building cases by indicating what evidence has previously been successful in demonstrating hostility and/or when considering other more suitable courses of action where such evidence is not forthcoming. As was indicated earlier, what may amount to evidence of hostility was not always clear in some areas, particularly with disability hate crime and this information would be therefore be valuable to officers.

Despite sometimes lacking specific knowledge about the uplift tariff and its use when officers were asked about whether an increase in sentencing would be useful in hate crime cases, the majority of officers felt that it would and their answers on this largely mirrored their earlier discussions on the more serious nature of hate offences. Many officers suggested that it would be of benefit to victims as it would reflect the greater harm done to them:

> *Police 023*
>
> *I guess it might be helpful, more for the victim, because then they can see that if they've been targeted for a hate crime then it's seen in the sentence, so yes, I guess that's good...so it would be good to show that, for the hate crime element, that they are getting the longer sentence for it. And I'm assuming the victim would be happy with that as well, so that's more for their benefit*
>
> *Police 034*
>
> *In terms of hate crime, it makes it that bit more painful for the victim, so if there is more sentence, more justice, then Yes, I suppose it is helpful...if they got more that would be great but I know that sentencing isn't great at the moment, certainly the severity of what people get isn't great...I've never heard about it being used, when it goes to court generally we don't get that much back*

Moreover, some officers also suggested that an increased tariff would be useful to indicate to the offender that their behaviour was more unacceptable and that they were considered to be more culpable than non-hate offenders and/or to possibly deter or rehabilitate them:

Police 026

I think yes, because, if you have committed a crime, in punishment, there is a judgement and it's like there to rehabilitate them as well...if they have stolen something from someone, they might get community service, but if they targeted them because of a characteristic, then they should get something extra because they need more re-education I suppose

Police 030

I think people sometimes look at sentencing and feel it is a slap on the wrist or that they are going to commit the crime again, so sometimes because of the nature and seriousness of the offence, be it racially aggravated, homophobic ally aggravated or whatever, I feel it does need to carry a higher tariff to make people realise what is going to happen

A minority of officers did feel however that it should be reserved for situations where a victim had been actively targeted rather than when abuse had been part of another incident:

Police 006

It would be useful if an offence had been deliberately targeted, but not if you can't prove that

Officers did suggest however that this information would be useful to them in understanding when the tariff had been successfully applied and in terms of helping them explain outcomes to victims provided that the information was detailed:

Police 005

I think it is useful but I'm not aware of it ever being used. But then we have very little to do with them once it gets to court. We'll give our evidence, if we have any, but generally hate crimes tend to happen when cops aren't there, so if you don't witness anything, as a general rule, you don't give evidence in these cases…we tend to get an

email to say, 'Guilty, sentenced to this and that'…but I think what we would probably need for it to be useful, is to be literally told 'Right, had this person just broken your window, they would have been sentenced to this, however, because they broke the window and shouted racial abuse, they've now been sentenced to this' - So, they [the victims] and we can see what the difference is, otherwise they'd probably look at them and think 'Is that all they got?' which is what I do every time I get an email for a job whether it is a hate crime or anything

It appeared that this failure to receive information back on the use of the uplift tariff (which would have been most evident in racially aggravated public order cases in terms of the cases that officers had discussed) was not limited to hate crime cases. There did appear to be some confusion about who was supposed to report back to officers, whether this was the CPS or witness care. Whilst the majority of officers seemed to think this was witness care it is suggested here that feedback on the use of the uplift tariff needs to come from the CPS as they are likely to be much more knowledgeable about this. Whilst a small minority of officers claimed to get some information back on the outcome of cases that they had been involved with, the majority of officers stated that they rarely heard anything about the outcome of cases and when they did receive information it tended to be from the Witness Support Programme, was often very general and rarely indicated sentence increases based on aggravating factors:

Police 018

All we get is an email from witness care to say they were charged with racially aggravated section 5 and they were sentenced to X, Y and Z. And that's all you get. You don't get anything specifically to say because it was racially aggravated they're going to get charged with, or they got more.

The following officer goes on to say that whilst the police are supposed to get feedback on every case from witness care this is not his experience:

Police 014

No because we don't get that much feedback from the CPS. I'm not saying that's a CPS fault because our feedback should come from witness care. I got some feedback

the other day, or the other month actually, I had an update from an incident where somebody had been sentenced to something for drug crimes. And I emailed them and said oh thanks for the update, we don't get them very often, it's nice to know what's actually happened. Because once we prosecute somebody we don't hear anymore as police officers. And she says 'Oh that's a bit strange because we're supposed to update you on every single job'... And I just emailed back and said unfortunately you don't, we don't get that. I didn't hear anymore about it. So there's somebody in witness care thinking yes every officer gets updated every court case but it just doesn't happen.

A number of police officers pointed out that it would be useful to get this information to help them with seeing which sorts of cases got the higher tariff and also to keep on their intelligence systems for future reference:

Police 011

When dealing with specifically hate crime then, yes, I think it would be useful but not just to be fed back to the investigating officer but to be fed back into the police so it can go on our intelligence systems that that person has received this punishment.

There are two recommendations here i) a greater emphasis on the increased tariff in training so that all police officers are aware of its existence and when it will be applicable and ii) better feedback to officers on the outcome of all hate related cases as this will not only be valuable for individual officers as feedback to them about how cases that they have been involved in have fared, (which may be good for morale particularly when positive) and, if the tariff was applied for and not successful, reasons as to why it was not successful. This information would be helpful to the police not only for their own learning on hate crime investigations in terms of what evidence is needed to establish hostility, but also when they are reporting information back to victims as they can better explain why the result occurred. This point about limited use of the uplift tariff by the CPS and the need for further elaboration about when the tariff has been applied successfully has been discussed in a previous article by the current author and Paul Hamilton (see Hamilton and Trickett, 2014)

This is especially important given that many police officers stated that victims were often disappointed with case outcomes where the outcome was not what the victim had wanted and that not only did officers sometimes have difficulty in explaining the outcome due to lack of

knowledge about it and/or extenuating circumstances which were sometimes outside of their control, but also that they were sometimes blamed for such outcomes:

> Police 027
>
> *..victims do tend to think it's our fault when it hasn't gone the way they were hoping it would, even when often it is to do with something that has happened at the CPS or at court*

Officers suggested that this was especially difficult because managing the expectations of victims in hate related cases based on perception recording practices was potentially problematic from the outset:

> Police 003
>
> *I think the challenges sometimes are finding out exactly what's happened because that can be very difficult, understanding what the victim wants, and sometimes being able to manage their expectations as well. I think that can also be very difficult. And I think that is across the board for all hate crime because you've got the people who don't want to report it because, you know, for whatever reason, but then you've got the people who do want to report it and expect that they're going to go away to prison for 20 years. And it's managing that to say, you know, they may get a caution. And it is difficult. It's a real balancing act and you don't want to put them off then from reporting it in the future, and you don't want them to think that we've done nothing and we haven't taken it seriously, but then our hands are tied with the legislation and what CPS will and won't run. So I think it is very hard. And also we have such tight guidelines so if something is classed as a non-crime, although that person is really upset about it, if it is a non-crime then nobody's going to be arrested.*

The lack of feedback on the outcome of cases and reasons for them are therefore particularly unhelpful when we are trying to increasing confidence in the police and raising reporting rates for hate crime. Moreover, it is also problematic for police morale and officers were often extremely disappointed with the outcome of cases where they had worked really hard for victims:

Police 033

It is really disheartening at times if you have worked really hard for a victim but we don't get the result we were after

Police 010

I won't be the only officer that's frustrated ...sometimes as an officer you do want your victim to have that day in court. It's almost like you feel, you know, this has really caused them a lot of stress and strife, and me and whoever else has worked hard to gain their trust, put all this work in to getting this offender or offenders, putting the prosecution file together and then, you know.... to just lose it at that last hurdle is very frustrating. No, we'll only charge him with this, or even refuse charge, no, no, no, no.

These points are extremely important as the CPS is the penultimate agency that the police must deal with in the event of prosecution and this relationship is particularly important within the hate crime context. However, feedback from police officers on their dealing with the CPS generally was somewhat mixed, outside of feedback on outcomes. A common criticism which is related to police feedback to victims is that other factors are implicated in the outcome of cases that are often extraneous to the strength of the evidence available. Such factors are sometimes to do with the changing of charges or deals being done with the offender for example – a flavour of these different factors is given below:

Police 003

Well they always go under whatever we arrest for.... Say we arrest for ABH and they're charged for battery that is standard, they will always come one underneath whatever you arrest for. And I think that's to do with what court they go to, they can go to magistrates then rather than clogging up Crown

Police 004

There's no consistency at all....and it does worry me that sometimes the prosecutor in court has only seen the file that morning and I didn't know that until I was a victim of a crime by my neighbour and it wasn't until I spoke to the prosecutor that morning in court that I realised she'd only just, she'd had the file maybe an hour.

Some police officers complained about deals done in court which often left victims and police officers frustrated:

Police 008

Yes they plea bargain at court. If you've got a multitude of offences, they'll say oh if you plead guilty to one we'll drop the rest. If that happened to me, and I was the victim, I would be really annoyed.

Police 007

…..*what really frustrates me though is if you go to court and they'll do a deal or try and do a deal beforehand. The offender will say I'll admit to common assault but not an ABH, ok, and then if CPS sometimes come and ask you and the victim and you say, no, no, no, it was an ABH, more of a GBH really, and then they go not guilty and go for trial. But the fact that they've coughed already is then not, why is that not admissible and given to court…..they want a lower sentence but they're admitting to doing the assault and we have evidence of the injuries and it's just not fair on victims*

This is not to say of course that police officers never found the CPS helpful or failed to realise that the CPS were also under pressure and experiencing budgetary cuts. Rather that the majority of officers felt that there was a divide between the police and the CPS and that they were often working to different criteria and goals. Certainly, few if any officers felt that they could or would ring the CPS for advice on a case during investigation i.e. on whether or not the case was truly a hate crime or not and what information might be needed to prosecute as such:

Police 031

I wouldn't feel I could go to them for advice, no

Police 005

There's no real way of asking for advice. You can't just ring up and say, 'I've got this, I was looking at doing this with it, what do you think?' There's not really a facility for

that…. and sometimes you want to know, before I put in all this effort to try and find somebody and do all this work, what I want to know is in these circumstances, in theory, is there anything we could do? And in the end I once got the answer no, there's nothing we can do with that. But that was through the backdoor almost, you can't just ring up and say 'I've got this, what do you think'

Police 007

So again with CPS direct, because it's on the phone you have to perhaps whack a full file together... but there's no-one to go to for, unless you go to a sergeant Sometimes you want informal advice if that makes sense before you put the file together, to see if it's worth running a particular charge, but you can't do that…it would be great if you could but you don't have that facility with them.

Many officers stated that you only went to the CPS when you were ready to charge, not for advice on charge, and some officers claimed that getting hold of the CPS was often difficult and that they had to wait considerable lengths of time on the phone. Most officers sought advice from their own Sergeant rather than go to the CPS and their dealings with the latter were mostly through being asked to revisit files and provide information or to get answers to questions put forward by the CPS. Some officers recalled when the CPS were in police stations and suggested that this made them more accessible.

Certainly it would appear that a better relationship between the police and the CPS would be desirable in outlining the importance of the uplift tariff and in helping the police to identify whether a prosecution for hate crime was possible or desirable and what evidence of hostility might be required. Better information sharing on case outcomes between the CPS, Witness Support Teams and the police should also lead to greater transparency about when the uplift tariff is used and reasons why it is successful or unsuccessful – this should also increase the understanding of the general public about some of the difficulties in prosecuting this form of offending.

It would also appear from the interviews that whilst police officers valued the input of their Sergeant; a dedicated Hate Crime Manager within the police, such as that in Nottinghamshire Police, would be welcomed by officers and this could help them in several respects, particularly in the early stages of investigation when deciding which lines of enquiry to

pursue and whether the prosecution for hate crime is either desirable or possible and the work of the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel will also be important here.

Let us now turn our attention to the use of risk assessment forms, repeat victimisation and safeguarding issues.

Hate Crime Procedures and Risk Assessment Forms

In contrast to clear-cut cases of hate crimes, officers suggested that many hate related incidents involved a 'greyer area' which often over-lapped with anti-social behaviour. The procedures and risk assessment for hate crimes and hate incidents are largely the same and the perceived overlap with anti-social behaviour is evidenced by the use of a combined form. For pragmatic reasons feedback on the forms and procedure are dealt with in this section of the report, which also includes a focus on the 'grey' area of hate crime. The case of Fiona Pilkington was examined here, which also helps to provide some context for the discussion.

Officers were asked whether they would deal with a hate related investigation differently to a non-hate one. There were mixed responses to this question with some officers suggesting that they approached hate crimes like any other crimes but that they made sure that they complied with the procedures and paperwork such as the filling out of the risk assessment forms to identify safeguarding needs, whereas, other officers stated that the procedure and use of the forms actually dictated how the offence was investigated. What officers were clear about however was that there was a particular need to deal with safeguarding in a hate crime situation:

> Police 005
>
> *I wouldn't say we approach the investigation differently because it's a hate crime but they may get different treatment because we've deemed it's been more vulnerable. So you could have a domestic violence victim who's equally vulnerable and will probably get equal assistance but it's because of the vulnerability as opposed to the hate incident, it being a hate crime itself. It's more the impact of how vulnerable that makes this person and how it affects them.*

Officers were also familiar with the use of the risk assessment form and the standardised procedure involved in hate crime investigations which are outlined in the following quote from an officer:

> *Police 001*
>
> *The standard process we follow is the anti-social behaviour hate crime form,...it's pretty standard it covers 15-20 questions that you would ask an individual and then they get graded at the end of...and that then goes through to the inspectors to check*

over it. And later on once the report is submitted the beat teams can get involved and it gets forwarded on to other organisations who then update you later on…

The officer goes on to state that the form is helpful in order to identify risk:

Yes it is helpful, to know how badly this person is suffering or how much at risk they are. Because there is a wide variety between a shopkeeper for example, who was abused by a customer but the customer was quite clearly angry because they wouldn't give a refund. And had it not been for that situation the person would probably never have abused him. Whereas on the other side of the spectrum you have got somebody who is on the street having the windows broken every day as a result of their disability or the colour of their skin. So it's good to be able to grade the people as to who needs the most immediate response.

Indeed the majority of officers felt that some form of risk assessment was needed and that the forms were useful for intelligence purposes:

Police 004

They're good because you take a risk assessment form to find out, ok what's your issues and is there anything that we need to know about that makes you more vulnerable and then we can put better safeguarding in place... organisationally it's a benefit because, like I said, it's the safeguarding and we can make sure the level of response we give that individual is probably proportionate to their needs really

Police 019

. *......it's like domestic forms they give us a good indication of how the person has been affected and what kind of intervention they might want. And we give those forms to the beat managers and it puts a certain risk level like the domestic form would do. So it does give you a picture of how at risk that person is.*

Police 020

...the risk factor is usually obvious, but I'm sure when I've filled it out and scanned it on, someone will have a look and then someone else can grasp what that situation

was and see what I've done maybe or whatever might need to be looked at in that situation

However, although most officers understood why the police were using the forms they often felt that the generic nature of the form meant that it was something of a 'blunt instrument' in establishing risk. Some officers felt that there was a problem in combining the Risk Assessment forms for anti-social behaviour and hate crime as many of the questions were not interchangeable:

Police *006*

Yes I don't see really from a hate crime to an antisocial behaviour crime that you can have the same questions. You could be suffering from antisocial behaviour say if your neighbour is playing loud music every night and banging on the walls and running up and down the stairs with the kids....that's not the same as hate crime

Indeed, some officers felt awkward in going through some of the questions when they felt that they were not relevant to the particular situation at hand and that this sometimes served to alienate the victim from the police at a time when they were attempting to establish some sort of rapport:

Police 008

It's one form and that's it….there's a massive range of hate crime. You can't get questions suited for all of that onto two bits of paper and so you ask them questions and you just think this is stupid, I shouldn't be asking this… but you've got to ask it for them to sign it. And then you've got to explain the form to them and say look, some of these questions won't mean anything but I've got to ask the questions. Some obviously fits the criteria perfectly but others really don't

Police 029

It can be a bit awkward, some of the questions aren't that relevant and you can see that they [the victim] is sometimes wondering why we are asking them that

Police 017

I think because some of the questions aren't always relevant that can hinder you when you are trying to build rapport with a person

Moreover, a large number of officers were not fully convinced of the usefulness of the Risk Assessment forms in identifying those most at risk and thereby effectively safeguarding those that needed it. This was often to do with the closed nature of the questions, which also limited the police officer somewhat in asking the questions in terms of what they contained and how they were put. A very common criticism was that the questions tended to over-estimate risk for those people who were not at particularly high risk, simply because of the way in which they answered the questions:

Police 007

...they are very narrow and you can get someone who can almost come back as higher risk because they've ticked the boxes and they're not higher risk...and a lot of it, again it's their perception, you know, Has this affected you a lot? 'Oh yes, it's terrible de, de, de'...when in reality they might have had a bit of litter thrown in their garden' - And because they've said yes, they end up being higher risk...where it's not really a higher risk at that moment in time

The following officer goes through these problems in a little more detail suggesting that the questions are somewhat leading:

Police 014

...I think sometimes the questions are a bit leading,. There's things like 'Do you think you were deliberately targeted? And a lot of people will just turn round and say 'Yes' to that, whether they are or not.... a lot of the questions I think are leading...It's almost as though you are spoon feeding them to answer yes to that question. And a lot of the questions are Yes and No answers, so there's nothing in between...another question, 'Has this happened before?' and they'll say well 'Yes, about 10 years ago'...but that goes as a yes which can go to raising them from a standard risk to a higher risk and it

might be a completely separate incident. So the questions aren't particularly good and I'm not sure who the risk assessments are for to be honest. As a police officer. I don't think they help me dealing with this, you know, you fill that form in, you give it to your Sergeant, he looks at it and signs it and agrees standard, raised or whatever it is. And I think Well how does he know because he wasn't there speaking to the person? He's only going off this and who knows if these questions are correct?- So I don't honestly know. My answer to that is who are they supposed to help to be honest?

Because of this it was felt that the risk assessment forms meant that almost everyone came out as a high risk which undermined the purpose of doing the risk assessment:

Police 012

We have a hate incident checklist form ....this one it's all condensed and onto one or maybe two sides of A4 and if you need to put any comments down you are having to write in the most minute writing. And the questions I just find are quite poorly asked in the sense of 'Is this incident related to a problem that's affecting you, your community or your family? But I think the problem is so many of them, I mean I think I've only ever done one which was only a standard risk. So many of them all get put into pile of a raised risk and then it *dilutes the importance of the raised risk. It's almost like you've got ones that are raised risks but there almost just lumped in with the ones where you are there thinking 'hmm it's not'...it could just be that's a one off incident where someone who they don't know has just made a comment to them in the street type thing, never seen them before, probably never going to see them again, first time its ever happened to them. And then all of a sudden it's a raised risk and you are there thinking That's not something like where it's a neighbour, or something which has actually led to say an actual assault.... that's a bit more raised because the potential of that person coming back and causing them more harm is quite high. Compared to the one where it's just a comment that's been made by a passer-by as it were.*

An additional issue raised by some officers is that some victims were familiar with the hate crime classification and wanted more attention from the police and/or an enhanced service, and so answered the questions in such a way that they came out as a high risk, even though in reality, they were not, whilst at the same time, they might serve to miss those that were really at high risk. These points are apparent in the next quotation:

> *... they try to cover everything they're just ridiculously extreme. With questionnaires like that the people that need to score the highest won't, because they will play it down... they will play it down because it's a big enough deal that they've had to ask you for help in the first place.....if you are afraid that's your first instinct as a human to do is cover up your vulnerabilities. But the ones that come out high risk...'How scared were you?''Oh, it was really bad ...and my whole life flashed before my eyes'.. You're not scared, you're not vulnerable, you're playing the system and you know how to play it...some people want to score higher on the form to starting to play the system because they think if I score really high I'll be able to write a letter to somebody, a strongly worded letter if I don't get somewhere...So they are not a true representation, the scores don't represent who's done them….....the people that are screaming and shouting from the rooftops aren't going to be the ones that go into a car park with their kid and kill them. It will be the quiet ones that don't have anybody to talk to, the people that are genuinely worried, genuinely vulnerable and genuinely affected by it are not going to shout from the rooftops that they are feeling shit, that they are feeling targeted, that they are beaten down, that they're depressed and they're feeling worthless. They slip through the net.*

Many officers felt therefore that the forms should be done by the beat team and the aforementioned officer goes on to suggest this:

> *I don't think it should fall to the response officers....I'm just going to do this quick thing with you, we'll tick them all right brilliant, ticked them I'll send it to the beat team. ...they should be reviewed. by the beat team you should be able to say 'You know what Serge she scored like three yet I think she's absolutely terrified, she needs to be much higher'*

Moreover, because of the nature of the questions, some police officers also felt that the use of the standardised form and the compulsory questions hindered their own investigative ability to be able to gauge more personalised and possibly more accurate assessments of risk. Having said that, some officers stated that if their 'gut feeling' was that the victim was possibly a higher risk than how they were verbally presenting to the officer, they would flag this up or adjust the risk rating to accommodate this, 'just in case'.

For these reasons it was suggested that the risk assessment forms needed a re-think:

> Police 019
>
> *Yes, they are useful but I think sometimes they try and emphasise that there is an issue. It's all questions towards is there a problem? Is this happening? Is it happening more often? which you need to establish but I think maybe if we had more scope to be more descriptive about the problems rather than just scoring something. So if someone comes in at 30 they are raised risk but if they come in at 21 it's a lower risk but it's not certain that one is less likely to kick off than the other one sort of thing, which is why we have to be a bit more careful in not jumping to conclusions and things like that and doing the right thing at the right time, and establishing exactly what's is happening, if it is motivated by hate and things like that.*
>
> Police 005
>
> *They're very closed questions where you can almost give yes or no answers. Whereas if you asked a more general question and it was just said, you know, for us you need to try and cover this, this and this in that question as sort of prompts, I think you might get a truer answer.*

Whilst the risk assessment forms are important therefore, the forms that we are currently using are seen as something of a blunt instrument by officers as this discussion has suggested. Moreover, it would appear that officers would also benefit from a more detailed training on risk assessment so that it is seen as something more than just a procedure that needs to be complied with. Some officers suggested that the risk assessment form was something that you had to be seen to do which again can lead to the forms being seen as something of a 'tick-box' exercise:

> *Police 008*
>
> *There are the risk assessments...I think it's more of a paper exercise and obviously once you've filled it in, you can look at how many more ticks there are and then obviously its standard, medium or high risk.....it's not helpful, but it's not a hindrance if that makes sense. It is just literally to say 'Well, I've done the risk assessment and its standard or medium'*

Therefore whilst all officers recognised the need to do a risk assessment for safeguarding purposes, they still largely gave more emphasis to this as a procedure that needed to be followed rather than focusing on the purposes behind the procedure. Indeed, it was suggested by a minority of officers that you had to follow the form as a means of 'safeguarding' yourself as an officer:

> *Police 007*
>
> *I think when you go and deal with a hate crime, as you do with a domestic, because they're high profile as it were and looked at by the gaffers, there's kind of a tick list to it and to be honest you tend to go right tick, tick, tick, tick, job done, because you know if you don't cover those ticks and something goes wrong you're in trouble so you tend to just concentrate on covering the ticks.*

Whilst these issues may be largely to do with the use of the standardised forms themselves and their perceived shortcomings, it would surely be useful here to give officers a more rounded training on risk assessment. This could be informed by the work of vulnerable person's panels and/or case conferencing using anonymous cases of raised risk to provide context as to *why* officers are actually doing the risk assessment and *how* it might help with the different types of situation that they may encounter.

This is particularly important given that a significant problem with hate crimes and incidents such as disability mate crime and/or those involving neighbourhood disputes is that they are often repetitive and incidents are connected. Indeed, the 'greyer' are of hate crime may serve to deflect from the seriousness of what is happening as is often the case with 'mate crime'. Therefore, in the conclusion, the author argues for a more holistic view of hate crimes and incidents and suggests that the notion of a 'continuum' (see Goodey 1994) may be particularly helpful when training police officers (and multi-agency partners) to better grasp the connections between incidents and the potentially escalating impact of repetitive incidents which may initially appear minor. Keeping this in mind, let us now turn our attention to the 'greyer' area of hate incidents and anti-social behaviour.

The 'grey' area of hate crime

Of course, the need to measure risk accurately and to ensure adequate safeguarding measures was tragically demonstrated in the Pilkington case and indeed, many of the measures taken since then, have been in an attempt to avert a similar tragedy. Before questioning officers about the Pilkington case, the researcher asked officers some general questions about the 'greyer' area that some hate related incidents fell into. Officers stated that many of the examples that fell into this area were not easily resolved. For example, a substantial amount of hate crimes and incidents involved defendants known to the victim in some way either in the form of neighbourhood disputes where there were often no witnesses, and/or 'mate crime' which was particularly prevalent for those with disabilities, including learning disabilities and/or mental health issues and some examples were also characteristic of anti-social behaviour.

The difficulties with such incidents often involved issues about the quality of the evidence including the availability of witnesses and a possible reluctance of victims and witnesses to take things forward, competing and often contradictory accounts between the victim and alleged perpetrator (which sometimes alleged victimisation on both sides), limitations in terms of how to deal with such situations and misconceptions on the part of the public about what could be done in the circumstances.

There are three points to make here in relation to police training which are i) working out what can and should be done in the particular circumstances, ii) the safeguarding of victims and iii) working with other agencies. Given that both hate incidents and anti-social behaviour are often repetitive, the relationship with other agencies is discussed at this point in the report, albeit, it will of course, be important in more clear-cut examples of hate crimes as well.

In terms of working out what could be done in particular circumstances, there was a difference in the greyer area of hate crime, in terms of how officers saw their roles. Perhaps unsurprisingly, both beat managers and PCSOs identified community work and relations as being part of their policing roles. In contrast, response work tended to be seen by both response offices themselves and beat managers and PCSOs as 'fire-brigade' policing which was reactive rather than proactive:

Police 013

...I see police work as being about prevention, community work, that's what I joined the police for to be honest and I've done a couple or three years on response and it was fine, but it was just too busy. You don't sort a job out, you start a job and then you pass it on...

Police 010

Well the response team are under pressure, you can go to between 15 and 20 crimes and incidents in a shift

For these reasons a number of officers that had previously been on response had moved onto beat work. As a result of these discrepancies in perceptions about their roles there appeared to be some differences of opinion between different ranks of officers in terms of what could be done about some hate crime incidents, particularly where there was an overlap with anti-social behaviour. Response officers tended to state that their role was to respond to the initial incident, to try to find out what had happened and provide the victim with information, if available on staying safe and further support but then they tended to discuss passing these cases on to the beat team. Response officers often discussed feeling constrained in what they could immediately offer to the victim on an initial visit:

Police 019

A couple of weeks ago I went to this chap and he reported that his son had taken some money off him but he had reported it a couple of weeks before and it had already been dealt with by another officer. But I felt like I didn't want to leave him on his own....when I walked into his house it was like walking into your granddad's house, you have got all the old war pictures in there and it's an interesting house to go into. You think he must have had a really interesting life and you want to sit there and talk to this person, he was 92 years old and I didn't want to leave him on his own. But what can you do for him? You can call a social worker up and say you can go round and pay him a visit and try and give him some more support. But you as a response officer sometimes you feel a bit helpless as to what you can do to help these people. You don't want to promise them the world and say 'I will do this and that' knowing full well you won't have the time or the resources to deliver. That's the problem with being a police officer sometimes, people think that you have all the answers and you don't, and you do feel

bad at times saying 'Well I don't really know, I can find out for you but....if it's 3 o'clock in the morning you are struggling because what can you do? Sometimes people say 'Well I haven't got a house or I want to leave my partner and where do I go?' Well unfortunately we can't provide you with a house, we can try and put you in touch with someone who can....You wish you could say 'Yes I will sit outside your house all night and guard your house' but as a response office, you can't.

This officer then goes on to discuss how it was also potentially difficult for response officers to help beyond the initial call:

Police 019

I think to us, unless they do anything criminal we are kind of restricted as to what we can do. If they cause damage to the fence we can deal with them for that ....but for other things it goes back to your hands are a bit tied as to how far you can go without spending every day of your life up there and patrolling it all the time. You are a bit restricted as to what you can do. as response officer we haven't got time to go back every day sitting there having cups of tea with people, probably the beat manager has and they can look at it more and maybe get housing involved...But there probably needs to be another group that can go out and look at ways to improve neighbourhoods that have got more time and resources to do this. Probably part of the council, they can look at installing cameras and speaking to the families. I know in Nottingham they have got the ASB teams and they are usually quite good at going out and dealing with these cases.

Often these issues were to do with the response team not knowing much about what the beat team did and/or the lack of localised knowledge afforded to beat teams which meant response officers knew less about other agencies that could help, albeit some officers did attempt to find out about these as the aforementioned response officer suggests:

...I can't honestly say I know of that many people that would be able to help an ethnic minority family out. If it was a disabled family or someone I thought was vulnerable for certain reasons, maybe they have got some mental health issues, you would know who to refer them to. You would know you go to social services and the doctors and look at getting some kind of care package put together or try and get some kind of care package with a social worker, it's not something we can sort but can say they need this. With

other groups I don't think there are that many real support agencies out there for them that I am aware of. Beat managers will go out and they will do some kind of intervention and they might be more aware of it than we are, because they generally take the crimes off us anyway. They are probably more aware of those people than we are. But sometimes your hands can be a bit tied as to who, you kind of say I can do what I can do but I don't really know who to say is the best person to support you in this situation.

Therefore whilst some response officers tried to get in touch with housing and/or speak to those in disputes to try and get them to come to a solution, generally, they tended to talk about passing on the case to the beat team if it required longer term investigation and management including dealing with safeguarding issues. The following officer a beat manager talks about the difference between the roles and experiences of response and beat officers in terms of their willingness to tackle issues and their knowledge bases for doing so. Some beat managers and PCSOs sometimes felt that response officers were sometimes too quick to pass hate incidents or anti-social behaviour onto the beat team:

Police 014

Yes it would be difficult for a response officer to do what I do.. Because they just buzz from one job, they haven't got the time to spend.....but saying that, I think some of them use that as an excuse of not doing anything. There's nothing wrong with them saying 'Ok, if there's no offences there, I can speak to the beat manager and see what they can do for me'... But a lot of them, in my experience, they just drop you an email and say 'Oh, I've been to this job, there's not a lot I can do, can you pay them a visit?' And you think well it's not really enough, you know, you need to be doing more....there's lots you can do. There's victim support and my best thing is Nottingham City Homes. They're not always council tenants the people committing the offences but that doesn't matter if one of the victims is a council tenant...and there's new anti-social behaviour laws and they are the things you need to look at....but you'll find a difference between a response officer's and the beat team, and it's not the response officer's fault, they don't get the time to do what we do, they're under a lot of pressure. We're under just as much pressure but different pressures and we do get the time to do that. So there are solutions out there and I think it's just a case of it's not always the police are the best way to resolve it.

This beat manager goes on to suggest that response officers often lack knowledge about what the beat team do:

> *There is a thing that response officers think we don't do anything and we're lazy, it's because they don't know what we do.*

Whilst the aforementioned differences did to a certain extent therefore mirror the differences in the roles and demands on these officers, it will be suggested at a later point that response officers could do with a better knowledge about what the beat team can offer in these cases as this will help them with their initial dealings with victims which is important given that they are often the first point of contact.

Indeed, much can be learnt from the beat team in terms of informing the training of other officers such as response officers and PCSOs and the latter certainly benefitted from exposure to the beat team in terms of hate incidents and anti-social behaviour. Because many of the responses of beat managers and PCSOs were very similar on these issues, this part of the report draws particularly upon some longer accounts of beat managers and PCSOs, albeit response officers are still included.

It is important to point out that there were many examples of good work done on the beat team to attempt to deal with hate incidents and anti-social behaviour. As stated earlier beat managers tended to see community policing as being central to their roles and they were often proactive in attempting to deal with hate crime victimisation and/or its escalation and discussed how they tried to make sure that they knew their area and the people on it and that they were also 'known', so that people would feel that they could report to them. Similarly, both beat managers and PCSOs felt that hate crime needed a community response and that this was also therefore part of their roles and that such work required time and commitment spent in the community, talking to victims and the public. They suggested that they had more time to do this than response officers who were often 'buzzing' from one job to another and this meant that they were often better able to work out what was happening:

> Police 014
>
> *A few months ago on the estate where I work, they kept reporting kids throwing snowballs at the windows. They called 999 which meant they get a response. So what*

the cops did, they're in cars, they drive down past their house, there's nobody here, we need to get to another job. Called back 10 minutes later, still nobody here, can't see anybody about, didn't even get out the car and speak to the people, they just drive past and say there's nobody here and I need to go to that person who's having his head caved in, it's more important....it's the role of the response cop, I'd never criticise them because they do ping from one job to another...and they evaluate each job. ....And I think they [the victims] called 4 or 5 times in the night...But what these kids were doing, when they saw the police car coming up the road, they ran off and hid round the corner.... I can do more, you know, I'll walk there and I'll go and speak to them and I'll advise them to get CCTV. And they got the CCTV, in a week we'd identified the lads, the parents grounded them for a month or give them a good hiding, ... and it solved that issue.

Therefore, whilst some response officers felt that the police were perhaps sometimes restricted in what they could do in some situations and who they could contact, beat managers were more aware about preventing and identifying problems and seeking solutions. This was not simply about their perceptions of their policing roles however but also because through carrying out these roles beat managers were more likely to have knowledge of other agencies that could help the police. Indeed, they pointed to a number of examples where they had drawn on the support of other agencies; Nottingham City Homes was particularly praised, but also the council and anti-social behaviour managers were identified as sometimes being helpful in resolving many neighbourhood issues. A number of beat managers had worked closely with Nottingham City Homes in order to threaten eviction and/or to act as a warning for further action being taken:

Police 014

I'm quite lucky at Bulwell, we've got an antisocial behaviour team from the Notts City Homes. And not just for hate crimes but all sorts of crimes but it does work well ...because one thing people are more scared of than the police is losing their homes. And quite luckily at Bulwell we've got an enforcement officer .and she's a champion of people's rights. We had an incident where an officer's attended; a young black family have moved in, she's quite timid; she's not got two pennies to rub together so she's

quite poor. She's got no carpets on the floor. But her next door neighbour's come round and been racially abusive to her and her son in the garden..because .the neighbours complained about the noise when the kid was running up the stairs, so he starts banging on the wall, 'Keep that noise down'. The kid thought somebody was banging to him and started banging back and made things worse. So the dad's come round and said 'You effing black this, you shouldn't even be in this country'... Now the cop's been there and I think there's going to be a prosecution for racially aggravated Section 5 Public Order so he will be interviewed on that. But also I've worked with the council patch manager and the antisocial behaviour enforcement officer....I went round to see the victim. We've taken statements regarding that and now we've got a council injunction against this man that he's not allowed to talk to them, he's not allowed to approach that family...If they breach you can get a power of arrest on it. If he breaches then they'll be looking to take action against his tenancy. It's basically saying if you continue this behaviour you'll be out. And that works better...and it's all recorded on our database where we record the crime.

This beat manager also gave a similar account of working to resolve issues with a disabled victim:

I went to a chap the other day with learning difficulties and the situation was that his neighbour upstairs does a lot for him and he's got a carer this chap with learning difficulties and to cut a long story short the chap with learning difficulties, he wants to do more for himself instead of his neighbour. So he's told his neighbour that and he's taken offence and is trying to cause him some problems so we've had to go round again with the council and warn him to keep away. , and because I work well with my patch manager, she'll call me and say 'Look, there's a problem there, this has been reported'. It's a case of putting these things out there and working with other agencies....we went and saw that chap we just gently reminded him you're a council tenant, you've got a code of conduct, if you do cause any problems you could be in a lot of trouble with your tenancy

Beat managers were therefore more aware of the different range of interventions that might be utilised in the 'greyer' area of hate incidents and anti-social behaviour. Although, PCSOs also had knowledge of other agencies it tended to be rather more limited than that of the beat

managers in terms of what could be done about incidents and who could be contacted but they often asked beat managers for information on these issues.

Some beat managers also discussed attempts to use Restorative Justice type approaches such as mediation which could sometimes prove helpful if they could obtain the co-operation of the parties to use it;

Police 030

Restorative justice as well can be useful in terms of healing the harm caused by one person towards the other and getting them to realise the consequences of their actions...we would always explore mediation from the earliest outset. And then if it's a case of we can use restorative justice as a means of disposal of the incident, if it's a crime we can use that rather than having to go to court, and then the other person feels less aggrieved because there is that thing of I am going to get my own back. So sometimes, if it's a positive outcome for all concerned, that's more successful than dragging something to court.

In some instances however, people had refused to take part in Restorative Justice as is indicated in the following example, this time from a response officer, who had also tried to get parties to hold talks in order to solve problems:

Police 019

.... in this particular incidence I said to the pair involved, the lady and the family, I said why don't you just come down to the police station and all sit in the room and have a chat about it and what can be done. Not interested...and you are like well we as police try to do what we can do, but I also think a lot of the time people don't want any responsibility for their own life...for dealing with it, they want to pass it on to us or to anybody else to deal with...this happens a lot, most neighbour disputes will start off with the neighbour saying ..'They shouldn't have done this or that 'and they escalate from there. I think people just need to learn, yes that happened but ...let's move past that...the problem is that some people, again to us the jobs that we go to, we will go to anything from deaths or violence or burglaries, and when we go to some of these, not referring to hate crimes but the lower level jobs, to that person it's the most important thing that has happened to them all year. But to us it's like 'Really, you really phoned

up for this?' And it's probably a bit harsh sometimes and then you try and sort it out with them and they are just not interested in taking any advice off you

Overall the three different types of officer in the study suggested that hate incidents and anti-social behaviour needed a community response as did anti-social behaviour and that safeguarding issues were important in all three. In order to further build on these discussions officers were questioned about the case of Fiona Pilkington in Leicester in order to find out about their knowledge of repetitive victimisation within the hate crime context, and also what the police could do about it. Whilst the majority of officers had heard of the case and could discuss it in some detail, a small number of them could not recall specific details.

Unsurprisingly perhaps the most detailed information on the case came from beat managers and PCSOs who perhaps understandably gave more expansive answers than response officers. When asked about what the impact of repetitive victimisation might be on victims like Fiona Pilkington, officers gave broadly similar answers:

> Police 015
>
> *She would have felt trapped I imagine…vulnerable and helpless, like no one was listening and nothing could be done. It would grind you down I imagine, repetitive victimization like that, it's like a descent into hopelessness and desperation…*

When asked what the police could have done, some officers suggested that the police could have done more, whilst other officers reserved judgement as they did not know exactly what the police had and had not done and what had been done by other agencies. Certainly, all of the officers felt that the Pilkington case required a multi-agency response and that such cases were not simply for the police who needed help from other agencies. The following quotations are indicative of the opinion of a large number of officers on the need in for other agencies to take more responsibility in some of these areas:

> Police 009
>
> *Yes, I mean a lot of people just point the finger at the police, the police aren't doing it, but we can't do it all. A lot of the time it's Social Services or it's schools or council housing or stuff like that, we're just part of the puzzle, we're not the be all and end all sort of thing... so that's quite challenging ...and there's a lot of vulnerable people as well who tend to get bullied on the street because, especially a lot of the kids know that*

they're vulnerable and they take the mick out of them and they phone us. It's only minor they get called names and stuff like that. but they still need a response and it's trying to tell them about keeping safe, about supporting them, but also you can't always get too involved because some of the responsibility has got to come down to the place where they're living. Obviously we have regular meetings with the management there to try and get them to do more to support their tenants rather than anything happens the first thing they do is call us but there also has to be some emphasis on other agencies also taking responsibility

Police 019

I think the police are always blamed for a lot of stuff that they don't necessarily have any control over...we are meant to be a response force in dealing with crime, and dealing with neighbourhood issues should be part of a neighbourhood group that maybe the council get more involved in dealing with

Whilst it was suggested therefore that a multi-agency approach was needed, it was also pointed out by some officers that victims like Fiona Pilkington might fall through the net if the information sharing between agencies was not strong, and/or, because agencies had failed to grasp the significance of the situation. The following quote from a beat manager suggests that a vigilant eye would be needed to avert such a situation arising:

Police 012

...As a beat manager if someone is calling that frequently I would pick it up, because I'd look at all the incidents that came in on my area, you'd suddenly look at it ...but I think the problem sometimes is...there was x number of calls over x year period, and then, when you actually looked at it and you think that's not a huge amount of calls compared to some people who call us with absolute drivel, some people can call us day in, day out, and they are the people you notice more. and not necessarily the person who might call once a month type of thing

However, it was notable that many of the beat managers were regularly involved in trying to solve these neighbourhood disputes and by working with other agencies they often had

success in getting to the root of the problem and finding a range of solutions and they suggested that these sorts of interventions may have helped in the Pilkington case:

Police 014

If I come across a family that's having these problems then I will spend time protecting them. I'll get the council in, I'll get injunctions in, and I'll spend months, and I've done it many times, I've protected lots of families. Another response cop went to an incident a few weeks ago where he took the first account of somebody and gave their next door neighbour a harassment warning to stop harassing her. I went round with the council and the lad who'd received a harassment warning was the nicest person you could ever meet...This woman next door is a violent alcoholic and I went with the council again and she was warned that if she doesn't pack it in harassing him, she's going to be kicked out....and they should be promoting more working with the council. So what I think the answer to it is, I'm quite a champion of neighbourhood policing, if you do it properly it works...if you just let neighbourhood policing get on with it, and it's got to be managed well, then you can. I'm quite proactive in my area and I do put these things in place....I don't think I would allow a situation like the Pilkington thing to have happened on my beat....

Officers were also asked what issues might arise in the policing of repetitive victimisation like the Pilkington case. For response officers grasping the concept of repeat victimisation was sometimes difficult due to time constraints, shift patterns and lack of local knowledge:

Police 020

Yes, even though it's a repeat victim....very rarely do you go to the same victim as a response officer...If someone's had 5 incidents of racial abuse in the last week, you might be one of those five that have attended...It's normally different officers, different shifts....but sometimes they [the victim] will say 'Oh, it's on record, don't you know what's happened? I've called you 5 times'.. You're like no actually I don't know what's happened. I know you've called and I've blue lighted it here and, you know, got here in a minute, I've not managed to consume all that information the control room are saying. And, yes, they do tend to get annoyed. I guess it would be ideal if it was one

officer for one complainant, so then they have that consistency, but that's not likely on response

Once again response officers in the main talked about passing the case onto the beat team to deal with repeat victimisation:

Police 020

.....we've got beat officers maybe for that type of thing who could maybe pick up those incidents but generally if it is a response job we need to get there, it's going to be us. I guess it depends on the type of call that's made. If it's there and then that they need police officers it's going to be response and then we make an assessment and get the beat team involved

Beat managers and PCSOs suggested that it was important to look at why there a high number of calls were coming from a particular address and why a victim was being repeatedly victimised. In the following quotation a beat manager is talking about an harassment and anti-social behaviour case, not dissimilar to the Pilkington case, that he is trying to get to court and he indicates the complexity of such cases and the range of different people that might need to be involved and the reliance on the offender actually taking heed of any measures taken:

Police 009

It is very, very difficult. I'm currently dealing with a group of youths that are harassing a family ..its similar issues to Pilkington in terms of what they are doing... it's basically a group of kids that have got a disliking for one other youth and then they started abusing the family and things like that. And I've just charged four of the young people with it, which is great and the family are really pleased but there's nothing to say that when they go to court they may be found not guilty, the CPS may discontinue it. Because it's very complicated, it's harassment over a period of time, it's not a straight up and down like somebody's hit somebody, there's a lot of statements, there's a lot going on. And I feel that I've done my job well but then I'm reliant on the courts, I'd be reliant on the council and housing associations to actually take action against these individuals and their parents, and other individuals if you're looking at going for ASBOs and things like that. But at the end of the day I can't physically stop that kid from doing something. I can do all I can, I can arrest him if he breaches the bail conditions, I arrest them when they do anything against them, but you need the help of

the Social Services, the council, the parents of these kids as well to help us. We haven't got a switch and we can stop them from doing stuff. We can do as much as we can but there comes a point where unfortunately we can't do anymore; we can't lock them up and throw away the key. .

The next interview extract from a beat manager touches on how these issues are more difficult with vulnerable victims who might become isolated because there is often a lack of social inclusion and neighbourliness in modern society:

Police 006

I think especially with disability crime really I think 90% of what needs to be done is the aftercare...if that person does come back and comes across as a repeat victim it's looking at the bigger picture. It's looking at the picture as to why they are a repeat victim. Is it because they feel they are and why? Or is it that they are in an environment somewhere that doesn't suit them shall we say. That's going to make them even more vulnerable because of their disability perhaps. You look out onto St Ann's and some of these big estates and gone are the days really where people used to look out for each other. Nowadays you keep your door shut, your windows shut and everything battened down. And if there is somebody that is suffering from some form of disability and they can't get out they are almost a recluse or they feel as though they are a recluse....and victimisation makes that worse

The officer goes on to say here that disabled people were also sometimes reluctant to involve the police because of the attention they thought that it would draw to themselves:

...some disabled people depending on their disability may feel that they are not held in the same esteem as somebody else, as an able bodied person especially if they are experiencing name calling and taunts....and that's been some of my experiences in the past, they think just keep my head down, I don't want people coming to my door...unless it's a strong willed person and that person will come forward. Other than that I just feel it's the close the door sort of thing and they are a prisoner in their own home. And the more it goes on the more reclusive they get and the less you see of them or hear of them...So if it's an individual that's in the middle of a housing estate and they are isolated, they are often the ones that most likely won't report.....and we have had it before, we had an incident that will come through and you will get a report from

someone else, but the victim will say 'Don't visit me I don't want the police knocking on my door. I am not reporting it anybody, I don't want anybody coming back'...And that's what you get sometimes. You know it's happening, but we can't have the evidence down on paper so we are never going to get to beyond reasonable doubt, so we can't take that action on the persons we believe to be responsible …

The officer goes on here to suggest that because of these problems a multi-agency approach was needed through joint meetings, in order to look at alternative courses of action, to make sure safeguarding was implemented and to try to end the problem:

[In Pilkington] I think it should have been around a table with housing, social care and with the police and with the education department, and look into why they think it's happening, it's all well and good taking report after report after report after report. As an officer and as an outside agency you most likely think oh we are dealing with the same person over and over again. But it's why are we dealing with the same person over and over again? It's having that time to get to the root of the problem and come up with a solution....It is a resource issue but on a case like Pilkington that would require a lot more time, a lot more effort, a lot more multi agency working...lets help her out, Can we get her moved from the house? She might not want to move from the house but do we move her? Do we move her temporarily do we show her the fact that it's that environment that we need to move her away from...or do we tackle the perpetrators and if so, how? What might work? And again it's not something we can do as an individual force but we supply the information to those other agencies, and that's what we try and get across to people. Not just on disability but on anything, but for us to be able to pass the information on we need to record it. It's no good me coming out and having a chat with you and you say this has happened ten times in the last month, well I haven't got the evidence ten times, so we have to keep recording...and something else with multi-agency working is that it is no good just having meetings ...there has to be a proper action plan drawn up

Indeed, beat managers suggested therefore that a range of possible actions had to be looked at in a Pilkington type situation. There were several examples of actions and safeguarding that had been put in place by the beat team and PCSOs when dealing with cases such as Pilkington, many of whom worked closely together; examples included the provision of alarms, fire-proofing letterboxes, advice on precautions and target hardening, providing numbers for

support, getting other agencies involved and increasing police presence and patrols in areas. Some of these like extra patrols the police could implement themselves and they had achieved some success with this. The following quote is from a PCSO:

Police 021

From my own point of view there was a lady on my area that used to come to our meetings, she was one of three people, and some of the local gang members got wind of it and they started congregating outside her house. And at its worse they wrote the word snitch all over the front of her house. But I made it like a personal objective to be on that street every day that I was on duty almost to an obsessional point. But I thought it's not acceptable, if that was my mum she would be terrified. And ultimately they dispersed because they didn't like someone from the police being there so they disappeared. And it's almost one of my proudest achievements but such a basic thing

However, often officers were reliant on working with other agencies to safeguard victims and they often had to rely on other agencies to get solutions also. Therefore one of the issues for officers here was sometimes in managing victim's expectations about what the police themselves could actually achieve for them:

Police 009

Yes, it's trying to put an end to it. Sometimes it's very difficult but you try and come up with solutions. We try and suggest if someone wants to move we can try and help them move but obviously that's not always what they want to do, which is fair enough. It's then trying to, especially if it's non crime or a low level crime sort of thing, our hands are tied a lot to what we can do to the offender and things like that and if they ignore us and come back again, and it's trying to educate people. And then again it's partnership working and stuff like that and trying to get other people involved to support this person to try and help him, to try and prevent it from happening in the future, which again is a long process as well. It takes a lot of time...you have to put the effort in..and we are relying on other people to help...and then you're at the risk of disappointing them when you can't do anything......so you say well I'll speak to the council to see if they can assist with a move and that sort of thing and then you make a referral and then they say 'No we can't do it'... I never promise anybody anything because if you do then it can go wrong but they expect a lot sometimes and you can't

always deliver it. You can make the best representation you can but it's not always yes,...It's managing the expectation of people sometimes which is difficult.

The officer then goes on to suggest why threatening eviction was sometimes helpful in these sorts of cases, because sometimes perpetrators placed more value on losing their homes than on anything the police could do and because the level of proof needed in such cases is lower:

...we have quite a close link in with say City Homes, now if it starts off as a neighbourly dispute.....as I said before if one black family has just moved in or Chinese family or one white family, we would then get on board with them. It almost sounds bizarre really but from a council or a housing point of view they seem to carry more weight on being able to take action against tenants than the police do. It's like the police trying to go and gather evidence for a criminal prosecution, we have to have all the evidence and prove things beyond reasonable doubt. From a housing point of view they would go and talk to the neighbours and they would give them a warning, a tenancy warning, when you took on this property you signed this property contract, you have had your warning. If that continues they will serve notice on your property and you could be on the streets...

Indeed, whilst there were some examples of success when using Nottingham City Homes, anti-social behaviour orders and/or increased patrols – one of the issues with some of these solutions was displacement of either the victim or the offender, neither of which addressed the offender's behaviour:

Police 025

NCH are good but again their workload is ridiculous so it all depends again on the area you're in, what that patch manager has got on, whether they're able to give the time needed for that extra support. You tend to find most of the time with NCH, if they're getting involved it's either warning letters to the offenders if they're known or, as I say, things like resettlement, which personally I'm not a fan of because it doesn't solve the problem. It hasn't changed the offender's behaviour, it hasn't dealt with the crime, it's just displaced the victim who's had to move because they're the ones being targeted. It sometimes gets marked off as a bit of a positive, like we've solved it, they're gone, you know, the problem's ended, but it's not really....if you're moving the offender they're probably going to pick on someone somewhere else and cause problems....and

there's the antisocial behaviour contract, harassment warnings...it's kind of a civil agreement so they're agreeing not to harass that person by signing it, it leads into other things so I think if they've breached the harassment warning then I think... if it continues they can be arrested for it. With the antisocial behaviour contract, which is the one I know, you hand that to them and that's kind of a restorative practice. They're involved in the decision of what the contract entails, they sign it and agree it, if they then carry on then you progress to the ASBO. You tend to find, well the ones I've done, I've involved the victim and said what do you want out of it, but some people probably don't. Some officers may well just say right, with the offender, obviously this is the behaviour you've been displaying; you're not going to display that behaviour anymore, agreed. They have worked in the past. in my experience however they've only worked in a limited sense. So you may find you put the antisocial behaviour contract on the person, it may stop the problem with them targeting house A, and they'll go quiet for a month or a month and a half but then problems are arising elsewhere and their name's getting thrown in again. I think a lot of neighbourhood policing unfortunately is displacement, yes.

Moreover, other beat managers and PCSOs suggested that they had had less success with threatening eviction and/or actually getting people evicted and it was often more about moving victims a lot of the time:

Police 013

Nottingham City Homes, their policies look brilliant on paper but they don't follow them through. That's probably one of the biggest social housing providers for Nottingham, but it's not always easy getting them to act on anti-social behaviour…I kept arresting this lady for calling this black woman and her daughters 'niggers' and 'chickaboos' all racist stuff, I kept arresting them. And because she was still in Nottingham City homes they wouldn't evict her unless there was a court case and prosecution out of it. But then she kept getting a suspended sentence or a fine that wasn't classed for them as a conviction…I was literally banging my head against a brick wall, we were going to the Equality Centre in town trying to find out what we can do...and in the end, Nottingham City Homes bowed down and evicted her after she had been arrested about six times. I think my arrest rates went up about 40% just for arresting this lady

Despite positive experiences with some agencies therefore, multi-agency working was not always successful and many officers experienced problems with it, including beat managers, in that they did not always find all agencies co-operative, there were often problems in accessing such agencies and getting to share information and it was also time-consuming. Whilst some beat managers for example had good relations with some agencies they gave more mixed feedback on others. Furthermore, even those agencies that received positive reviews in some areas of the city and county, received poorer feedback from officers in other areas; the feedback therefore was far from consistent. The following beat manager is talking about the inconsistency he has experienced with social services in terms of repetitive victimisation and them being willing to take action and/or feedback on what action has been taken:

Police 006

Social Services are hit and miss. Sometimes they're fantastic, other times they either don't really want to do anything or it's the same person again, yes we know about him, we'll note it down sort of thing, which is frustrating because you do all this work to a point where you can't do anymore because they need the specialist support and then you don't know what happens really. It would be good to know what they can do rather than us just referring it to them and saying well we'll do this, we'll do that...

Data protection was sometimes an issue that hindered multi-agency working:

Police 014

....there are times when you go to meetings and you've got us, Social Services and Housing and not one person will give any of the information that we need to share because...it's data protection and you go well that's why we're all here....but it's data protection ...but you've got information that I need.... because without that information you can't do the right thing for that person and they don't see that.

It was also suggested that multi agency working was problematic because the police were a 24/7 service and the other agencies were not:

Police 024

Multi agency working will not work with having a two tier response...multi-agency working would work really well if PCSOs can work shifts when the other agencies are working. But who am I going to get hold of at ten o'clock at night?

This meant that a frequent complaint was in having to wait for other agencies to get on board with safeguarding particularly at evenings and weekends which had a detrimental impact on victims. This was a problem that often surfaced with victims and perpetrators with learning disabilities and/or mental health conditions especially and social services were felt to be particularly problematic with some officers:

Police 009

It's very hard to get hold of them [social services] on a weekend, you know, and things don't happen just between 8 and 5 o'clock. And they're notorious for ten minutes to five on a Friday phoning in, there's this person there, we think they're vulnerable, and then you can't get through to them, which is, you know, it's going back to the triage car thing, that's helped in terms of supporting people who are maybe thinking of self-harming and that sort of thing. And that's helped free up officers to go to other incidents and things like that. And I know there's an emergency service in the EDT but there's only two or three people on there and they can't do a great deal really. In this day and age where things are 24 hour it would help if we got more support around the clock.

Police 005

It can be quite frustrating with a lot of other agencies only because most other places are Monday to Friday, 9 to 5, and crime generally doesn't happen just in between those times. Quite often you might get a call, someone's rung it in when they've got back home, or they've got back from school, by which time the other agencies that perhaps could offer the support and help aren't back in until Monday morning and it's now half past 5 on a Friday afternoon. So a lot of it does fall at the police's doorstep and we can deal with the criminal side and we can offer the support that we can but a lot of the help that these people are going to need ultimately isn't going to be from the police, it's going to be from the other agencies. And if somebody's an ongoing victim like the one

[Pilkington] in Leicestershire that you've mentioned, having to wait until Monday morning for someone to come in and pick up an email or get a voicemail message is going to seem like a lifetime, having to wait all weekend for it.

It was suggested by some officers therefore that multi-agency working was currently too disjointed and that a more joined up approach was required with clearer lines of accountability. This brings us to the final section of the report which requires us to consider the impact of the austerity measures on protecting people in the community both in terms of the using police and other agencies. We have just identified that officers felt that hate crimes, hate incidents and anti-social behaviour required a neighbourhood model of policing which drew on the support of other agencies. However, abstraction from their duties was a problem that was increasingly faced by officers and this impacted upon the service they felt they could provide in such situations. The following extract from an interview with a PCSO which touches on many issues around Pilkington is informative here:

Police 024

....I think it needs people skills, I think it's time and I think that's one thing that we don't have because we're being pushed from pillar to post. Understandably its money and its resources and I get that but as an organisation we bang on so much about being public facing and community....and in reality we don't get chance to do it...hate crime needs to be dealt with by the beat team because.. if someone smashes your window, it's like right we've nicked him he'll go to court done. Hate crime doesn't happen like that ....it's not over and done with and it's all fine.... we should be able to go and revisit people without having to just give them a quick phone call and go 'I've got to ring you because I've been told I've got to ring you every week'. We shouldn't do that, we should be able to have the time to go round and ask them 'How have things been?'

Abstraction was a problem for all officers but for beat managers and PCSOs it often affected their relationships with people on their own patch in terms of community policing if they were abstracted to other beat areas and/or to cover for response officers. The aforementioned PCSO goes on to elaborate about how damaging abstraction could be in cases like Pilkington involving hate crimes, incidents and anti-social behaviour:

You go three steps forward and two steps back it's ridiculous. You don't get anywhere because we're not in the community. If PCSOs were allowed to do the community work that we were supposed to do, that we were employed to do, then you would know the people on our beat....Response may have to make a judgement there and then but we wouldn't have to. We would be able to come in and build the relationship we are supposed to build with someone, get the trust and then do what we can to help them. I understand you have to put your resources where you need them...but I never applied to be a cop. I applied to be a Community Support Officer. I applied to work in the community to resolve the lower level issues and we don't do that anymore....the beat team is there to be the beat team but you get moved around constantly. 'Oh I'm moving you to this beat; or 'You're going to have to move to that beat.' ...you build a relationship with victims and then you pull it from underneath them. If somebody came up to me and I was struggling and I needed somebody to lean on, somebody to support me which is what we are supposed to do, and they were there for half the time then said ...'I'm going to a different beat...but here lean on this lady's shoulder, you've never met before in your life, don't know anything about her but enjoy, tell her everything'.. It's not going to happen....You've got no continuity with staff, you've got no continuity with time, you can't say 'I'll be here'.....you have to look at your diary and go I'm not really going to get to you for another two weeks. So if you could just hold your breakdown and the support that you need for about two weeks then I'll be with you love, can't do that.....

This officer goes on to explain how discontinuity may have been a factor in the Pilkington case:

...the whole anti-social behaviour thing, something should have been done with Fiona Pilkington before she became that desperate...it should have been down to the beat teams to pick up on that and go something's not right there, something is clearly not right....she's ringing all these jobs in, nobody seems to be listening to her. I don't know the whole ins and outs of it but it would be interesting to know if she had the same beat team the whole way through that case, whether they were accessible to her, because I know full well that I'm not accessible to the community I serve... if you're going to try and get somebody to trust you and build on that trust you have to be their only point of call. You have to be there for as often as they need you to be there if you can. I'm not

for one minute suggesting we should work twenty four hours a day. But you should have one or two points of contact with the people that you trust

The PCSO then goes on to discuss an example from their own policing about how they have become reacquainted with a disabled victim through being moved back onto the area where the victim lives. The officer expresses their frustration that they are not currently able to spend the amount of time on such victims that they used to be able to do:

Police 024

There's a lady on my beat who has learning disabilities......she's got a social worker but again the problem I have is that I picked up the job from two other PCSOs....Since I've been on it I think I've been to see her once and the thing is she didn't speak all that much to the other two officers..., the kids in the area were targeting her throwing stones at her property...but although we are supporting her we haven't had that many calls, I haven't been round to her house half as much as I'd like to, just to knock on her door. The minute I walked back through her door she went 'You used to be my PCSO' that was four years ago, yet she remembers me from four years ago because I had chance to build a relationship with her four years ago, I don't now...which is sad because that's why I joined. I didn't join to drive fast cars...I'm not interested in fights... I joined to make a difference. I don't make any difference anymore, I honestly don't - not the difference I want to make.

The following officer also a PCSO suggests that abstraction might make it very difficult to keep up extra patrols in an area where they might be needed for repeat victims:

Police 025

If you're got two or three different repeat victims, it can be very difficult to make sure that you're spending enough time on their street and dealing with all the other jobs that are coming in at the same time. You tend to find abstractions are quite high at the moment. Again with the low levels of staffing there are a lot of operations in place that abstract us from our normal work to do, you know, targeted policing on things like acquisitive crime ....and that's all stats driven, not knowledge driven... So it's difficult to deal with because really the best way of dealing I think with repeat victimisation is just being able to be in that area solid for a week or so and you tend

to find if you're able to do that, it does stop or at least slow the problem enough for the victim to feel better about their quality of living.

Whilst therefore abstraction was a problem for all officers and PCSOs found it difficult to keep continuity with victims, it was considered as particularly problematic for beat managers and it was felt to really limit their potential to solve problems like that presented by the Pilkington case:

> *Police 014*
>
> *I can neighbourhood police if you let me get on with it. My fear is because we're so short of officers now, once response officers are all tied up at jobs, the first thing they do is come to neighbourhood police officers and say you need now to go to that job. And that's happening more and more often...we're being taken off our areas to police other events... they champion neighbourhood policing but a lot of it is all talk... I think one of the things I'd like to feedback is that neighbourhood policing is good but you have to allow officers to do it and stop extracting them from duties to deal with other things. And they will say 'Well ok, it happens now and then we do have to do that' but it's not now and then, it's becoming more and more regular. And every time I go to another job and pick an assault up, I'll probably be gone most of the day dealing with that and I'll come in the next day and it will happen again and I'll be extracted from my duties again. And all this time, this is where the Pilkington case has built up...Neighbourhood policing is a fantastic idea and I'm a champion, and I've done both, I've done response, and I achieve a lot more on beat......and we can prevent things like Pilkington but we've just got to be allowed to do it. And that is one of my bugbears really that stopping things like hate crimes and working with people, it takes time. If they stopped extracting us all the time we could spend more time dealing with these issues... And we should be held accountable as beat officers they should be able to say to us – 'What are you doing about this vulnerable family? Are you working with anybody?'....I'll say to them, 'Well, you keep extracting me, when do you expect me to do it?'*

In addition to police officers being stretched in terms of reduced manpower through losing officers and/or abstraction, which was perceived as having a detrimental effect on the neighbourhood policing required for these types of issues, they often had to deal with more issues as a result of other agencies also being stretched for time and resources. Therefore,

although officers stated that they could not deal with cases like Pilkington in isolation and that other agencies had a key role to play in keeping people like Fiona Pilkington and her family safe in the community, it was suggested by a number of officers that rather than helping the police with members of the public, other agencies were frequently passing individuals on to the police:

Police 004

A lot of the agencies I've come across don't want to help and they're too willing to pass their problems to you rather than take some off you. So I've not found a great deal of help and support from other agencies. The 4 o'clock Friday phone call from Social Services, you can set your watch by it.

As the aforementioned officer alongside many other officers in the study suggests what is needed is a more holistic and less disjointed multi-agency approach, but part of the lack of this and the issues with other agencies were often to do with financial and staffing cutbacks in that they were also experiencing, which meant that more people were likely to be passed on to the police:

Police 026

Yes I think it would be amazing if we could and get a more holistic approach and get some of larger agencies involved working with the police to try and solve problems...But it's all very disjointed and maybe we can but once again it becomes an issue of money. So we understand, we have got a lady who is causing the sergeant problems at the moment because he keeps getting told why do we keep getting loads of calls from this lady. But we are not because we have spoken to her and she has got mental health problems and we have made her aware of the health agencies that need to be involved. But they are strapped for cash so they work on the basis of they do this much and then they will go ok she has called us we have told her this but we can only do that. And then they call us... so all our calls are coming from them and not from her.

As the following officer suggests therefore many calls for the police are coming from other agencies to deal with members of the public:

Police 006

We have got a female that has got some mental health issues and she is under the Stonebridge centre she has got a community nurse down there. Now for many years she has phoned 999 and said I am going to kill myself. And she used to ring us and say that which would generate concern for safety and immediate response we would go and find this female. Nine times out of ten you would find her at home asleep on the sofa stoned. But eventually we chipped away at her and we said you have got these tendencies and put her in touch with QMC for medical support …but now what happens is she rings 111 which really is the right sort of response and they put the phone down and ring 999, it still generates the same amount of calls.

It was suggested that as well as the police being called to deal with vulnerable people because of these cutbacks elsewhere, it was also leaving some members of the public more vulnerable when out in the community. An example is given below by a beat manager of less carers and neighbourhood wardens being available to check on vulnerable people in the community:

Police 006

Now we do have quite a few community centres, sheltered housing complexes around St Ann's and 99% of the people in them are in the same boat so you might have quite a few disabled people with mobility aids and this that and the other. And they all meet in a little community room. And they used to have a live in warden on each of these sites but again due to the cut backs they now have roving wardens which is not as good and for some people like the elderly and disabled people, support networks are being cut....like day centres and places for them to meet and transport to such places... ...the last two days running, there is a gentleman he lives Mapperley...he is in his nineties, him and his wife both suffer from dementia, yesterday she reported him missing, well we didn't know if it was right or wrong because she suffers from dementia as well. But the carer said they went in just after 12 and they were both there and now he has wandered off. She said [his wife] he has gone to join the army, we found him at Chilwell, the barracks, 94 I think he is. But he disappeared again today and he is in Chilwell again and they [the police] brought him back. And for an incident like that there isn't a crime but as an organisation to protect the individual. I feel from that we would have

a duty to try and put things in place. It's all well and good having a carer come out midday or morning and night, but the situation is telling us they need more than that....

As well as these issues arising with elderly people and those with disabilities there were also recurrent calls to the police to deal with people with mental health conditions. Examples included people who were self-harming and/or who had tried to commit suicide, where people with mental health conditions had assaulted hospital and/or caring staff or who had been reported by a member of the public for being intimidating or threatening when out in public or for simply 'acting shifty'. Dealing with people with mental health conditions was often difficult for the police particularly when medication had not been taken properly or the person had perhaps been drinking and violence was often used against the police particularly when people felt intimidated by the police being called. This was also particularly problematic if mental health conditions were not known about, as many people came across as being drunk and/or intimidating. Again, many of these calls to the police were perceived as increasing due to cutbacks in mental health provision both in hospitals and also in the community:

Police *007*

Our remit is policing but we have to deal with so many people with mental health problems but it should be the national health service dealing with them ....I guess it started back in the nineties when we tended to have the highest rate of people with mental health problems in the community....because they had been treated in the community...but there is no infrastructure...no proper care which has got worse ...and that's the hardest thing because we become then in effect carers for these people and it's difficult. And for young cops, the difficulty is what to do with them, especially with really big guys who have got a mental health conditions and aggression issues... that's the difficulty of what to do with it because you just worry about how that person is going to react....we have had dealings with a couple of really big guys with mental health problems who can become really volatile and they could end your career...and it makes me very cross sometimes the way we are constantly called out to deal with people that need proper social care and medical support....particularly over the weekends and evenings....but I don't think the units are kitted out to deal with them so they have got a problem with resources as well.

There were also issues with people with mental health conditions themselves calling the police, sometimes excessively. It was alleged that one man who had an obsession with emergency

services had called the police 200 times. Another lady had reported a public advertisement on an advertising board which she thought was aimed personally at her.

The next quotation is from a beat manager discussing a member of the public that is suspected to have mental health issues who constantly rings in racist incidents for which the police can find no proof despite patrolling past his home and listening to playback from recording devices:

Police 014

...we've got this Asian chap called Mr X and he feels the worlds against him and he keeps calling in racial incidents and they're quite frankly not racial incidents. The trouble is nothing's actually happened. He'll see a couple of lads walking down his street and if they glance at his house then he reports that as targeting him. But it's really difficult to deal with because he's got numerous video cameras around his house.. .and nobody can hear anything....there's not one incident with that particular gentleman where anything's been proved, nor has anything come back from patrols.. ....he'll say 'Listen to these tapes'...you'll take them away and have them tested at our digital investigation unit, we have had forensics on it and they can't hear anything and we have had CPS involved and they can't find anything, so we have to close these jobs down through lack of evidence. You go back and tell him that and...this is probably down more to his mental health [he has recently been flagged as having a mental health issue], he thinks that we're failing as a force. But if he writes in and makes a complaint and says my investigation isn't being taken seriously, then I feel that the senior officers look badly on the officer that's dealing with it, when that officer may well have dealt with it perfectly well. And then you feel under pressure then when you go back, you must do something...But there's nothing you can do anything with. And you keep going back to these places and I feel we need to be a strong organisation. I think we should do everything we can to help people, victims of hate crime, we do get a lot right, we do take hate crime seriously, and if officers don't deal with it properly then they're in trouble, we all appreciate that, but there also should be a point where you've done as much as you can and we should be able to say 'I'm sorry but there's nothing happened here, we don't believe this is a racial incident and we're not going to take it any further'. But we seem to be scared to do that.....as an organisation we're so scared of not been seen to do the right thing...we are scared of offending people..

This led some police officers to feel that they are increasingly being called up to be social workers due to the calls for them to deal more and more with social problems rather than crime:

Police 001

We need lots of help and all the help we can get, remember police officers are primarily criminal law and preserving life and limb. There are too many cases where we are relied on to be social workers, we really are. A lot of the problems come down to if it's not for the fire service or the ambulance it must be for the police. The councils are very rarely approached.

As the next officer a beat manager suggests in the current political and financial climate, multi-agency working is going to become more of a necessity:

Police *010*

Our role, because of the demands on it, is changing all the time and I think our Chief is pressing home the fact that to meet demand and with resources stretched we are going to have to work more and more with other agencies to still deliver a service. So, for instance, your example of throwing eggs and stones and stuff, we work on our teams, as well as police officers and police community support officers we've got community protection officers and part of their remit is to deal with antisocial behaviour.

These points about the reduction in police budgets and the increased pressures that the police are under including the need for improved multi-agency working bring us to the end of the report. In evaluating what can be done about hate crimes, hate incidents and anti-social behaviour we must keep in mind the demands on our police force particularly in this time of austerity cuts which are having a severe impact on the availability of officers and consequently police capacity. Whilst other agencies are also experiencing cuts the current austerity climate serves to exacerbate existing issues in policing. Whilst there is only space to discuss a minority of these issues here, currently policing takes place within a context where many members of the public have little respect for the police or authority figures in general. This is not helped because there are virtually no media stories which publicise good work that many officers are regularly engaged in. This is particularly problematic in the national press consisting of tabloids and broadsheets which include stories criticising the police but rarely any positive accounts:

Police 015

......you never hear any positives about the police. But then bad news sells papers...you never hear about successful prosecutions.

The following officers suggest that there is a general lack of respect for the police force which is partly to do with negative publicity about when the police have got things wrong but which is also endemic of an overall decline of respect in society for authority figures:

Police 013

I think to be fair, there's not enough respect for the police anymore I don't think. Everyone says that when you were a child you saw a police officer and you thought 'What have I done wrong?' .....whereas this sort of day and age, the teenagers and young people have grown up in a society where there's been a lot of problems surrounding the police, and the parents have obviously spoken about the police and stuff, I think it has just lost a lot of respect

Police 025

The way the world seems to be going, this whole sort of, no respect for authority....everyone nowadays seems to have a chip on their shoulder about being told what to do and how to live their life, this whole swag culture that's crept in over the years. It's extremely difficult...I mean just the other day I was walking up the street and this kid on a bike, I didn't see him, he's right behind me and he starts going 'Beep Beep' really loudly and then cycles on past. And it's like what can I do? I can't grab hold of him for that because he's not really committed an offence. He made me jump and I can imagine if he'd done that to a member of public we would probably have got a call about it, but it's, like if they're like that with us, with other people who have no authority or powers to deal with anything, then you just dread to think what they're like with them. But I do think it's a societal problem, I don't think it's anything the police are necessarily getting wrong, I think it's just the whole system at the moment is just off kilter...and with hate crime you are trying to change someone's mind set and that is often impossible for the police to do

An additional factor here is that there has also been scant research, particularly in recent years, on the high value that many police officers do place on community policing and their frustrations at issues that hinder them in their attempts at engagement with this model of policing.

The constant criticism of the police is felt by even new recruits and is therefore especially important given that the austerity cuts are currently having a real impact on police morale which often serves to exacerbate the existing pressures of being a police officer. Because of this, a number of officers were seriously questioning whether they could see themselves staying with the force and those that had a longer service questioned whether they would be able to achieve that if they had joined the police in recent years. The following quotation is from an officer with five years' service in the force:

> *Police 033*
>
> *It is difficult...I have a young child...recently my life was in very real danger, I was in a situation where I thought I was going to be killed...it is a unique job in that sense...as you are often faced with unpredictable and violent people, you never really know what you may be walking into...my partner knows when I become introverted that something has happened at work...but she has learnt not to ask because you tend it bottle it up...and that can make family life difficult sometimes, when you can't shut it off, a lot of my colleagues in the force are divorced or separated because policing can take such a toll on your family life....all of that is made more difficult by the constant pressures we are now under because of the cuts...we have less officers and that is often really stressful and makes you feel more vulnerable....I do have to question whether I can do thirty years' service, another five years often begins to look improbable to be honest....*

Another officer, a beat manager, also touches on similar issues and talks about the threats that have been made against him and his family as a result of his being a police officer:

> Police 016
>
> *Policing should be and is a vocation...and there are positives to policing, that's why people do it...but the idea of switching off from policing is difficult...it takes its toll on*

your relationships... I have gone through divorce and it's difficult..... going back to how we deal with incidents, you have to have empathy towards people if you want to get the truth out of them, even witnesses, but you go home to your family and it's difficult to show that to your partner, you are drained. ....it's just this thing about the idea of what policing is about......nobody wants to hear the negativity about it....I have been followed home, I have had death threats... Now they are expecting cops to do 40 years, it's a tough run for kids to do and with all you are up against. And I think the government is saying you are really bad at this, stuff from years ago like Hillsborough and the Lawrence affair and situations like that and no-one doubts that some of the police were bad there..... But there are good, dedicated coppers and again you look at policing and what we have to do, the intelligence we have to put in....the people that we have to deal with day in and day out and how they think about the police force. And your kids names are found out and publicised on the internet, your Facebook is being followed, that's what I have to deal with ....and then how we deal with it, the hate towards me, I have had hate crime, I have had hate messages and death threats because some people hate the police force, so I have been on the receiving end of some of that and I know what it is like

Finally, attention must be paid to the huge range of incidents that the police have to deal with which as well as crimes include suicides, traffic accidents, policing public events, dealing with people with mental health problems either as victims, perpetrators or sometimes simply members of the public who go missing. The reductions in service provision for the mentally ill is having a huge impact on police officers who are frequently called in to deal with people particularly during the night and at weekends, often in situations where they are not the most appropriate organisation to do so. There are also members of the public who do waste a considerable amount of police time whether intentionally or otherwise.

Any evaluations of police performance must be more transparent in taking account of the austerity measures and the pressures that police forces currently face. Therefore evaluations of police performance must be accompanied by a greater awareness of the roles of other agencies who must also be subjected to the same processes of scrutiny as the police. It is interesting to note that the CJJI (2015) follow up to the (2013) report found continued shortcomings amongst the CPS and the probation service on identifying and dealing with disability hate crime.

As the 24 hour emergency service provider, the police are often the first point of contact for many victims. However, hate crime cannot be the responsibility of the police alone. Indeed, this study has revealed that police officers need far more support including improved training, resources and most importantly more support from other agencies in order to effectively deal with all types of hate crimes and incidents, disability in particular. Therefore, evaluations on police performance in this area must take account of the current budgetary pressures on police manpower which potentially reduces the capacity of officers to provide a much needed community approach to hate crime at a time when they are also experiencing increased calls from other agencies about members of the public.

Summary

To conclude this second section of the report, it would appear that whilst police officers knew about the procedures to be followed on hate crimes and incidents, knowledge on other issues was less solid with considerable differences between officers and that this is often to do with training issues and sometimes lack of exposure to such cases. This discussion has indicated that training by the police needs to take account of the 'Silo' effect where perceived differences between the roles of response officers, Beat Managers and PCSOs can lead to officers becoming divorced from the experiences of those in other roles to themselves, which can sometimes hinder their own development and learning, particularly in hate crime as knowledge is not always shared.

This requires us to recognise that organisations can easily become trapped into favoured ways of thinking and that these may differ considerably between different departments or those in different roles. 'Silos' involve mutually held knowledge and depict certain mind-sets that represent particular spatial, temporal, cultural and structural conditions (Stephenson, 2004). There were some examples here of insular fragmentation, through 'departmental silos' developing between those in different police roles, whether consciously or unconsciously, where some officers become blinkered to the experiences of other officers.

It is suggested therefore that officers need to be trained using a more holistic hate crime model, that whilst recognising the different demands posed by their policing roles also connects their different contributions into an overall 'process'. For this reason it is suggested that training sessions should involve all three types of officer with an emphasis on the key roles that they all play in dealing with hate crimes and incidents. Therefore, a more holistic view of training in terms of conceptualising hate crime as a 'process' from beginning to end, in which the police play a pivotal community and preventative role, not simply a reactive role could help when training the police on dealing with different types of hate crimes and hate incidents.

Given that multi-agency working is important to hate crime, such training should also include other agencies to avoid the 'Silo' effect where the knowledge, experiences and actions of the police and other agencies may fail to be joined together effectively. 'Silos' also exist between internal and external parties where there is a breakdown in communication, co-operation and

co-ordination (Fenwick, Seville and Brusdon, 2009) which may be especially detrimental to the communities that suffer from hate crimes and incidents.

A particular form of agency that the police had contact with were housing associations, including, most frequently, Nottingham City Homes and many police officers, particularly beat managers and PCSOs discussed positive experiences with this organisation and much can be learnt from this.

However, the 'Silo' effect was still sometimes apparent in the interviewee accounts of policing dealings with this agency and with other agencies also. Outside of social services other sources of support in helping the police to investigate and deal with crimes and incidents and to provide support to victims were much more limited. Certainly, this is an area that needs addressing, not least of which, because officers often experienced difficulty in getting hold of social services, particularly out of hours at weekends and although there was an emergency number, officers sometimes struggled to get help or advice until Monday morning. That is a very long time for a victim who might be in need of information and more outside support over a weekend period.

To avoid the 'Silo' effect between the police and other agencies, hate crime training should take a multi-agency format which includes the police and other agencies and which includes an emphasis on both prosecution and alternative solutions including the promotion of alternative solutions if appropriate including anti-social behaviour powers whilst stressing the roles of all agencies in tackling hate crime. Whilst some police officers have received training on this area it would be helpful for them to have this training in a multi-agency context. This should also be accompanied by an awareness campaign for the general public which stresses that the area of hate crime involves a 'shared responsibility' between the police and other agencies which outlines the different courses of action that might be available.

Conclusion

In order to learn from positive feedback as well as negative we must acknowledge the former and this report has highlighted a number of positives in terms of police knowledge on hate crimes and incidents. It has identified that officers clearly knew what a hate crime was based on the legislation and protected characteristics. It has also identified that police offers were aware of the need to record both hate crimes and hate incidents and the associated hate crime procedures that they needed to comply with. It has also identified that a number of police officers in Nottinghamshire see hate crimes and incidents as needing a community policing response and that many of them are committed to the neighbourhood model of policing that this entails.

However, it would appear that whilst police training helps the police to a certain extent in terms of identifying what a hate crime is and outlining the procedure for investigation including the completion of risk assessment forms, it is less successful in terms of providing officers with a holistic view of some of the more complicated incidents, in helping them to identify hostility and in signposting them to agencies for providing support in investigation and safeguarding. Indeed, much of police learning in this area was by 'trial and error' in terms of learning on the job. Whilst inevitably given the nature of the police role, much learning does take place in this way and this author argues that such experiences should be brought into learning, there can be no doubt that the police would benefit from more training and support in how to recognise disability, what evidence might help to establish hostility in particular cases such as 'mate crime' and which other agencies are available to help them in investigations and the safeguarding of a range of hate crime victims.

The research has identified a number of issues raised in interviews with police officers that might be successfully tackled by training. The first point of note is that police officers know that hate crime is a priority area for the force because of the emphasis placed on it. This does not mean however that officers see hate crime as a priority area for them and/or value the training that is provided.

When we consider the feedback on training given by officers, several important points have emerged for our consideration. As we have seen, officer's receptiveness to training and ability to engage with it and retain it was influenced by a number of factors.

Firstly, there is a need to consider how to change the focus of training so that officers value it because they feel it is of real benefit to them in terms of their daily policing and their longer term career progress. Training for the police in this area needs to be more skills based. An important point raised by the officers was about the limited practical utility of the training in their daily working lives, reflected in the higher value placed on the input of external agencies with specialist knowledge and the exposure to people that it provided, most notably victims, with whom some police officers, particularly newer recruits, may have had little contact. This exposure is particularly important when trying to equip officers with skills for dealing with hate crimes and was especially valued for dealing with people with disabilities and mental health conditions.

Secondly, officers need to feel engaged with the process of learning and be given training opportunities that will enable this as well as providing opportunities for reflection. This requires a change to from pedagogical to andragogical approaches so that they can become more 'active learners' (Brookfield, 1995; Knowles 1990; Birzer 2003 see Trickett forthcoming). As we have seen officers felt disengaged from NCALT because of the lack of human interaction and very limited opportunities for personal involvement in computer based learning. Where opportunities were provided for human input and interaction, particularly with the use of outside agencies, they were highly valued by officers because they involved both the use of experts and gave police officers exposure to victims with particular conditions, issues and experiences.

As stated, exposure for the police in training is crucial here as hate crime is less well reported than other types of offending and some types, disability hate crime and transgendered hate crime are particularly problematic in terms of reporting levels. Many officers had been largely trained on NCALT and did not feel that they had been equipped with sufficient knowledge on hate crime which is especially troubling given the huge range of victims that the police might be faced with. This was also connected to the fact that much of the training that had been provided to officers was Equality and Diversity, Vulnerability or Anti-Social Behaviour which they did not feel had provided them with information on the specificities of particular hate crimes. Therefore, in terms of exposure training it is also important to use 'real' cases to train the police and a sufficient range of such cases, particularly those from the 'greyer' area of hate crime. These could involve anonymous past cases from within Nottinghamshire and elsewhere.

Whilst the force has occasionally done this, i.e. through a focus on the Pilkington case, an increased emphasis would be valuable to officers. Work from a Case Conferencing model could help inform training here such as that used in the 'prostitute support network' (PSN) which brings together a PC from the OSPT with other key/front line workers from each voluntary and statutory group to 'case conference' individual cases and to tailor individual 'action plans' for problematic cases putting together a joint course of action. This is an example of how a multi-agency approach can be effectively utilised within training models.

The work of the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel and the Hate Crime Manager will also be important here and could help with the design of training by providing actual examples. In this however there needs to be a sharing of good practice as well as focusing on cases that have not gone well in order to help with police morale, a point to be returned to shortly.

This is especially important given that some officers had little practical experience of dealing with hate crime, particularly disability hate crime and with the exception of newer recruits some officers had limited focussed training in this area which needs to be addressed. It is also important to point out that exposure to hate crimes and in particular hate incidents, varied between the ranks of officers depending on whether they were response officers, beat managers or PCSOs and this affected knowledge. Whilst this is perhaps unsurprising given the different nature of the policing roles, it is something that needs to be addressed in the design of training and this point will be revisited shortly.

As a result of some of the aforementioned points, a frequent complaint with all types of training, but particularly hate crime, was that the officers felt that they were doing the training largely as a tick-box exercise so that the force could say that they had been trained on hate crime. This was not helped by the dominance of NCALT which officers felt was largely being used as a cheap but ineffective way of training them. This meant that sometimes officers questioned the value that the police force itself placed on hate crime training. Consequently, officers were often dismissive about this form of training delivery albeit not the subject, but the overall effect was that officer's receptiveness to the training due to the format and the emphasis was undermined. Put simply if officers do not feel that the police force places value on the training format, why should they place value on the content?

This is not to say that there is no room for the use of computer packages but the over-reliance on them can be particularly detrimental when trying to equip learners with skills. This means that the police need to reconsider their heavy reliance on NCALT packages given that they

are hugely unpopular with officers and it appears that practicality and cost is being elevated over quality learning.

A related complaint, albeit not limited to NCALT training, was that officer's experiences were neither valued nor incorporated in training sessions. Certainly there was limited opportunity for officers to actively take part in training and/or to work with other officers and discuss training. Although there were occasionally opportunities on training days for officers to talk together, and to engage with trainers and members of the public, these were not frequent. As a result of the lack of opportunity for officers to get involved in training and in particular to draw on their own knowledge and experiences, officers sometimes felt patronised in training programmes including NCALT training and the use of police trainers and sometimes that provided by other agencies.

This leads us on to the importance of context in training the police. A significant consideration in training employees in any organisation is receptiveness to training and dealing with cynicism and the police are no exception. There are a number of points to make here however about factors that contributed to such cynicism and how they might be addressed in training. Firstly, as we have seen officers often felt undervalued in training because they thought that their experiences and knowledge was ignored. A further and arguably related complaint was that officers often felt that training was on many occasions in response to criticisms of the police and it involved a suggestion that they were somehow at fault. This is extremely important because there is very little praise for officers in their job but an overall tendency for criticism of the police. There are rarely positive stories about the police in the media and many police officers felt that they were living in a culture of little respect for the police and authority generally; this was coupled with increasing police bureaucracy where they felt that they had to constantly be on their guard; none of this is helped of cause by the increasing pressures that the police are under due to the austerity cuts.

This means that barriers to training may be exacerbated in the current financial climate. Such barriers are not unique to the police but a lack of receptiveness to training is something that requires addressing in the design of training formats and a more positive context for training which can help to boost rather than undermine morale is desirable. This is also a further reason for better inclusion of police officers in their training by using their skills and experiences particularly the use of positive examples, and where negative examples are used, doing so within a more positive overall climate.

Another context issue in police training is the frequency and amount of training that the police have to undertake. Police officers often felt bombarded with different types of training and the times in which training was undertaken were often questioned by officers. Whilst not all of these points can be addressed and solved, for example, shift working patterns can make the delivery of training somewhat problematic, there is a sense that the value of the training to individual officers needs elevating and that this is difficult to do when officers are faced with so much training in short periods of time and feel increasingly pressurised to simply 'get it done' which means that training becomes simply one of a huge lists of things to do and can be seen as a burden. Whilst training demands such as those imposed by legislative changes, are to a certain extent outside of police control – this is still a major factor to consider.

A further recommendation is that hate crime training needs to be more holistic in several ways. It needs to be more holistic in terms of ensuring the uniformity of knowledge between officers of different ranks, so that they are aware of the differences in their roles but also have a shared knowledge between them. Whilst, it is perhaps unsurprising, that there were differences in perceptions of role and experiences between response officers, beat managers and PCSOs, it is important for officers to have an understanding of what the other officers may do and what actions may be appropriate as these will help them when dealing with perpetrators and victims. There is therefore a need for better liaison between different ranks of police officers in terms of sharing information and learning from the differences in their roles. For example, although response officers are extremely busy and moving from one incident to the next, a better understanding of hate crime, in terms of what the beat team do and what is possible can help them when initially dealing with and advising victims.

This means that training also needs to be more holistic in terms of its integration into an overall view of the policing role. Although officers had good knowledge of the hate crime legislation, recording practices and procedures, including risk assessment forms, they had less knowledge about what course of action may be most appropriate in individual cases, particular in the grey areas; albeit beat managers had a much better understanding of this and the many examples of their successes in this area need to be fed into the design of training packages.

These points on a more holistic view of the policing role and the connections between officers should help in developing their understanding of the 'grey area' of hate crime. Whilst increasing the connections and knowledge sharing between officers will help in this

regard, it may also help if we train officers using the concept of hate crime as a 'process' (Bowling 2003; Hollomotz 2013) involving a continuum wherein events become connected and may possibly escalate.

It is important to raise the importance of such incidents for all officers. The area of hate crime, community policing and relations are extremely important in terms of creating a better environment for people to live in and for officers to police. The role of the police here contributes to the maintenance of public safety and order which can spiral out of control if not kept in check. Therefore an emphasis on prevention rather than simply reaction is important and drawing on the roles of beat teams and PCSOs can help here.

Keeping this in mind, the examples used in police training were often found to be clear cut and it was suggested that in reality many hate crimes and particularly hate incidents fell within a greyer and more complicated area, which was apparent in officer's experiences, but not in many of the examples given in training. These real examples would be a valuable resource to use in training to give officers a better understanding of the range of hate crimes and incidents that can occur. Other information that can be used in police training here is the use of hate crime 'hot spots' in specific areas. Whilst these are currently useful to beat managers they might also be helpful to PCSOs and response officers.

A related issue is how to better identify risks and safeguarding. It is suggested that risk assessment tools are currently rather blunt and may have the effect of both over predicting and under predicting actual risk levels. Moreover, officers often feel constrained by the risk assessment forms, which means that the forms are sometimes at odds with their professional judgement. It would help enormously if officers had a more detailed form of training here – this could involve the work of the Vulnerable Persons Panel (VPPs) and the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel to give officers access to a greater range of situations and also feedback from the work of the beat team who have a wealth of experience in this area. This will help to focus officer's minds on the purpose of making risk assessments rather than the procedure itself and give more scope for officer's judgements to be incorporated.

Whilst, as I have already said, hate crime training must emphasise the importance of the police role, it also needs to contextualise this within the context of a multi-agency approach. Dealing with hate crime and incidents cannot possibly be the responsibility of the police alone, and it is essential that the role of other agencies is promoted and the parameters of the police role and what the police can and can't do is highlighted and made public. This is

particularly the case in terms of prosecution as there is a discrepancy between recording practices based on simple perception and prosecution policy based on evidence of hostility.

It is also important that other agencies are subjected to the same level of scrutiny as the police. Too often the police are held as the panacea for all hate crime and incidents and for dealing with people with mental health issues. Much clearer lines of 'responsibility' and 'ownership' of these problems need to be set out. The MARAC model needs to be examined and the legislative powers on anti-social behaviour under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 need to be built into training. Within the 2014 statute different organisations can apply for many of the remedies and closer agency working would doubtless be valuable here but this needs to be accompanied by clearer lines of responsibility, through agencies taking ownership of problems if it is to be effective. Whilst some officers had good knowledge of these newer powers these officers were in the minority and learning about these legislative provisions needs to be incorporated into a multi-agency training module for all agencies.

Training about multi-agency solutions can help the police to decide on the best courses of action which may or may not, depending on the evidence and the wishes of the victim, involve prosecution but where a range of credible alternatives may be considered. Such training can help police officers to identify other agencies that can help whilst incorporating the wishes of the victim where possible.

Most hate victims want the situation to stop and to live their lives without harassment and abuse, and therefore possible resolutions, involving the use of the new ASB powers, as well as other civil remedies might be explored as part of the tapestry of police and non-police solutions. The views of the victim can be factored into training including the appropriateness of Restorative Justice in some cases (see Walters, 2014). Reflecting on work by the beat team can provide practical examples of where such strategies have been pursued effectively and where they have been unsuccessful and why. The work of the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel and the VPP will also be of assistance in these endeavours.

Alongside this a much improved range of resources and contact numbers needs to be provided to officers so that they can turn to these when dealing with victims in order to find other agencies to support them in investigations and safeguarding. Other agencies need to take a more proactive role here in helping to equip the police with information on their services and important points of contact as a lot of police time is spent chasing up other

agencies, often with little success. More be-spoke training and resources are needed for officers when out on the streets and a multi-agency approach should help us to build these resources using appropriate technology such as the use of an electronic tablet or mobile phone which officers can carry around with them which will enable them to access a resource base when they are out policing. Therefore, a multi-agency approach can assist us in building a technological resource kit such that can help officers them when they are advising victims and/or members of the public.

This should better help us in supporting victims; whilst officers were aware of Victim Support, the Victim's Charity, who can offer support to crime victims, they were much less aware of other agencies that could help them. At present too much time is taken up for police officers with seeking out information that should and could be at their fingertips.

As well as examining police relationships with multi-agency partners and the level of support that they offer, the Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel can help to assess where some people take up an enormous amount of police time and resources. Evaluation of such cases is desirable as the impact on already stretched police resources is considerable. This emphasis on multi-agency and scrutiny of cases can also help us to spell out the boundaries about what it is possible for the police to achieve and what is not. It is important to recognise the parameters of the policing role including the need to act within the law available and that prosecution is not always possible or desirable. Defining the parameters of what the police can and can't do and putting responsibility on other agencies where warranted is necessary.

This scrutiny can also help us to better inform the public on hate crime and help the police when interacting with the public. The public also need to be made aware of the huge variance in the police role and the pressures they are currently under. The police are *the* 24 hour emergency service – and unlike many other service providers they are available 24/7. But without the support of other agencies at nights and during weekends the police are simply unable to provide all the support that is needed in hate crimes and incidents. There needs to be a much greater recognition of these factors when considering multi-agency working and criticisms of the police.

With this in mind, and as the last component of a more 'holistic' emphasis in hate crime training which looks at hate crimes as a 'process' from start to finish, more attention must be paid to the role of the CPS. Communication from the CPS on the use of the uplift tariff would be helpful to officers and thought needs to be given to how such lines of communication

between the police and CPS could be opened up. If the CPS were to provide examples about cases where hostility has been proven and the factors involved, this would help build police knowledge and morale and also assist them in their communications with victims.

Alongside this, there needs to be better publicity about what is needed to prove a hate crime and what alternative courses of action are available to victims and what other organisations can help them. A point of note is that some officers lacked complete understanding of the status of homophobic and disability hate crimes, in that it was only the use of the uplift tariff that demonstrated it was a hate crime in practical terms. Whilst this was partly to do with training and lack of adequate exposure to disability hate crime, it was also to do with the limited information made available to officers on the use of the uplift tariff and outcomes of cases more generally.

There were many examples where police officers were left with no information about how a case had turned out which is not only bad for police morale, particularly in cases where they have worked extremely hard for victims, but is also unhelpful in terms of future investigations. Most importantly it is extremely detrimental for relationships between the police and the public who are often left disappointed and confused and feel they have been let down by the police because they did not get the prosecution they wanted.

On this point, there needs to be much greater transparency of the sentencing process which must be accompanied by improved public understanding of what factors are outside of police control such as charge changing, decisions reflecting the processing of court case loads, availability and competency of witnesses and lack of use of the uplift tariff. This information must be publicised alongside publicity about positive examples of policing on hate crime.

This means that a forum should be established by Nottinghamshire Police to facilitate the sharing of good practice and ways for police officers to draw on positive examples drawn from their own experiences. Success stories must be promoted so that members of the public get to know about them. There are many positive stories about good policing that the public simply never hear about.

Finally, therefore the police need to look at what is already working well such as the use of outside agencies and exposure to victims, Pegasus and the Triage car. The Triage car was particularly valued by police officers given the fact that a significant amount of police time is taken up with people with mental health issues either as victims, perpetrators or simply

ordinary members of the public. The expertise provided meant that the police officers saw this as a valuable resource; the Triage car was limited in terms of its availability however and a number of officers had not always been able to take advantage of it particularly at busy periods such as weekends.

The police force also needs to make better use of the many good examples of police work in Nottinghamshire on this area and to design it into their training packages. The incorporation of VPP panels, Case Conferencing examples and the work of Hate Crime Scrutiny Panels has been already been discussed. Most importantly, good training needs to make officers feel both valued and empowered – the issue of police morale is essential to receptivity to training.

To conclude, this research has suggested that we need to provide our police officers with considerably more support and resources for dealing with hate crime and incidents than we are currently doing.

Dr Loretta Trickett
8th June 2015
Updated 30th June 2016.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the evidence identified in this report there are a number of tangible ways to improve the effectiveness of hate crime training. Some of this can be done with little resourcing, whilst other suggested changes will require a greater level of resource commitment.

1. Dealing with HC effectively, requires a multi-agency approach. It is neither realistic (or equitable) to expect the police service to prevent and deal with HC – or indeed any social 'problem' – in a unilateral way. Police clearly have an important role to play, but this role has to be delivered in conjunction with others. Given this, training needs to take a more 'holistic' focus which reflects this multi-agency requirement. Therefore 'partners' (housing, NHS (esp. mental health), probation, CPS, amongst others) and communities (including victims/survivors) all need to be more actively involved in the design, delivery (co-training) and participation of HC training.

2. In relation to the previous point, senior managers should facilitate a paradigm shift whereby officers move away from seeing HC programmes as 'just another police training initiative', towards seeing this as a 'quality of life' and community (policing) cohesion issue requiring intelligent and joined-up multi-agency training strategies. There is some evidence from Beat Managers and PCSOs to suggest that they do see this but this comes from their conception of their roles in the police rather than from the training on hate crime. To help make this switch, there may be some value in HC training taking place away from police facilities. Most obviously, training could utilise community venues. Consider co-training with 'partner' organisations (especially housing).

3. Training needs to be much more skills based and there needs to be a greater emphasis on 'why' officers are doing the training and 'how' these skills might benefit them in their daily policing

4. Training for the police on procedures and risk assessment needs to place a greater weight on the 'Why' rather than on the 'How' so that there is a less formulaic approach to doing risk assessments. With this in mind, it would help if training on risk assessment could be informed by actual cases from VPPs and/or Case Conferencing in order to provide proper context (Cross reference points 1 and 2). Attention also needs

to be given to the current design of the generic ASB/Hate Crime risk assessment forms given the shortcomings highlighted by the officers in this study.

5. There is a need to select and recruit local community trainers with a proven track record of delivering relevant, impactful and innovative HC/community cohesion training. Such training needs to provide officers with opportunities to meaningfully engage in the sessions

6. Community members should have more opportunities to develop and design appropriate training programmes. Training should use experience to generate meaningful, quality examples/exercises. Again, empathy should be at the heart of the training experience. Whilst empathy is 'key' there is no magic formula for dealing with disabled people as empathy is needed in dealing with all victims. What is important for building empathy with disabled people however to recognise and respond to their needs and this must be where training is focused. In terms of Disability Hate Crime, whilst officers cannot be trained on all types of disability, there is scope for more 'bespoke' training in this area to help achieve this (Cross ref, 12)

7. There needs to be much more emphasis and better use of visual imagery and role plays. Where NCALT is used, this should NOT be used to replace face-to-face training, but to compliment it and provide a resource for officers to go back to

8. It is important that ongoing evaluation of training takes place. This evaluation might even include the input of relevant community members/organisations - but accountability of all organisations has to be maximised. As a point of reference, communities (especially those affected by hostility) are the ultimate arbiters of success. However, we need to decide what success in hate crime looks like when considering such evaluations. Therefore, training needs to be accompanied by an awareness campaign for the general public about the range of possible interventions in hate crimes and incidents rather than simply an emphasis on prosecution. There also needs to be an emphasis on multi-agency responses to the problem and the roles and responsibilities of other organisations as well as the police in working towards victim satisfaction. Examples of good policing and practices need to be maximised in order to demonstrate both to the police and the public when they have done a good job which will help with

relations between the police and the communities that they serve, as well as increasing police morale and receptivity to training. Within this multi-agency training the huge range of demands on the police and the parameters of their role must be acknowledged and the responsibilities of other agencies promoted.

9. The CPS could help considerably by providing information on why and in what circumstances cases come to court (use anonymous examples of cases that did (not) meet the threshold and why) and how the sentence uplift works and why this is important. Different examples of how hostility can be established in cases such as 'mate crime' are also needed. Any initiatives to facilitate this sharing of information between the CPS and the police service are to be welcomed.

10. Authenticity – victims/survivors accounts (positive and negative) need to be included in training design. Opportunities for meeting victims from the different hate crime strands should be maximised

11. For training to be effective, there have to be opportunities for honest – but controlled – discussion. This is especially pertinent when considering potential antipathy towards HC as a concept (or the often 'blurred lines' that exist in this area) and the legislation that exists to deal with it. We should remember that officers will come into this training domain with their own prejudices/misconceptions about the legislative response to hostility, its perceived lack of importance (in much the same way that DV was seen as 'just a domestic'…much could be learnt about how the police service have re-designed their training towards DV) and the role of other organisations in dealing with and preventing HC. Challenging these prejudices is imperative for the delivery of effective training interventions. Yet we also needed to recognise where some of these perceptions come from and this is not to say that officers in this study did not feel that hate crime was important. However, officers dealt with much less hate crime than other types of offences which often gave them much less exposure to the people that might be affected by it. Moreover, the receptivity of officers to hate crime training was greatly affected by the mode and context of training delivery in this area and as we have seen, there are many ways that this can be tackled.

12. A far greater range of resources needs to be made available to the police including information on identifying disability and communicating with victims and how to safeguard them. Much better use of technology is needed here which could build on the design of Pegasus and Pocket Comms. Currently officers have to spend a lot of time trying to find this information and chasing up other agencies for it. A database for officers which can be stored on an electronic device needs to be developed and other agencies have a key role to play in helping with the design and production of the information that it requires.

Bibliography

ACPO (2012) *Response to Disability Harassment Inquiry*, NPIA National Policy Improvement Agency.
https://www.google.co.uk/?gws_rd=ssl#q=acpo+hidden+in+plain+sight+response, accessed December 29th 2015, 10.25 GMT

Action for Blind People (2008) *Report on Verbal and Physical Abuse Towards Blind and Partially Sighted People Across the UK*. London: Action for Blind People. http.www.actionforblindpeople.org.uk/abuse-survey,484,SA.html   Accessed 18/12/2015, 9.55 GMT.

Allen, C., Isakjee, A. and Young, O. (2013) *Understanding the impact of Anti-Muslim Hate on Muslim Women*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Allport, G. W. (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice*, Reading, MA: Addison—Wesley

Asquith, N. L. (2009) The harms of verbal and textual hatred, in *The Consequences of Hate Crime*, Praeger, Westport, Conn., pp.161-174.

Asquith, N. L. & Thorneycroft, R. (2015) *The Dark Figure of Disablist Violence*, The Howard Journal, 54:5, 489 – 507.

Awan, I. (2014) 'Islamophobia on Twitter: a Typology of Online Hate Against Muslims on Social Media' *Policy and Internet* 6 (2): 133 – 150.

Awan, I. and Zempi, I. (2015) We Fear for Our Lives: Offline and Online Experiences of Anti-Muslim Hostility, TELL MAMA.

Balderston, S. (2013). After Disablist Hate Crime: Which Interventions Really Work to Resist Victimhood and Build Resilience With Survivors? In A. Roulstone & H. Mason -Bish (Eds.) *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence*, Oxon: Routledge.

Barnes, C. (2010). A Brief History of Discrimination and Disabled People. In L. J. Davis, (Ed.), *The Disability Studies Reader* (3rd ed.) New York: Routledge

Bartkowiak-Théron, I. and Asquith, N. L. (2012) The extraordinary intricacies of policing vulnerability, *Australasian Policing : A Journal of Professional Practice and Research*, 4 (2) Summer, 43-49.

BBC News, Anti-Islam Hate Crimes triple in London after Paris Attacks. 4th December, 2015

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-34995431, accessed 4th January 2016, 20.10 GMT

BBC News, Jo Cox died for her views her widower tells BBC, 21st June 2016, 17:09 BST

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-36590824, accessed 22nd June 2016, 12.30 BST

Beadle-Brown, J., Richardson, L. Guest, C. Malovic, A. Bradshaw, J. & Himmerich, J (2014) *Living in Fear*. Main Research Report
http://www.mcch.org.uk/pages/multimedia/db_document.document?id=8009

Accessed 21st December 2015, 10:25 GMT

Belfast Telegraph (2016) Death Threat Shadow Minister Pat Glass will not stand again as MP, 28th June.

http://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/uk/death-threats-shadow-minister-pat-glass-will-not-stand-again-as-mp-34841073.html, accessed 16:47 BST June 28th 2016.

Birzer, M. L. and Tannehill, R. (2001) A More Effective Training Approach for Contemporary Policing, *Police Quarterly*, 4 (2) 233 – 252.

Birzer, M. L. (2003) The theory of andragogy applied to police training, *Policing*: *An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 26 (1) 29 – 42.

Blaikie, N. (2009) *Designing Social Research*, 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Policy Pres.

Bowling, B. (2003) 'Racial harassment and the process of victimization: conceptual and methodological implications for the local crime survey', *British Journal of Criminology*, 33, 231-50.

Bowling, B. (2009) "Violent Racism: Victimisation, Policing and Social Context" in Williams, B. and Goodman-Chong, H. (eds) *Victims and Victimisation: A Reader*, Maidenhead: OUP.

British Transport Police – Advice and Information on how we tackle hate crime.

http://www.btp.police.uk/advice_and_information/how_we_tackle_crime/hate_crime.aspx, accessed 11th November 2015, 20.10 GMT

Brookfield, S. (1986) *Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning*, San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (1995) *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*, San Franscico: Jossey Bass Inc.

Caffarella, R. S. (1993) Self-directed learning, in Merriam, S. (Ed) *An Update on Adult Learning Theory, New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, San-Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Casianni. D (2016) PM condemns 'despicable' post EU referendum Hate Crimes', *BBC News*, 27th June,

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36643213, accessed 27th June, 11:35 BST.

Chakraborti, N. (2009) A Glass Half Full? Assessing the Progress in the Policing of Hate Crime, *Policing*, 3 (2) 1 - 8.

Chakraborti, N. (2010) 'Crimes against the "other": conceptual, operational, and empirical challenges for hate studies', *Journal of Hate Studies*, 8, 9 – 28.

Chakraborti, N., and Garland, J. (eds) (2010) *Hate Crime: Concepts, Policing, Future Directions*, Collumpton: Willan.

Chakraborti, N. & Garland, J. (2012) 'Reconceptualizing hate crime victimization through the lens of vulnerability and "difference"', *Theoretical Criminology*, 16, 499 – 514.

Chakraborti, N. & Garland, J. (2013) (eds 3rd Ed) *Rural Racism*, London: Routledge.

Chakraborti, N., Garland, J. & Hardy, S. (2014) *Victims' Manifesto: The Leicester Hate Crime Project*, Leicester: University of Leicester.

Chakraborti, N. and Garland, J. (2015) 2nd Ed. *Hate Crime: Impact, Causes, Responses*. London: Sage

Chakraborti, N. and Garland, J. (eds) (2015) *Responding to Hate Crime: The Case for Connecting Policy and Research*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Chakrabortty, V. (2016). After a campaign scarred by bigotry, it's become OK to be racist in Britain, *The Guardian*, Tuesday 28th June, 07:00 BST.

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jun/28/campaign-bigotry-racist-britain-leave-brexit, accessed 28 June, 10:30 BST.

Chan, J. (1996) Changing Police Culture, *British Journal of Criminology*, 36 (1) 109 – 134.

Chan, J. (2007), Police Stress and Occupational Culture, in O'Neill, M., Marks, M. & Singh, A. (eds.) *Police Occupational Culture (Sociology of Crime, Law and Deviance, Volume 8)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Charles, M. T. (2000*) Police Training Breaking All the Rules: Implementing the Adult Education Model into Police Training*, Charles C. Thomas Publishing, Springfield, II.

CJJI, Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorate Review. *Living in a Different World,* (March 2013)

https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmic/media/a-joint-review-of-disability-hate-crime-living-in-a-different-world-20130321.pdf, accessed 12th December 2015, 12.10 GMT.

CJJI, *Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorate Review on Disability Hate Crime*, follow-up inquiry (May 2015)

https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/cjji/inspections/joint-review-of-disability-hate-crime/, accessed 12th December 2015, 17:35 GMT

Clement, S. et al (2011) Disability health crime and targeted violence and hostility: A mental health and discrimination perspective, *Journal of Mental Health*, 20 (3), 219 – 225.

College of Policing (2014) *Hate Crime Strategy*

http://www.report-it.org.uk/files/national_policing_hate_crime_strategy.pdf, accessed 12th December 2015, 9:45 GMT

College of Policing *(May 2014) Hate Crime Operational Guidance.*

http://www.report-it.org.uk/files/hate_crime_operational_guidance.pdf, accessed 12th December 2015, 10:20 GMT

Compton, M. J. et al (2006) Crisis intervention team training: Changes in knowledge, attitudes and stigma related to Schizophrenia, *ps.psychiatryonline*.org, 57 (8), 1199 – 1202.

Cotton, J. (1995), *The Theory of Learners: An Introduction*, Kogan-Page: London.

Crerar, P. (2016) Sadiq Khan issues rallying cry to Londoners after Brexit vote triggers surge in Hate Crime, *The Evening Standard*, Monday 27th June 2016

Cresci, E. (2016) Britons urged to wear safety pins in solidarity with immigrants, *The Guardian,* Wednesday 29th June, 11: 56 BST,

http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/29/britons-urged-to-wear-safety-pins-in-solidarity-with-immigrants-safetypin, Accessed 30th June, 20:09 BST

Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) (2010) *Guidance on the distinction between vulnerability and hostility in the context of crimes committed against disabled people.* 17th March 2010. From: http://www.cps.gov.uk/legal/d_to_g/disability_hate_crime_/#content#

Accessed 21st November 2015, 13.23 GMT

Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) *Disability Hate Crime Action Plan*

http://www.cps.gov.uk/publications/docs/disability_hate_crime_action_plan_2014.pdf, accessed 21st November 2015, 10.15 GMT

Dawes, R., Mansell, I. Northway, R. & Jenkins, R. (2006) Responding to the abuse of people with learning disabilities: the role of the police, *The Journal of Adult Protection*, 8 (1), 11 – 19.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage: Thousand Oaks USA.

Department of Health, Final Report (2012) Transforming Care: *A National Response to Winterbourne View Hospital.*

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/winterbourne-view-hospital-department-of-health-review-and-response, accessed 10th December 2015, 15.42 GMT

Disability News Service, Hate Crime Failure by Police was 'institutionalised disabilism', September 2nd, 2009.

http://www.disabilitynewsservice.com/hate-crime-failure-by-police-was-institutional-disablism/, accessed 12th December 2015, 20.25 GMT

Donnelly, E., 'Hate Crimes Against Travellers' (2002). *Criminal Justice Matters*, 48 (1), 24 - 25.

ECDP (2010) Disability Hate Crime: Discussion Paper. Downloaded from: http://www.ecdp.org.uk/home/2010/4/16/disability-hate-crime-an-ecdp-discussion-paper.html Accessed on 29th November 2015, 20.08 GMT

Elias, J. L. & Merriam, S. B. (1995), *Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education, Krieger Publishing Company*, Malabar, FL.

Emerson, E. & Roulstone, A. (2014) 'Developing an evidence base for violent and disablist hate crime in Britain: findings from a life opportunities survey', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29, 1 - 19.

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2011) *Hidden in Plain Sight*

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/documents/disabilityfi/ehrc_hidden_in_plain_sight_3.pdf, accessed 23rd December 2015, 11.15 GMT

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2012) *"Out in the open: A manifesto for change."* http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/inquiries-and-assessments/inquiry-into-disability-related-harassment/out-in-the-open-manifesto-for-change/, accessed 21st December 2015, 10.15 GMT

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2013) "*Out in the Open: Progress Report*.http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/documents/publications/manifesto_for_change_progress_report_2013_final.pdf, accessed 21st December 11.00 GMT

European Directive on Minimum Standard for Victims of Crime, Directive 2012/29/EU

http://ec.europa.eu/justice/criminal/victims/rights/index_en.htm

Evans, M. (2013) Hate Crimes to include attacks on punks, goths and metallers. *The Telegraph*, 3rd April 2013, 7.34 GMT accessed 16 January, 11.00 GMT

Fenwick, T., Seville, E. & Brunsdon, D. (2009) *Reducing the impact of organisational silos on resilience: A report on the impact of silos on resilience and how the impacts might be reduced*. University of Canterbury, Engineering Working Paper [16]

http://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/9468

Galbraith, M. W. (1988) "Becoming an effective teacher of adults", in Galbraith, M. W. (Ed), *Adult Learning Methods*, Malabar, FL, 3 – 19: Krieger Publishing.

Giannasi, P. (2014) Policing and Hate Crime in Hall, N; Corb, A; Giannasi, P and Grieve, J (eds) *The Routledge International Handbook on Hate Crime,* Oxon: Routledge.

Giannasi, P. (2015) The Narrative for Change: How Disability become included in UK Hate Crime Policy in Shah, R., and Giannasi, P. (eds) *Tackling Disability Harassment and Disability Hate Crime: A Multi-Disciplinary Guide*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Goodey, J. (1997) *Boys don't Cry: Masculinities, Fear of Crime and Fearlessness*, The British Journal of Criminology, 37 (3) 401-418.

Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Law and the Humanitieshttps://graduateschool.nd.edu/assets/21765/guidelinesresearchethicsinthesocialscienceslawhumanities.pdf, accessed January 16 2015.

Hall, N. (2012). Policing Hate Crime in London and New York City: Some Reflections on the Factors Influencing Effective Law Enforcement, Service Provisions and Public Trust and Confidence. *International Review of Victimology*, 18:1 73-87.

Hall, N. (2013). *Hate Crime*, (2nd Ed) Oxon: Routledge.

Hamilton, P. & Trickett, L. (2014) Disability Hostility, Harassment and Violence in the UK in Hall, N; Corb, A; Giannasi, P and Grieve, J (eds) *The Routledge International Handbook on Hate Crime,* Oxon: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. (2002) The Relationship between Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Paradigm Loyalty versus Methodological Eclecticism, in Richardson, J. T. E. (ed) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences,* Oxford: Blackwell, 159 – 174.

Hanes, E., and Machin, S. (2014) 'Hate Crime in the Wake of Terror Attacks: Evidence from 7/7 and 9/11' *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 30: 247 – 267.

Harre, R. N. (2001) The making of a community policing officer: The impact of basic training and socialization on police recruits, *Police Quarterly*, 4 (4), 402-433

Healy, J. (2015) Why don't we recognise disability hate crime? *International Network of Hate Studies*, 20th March 2015

http://www.internationalhatestudies.com/dont-recognise-disability-hate-crime/, accessed 20th March, 23:00 GMT

Herrington, V. & Pope, R. (2014) The impact of police training in mental health: an example from Australia, *Policing and Society*, 24 (5) 501 – 552.

Heslop, R. (2011) Community engagement and learning as 'becoming':findings from a study of British Police Recruit Training. *Policing and Society*, 21 (2), 327-342.

HM Government (2012) Challenge it, Report it, Stop it.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97849/action-plan.pdf, accessed 12 January 2016.

HM Government (2014) Challenge it, Report it, Stop it: Delivering the Government's Hate Crime Action Plan,

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/307624/Hate

CrimeActionPlanProgressReport.pdf, accessed 13 January 2016.

HM Govt (Nov 2013) *Government's progress on the recommendations from the ECHR Inquiry into disability related harassment*.

HMIC. (2011). *Demanding Times: The Front Line and Police Visibility* https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmic/media/demanding-times-062011.pdf, accessed 13th November 2015, 21.15

HMIC. (2012). *Policing in Austerity: One Year On*

https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmic/media/policing-in-austerity-one-year-on.pdf, *Accessed 12th November 2015, 14.06 GMT*

HMIC (2013) Response to EHRC Manifesto for Change.

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/uploads/documents/DHI2013/hmic_response.pdf

Hollomotz, A. (2013). Disability and the Continuum of Violence. In A.

Roulstone, & H. Mason-Bish (Eds.), *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence*, Oxon: Routledge

Hollomotz, A. (2013) 'Disability, Oppression and violence: towards a sociological explanation', *Sociology,* 47, 477 – 93.

Holloway, S. L. (2005) Articulating Otherness? White Rural Residents talk about Gypsy-Travellers. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30 (3) 351 – 367

Home Office, Hate Crimes England and Wales 2013-2014.
https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/hate-crimes-england-and-wales-2013-to-2014, accessed 10 January 2016.

Home Office, Hate Crimes England and Wales 2014-2015.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/467366/hosb0515.pdf, accessed 10 January 2016.

Home Office, Hate Crimes CSEW, 2012 – 2015.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/467366/hosb0515.pdf, accessed 12th December 2015.

Iganski, P. (2001) Hate Crimes Hurt More, *American Behavioural Scientist*, 45 (4) 626 – 638.

Iganski, P. (2008) *Hate Crime and the City*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Iganski, P. (2009) (Ed), *Hate Crimes: The Consequences of Hate Crime*, Vol. 2, CT..Praeger.

IPCC (Independent Police Complaints Commission) (May, 2011) IPCC publishes Fiona Pilkington Investigation Report.

https://www.ipcc.gov.uk/news/ipcc-publishes-fiona-pilkington-investigation-report, accessed 12th November 2015, 12.45 GMT

Jacobs, J. And Potter, K. (1998) *Hate Crimes: Criminal Law and Identity Politics*, New York: Oxford University Press.

James, Z., (2014), Hate Crimes Against Gypsies, Travellers and Roma in Europe in Hall, N; Corb, A; Giannasi, P; Grieve, J. (eds) *The International Handbook of Hate Crime*, Oxon: Routledge.

James, Z. and Simmonds, L. (2013) Exploring Prejudice: Managing Hate Crime in the South West of England, *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 15 (4) 241 – 257.

James, Z. (2014) Policing Hate Crime Against Gypsies and Travellers: Dealing with the Dark Side in Chakraborti, N. and Garland, J. (eds) *Responding to Hate Crime: The Case for Connecting Policy and Research,* Routledge: Oxon.

James, Z. (2007) Policing Marginal Spaces: Controlling Gypsies and Travellers, *Criminology and Criminal Justice,* 7 (4) 367 – 389.

Jeory, T. (2016) UK entering 'uncharted territory' of Islamophobia after Brexit vote: Tell Mam report 326% increase since 2015 – and warns Brexit could make it worse, *The Independent*, 27th June 2016,

http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/brexit-muslim-racism-hate-crime-islamophobia-eu-referendum-leave-latest-a7106326.html, accessed 28th June, 08:32 BST

Jones, O. (2016) On Sky News last night I realised just how far some people will go to deny homophobia, *The Guardian*,13th June, 12:02 BST.

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jun/13/sky-news-homophobia-orlando-sexuality, accessed 14th June 17.50 BST

Jones, T. and Newburn, T. (2001), *Widening Access: Improving Police Relations with hard to reach groups,* Home Office, Police Research Series, Paper 138.

Karp, S. And Stenmark, H., (2011), Learning to be a police officer: Tradition and change in the training and professional lives of police officers, *Police Practice and Research*, 12 (1), 4-15.

Kerley-Kent, R. and Benson, M.I. (2000), "Does community-policing help build stronger communities?" *Police Quarterly*, 3 (1), 46 – 69.

Khaleeli, H. (2016) 'A frenzy of hatred': how to understand Brexit racism, *The Guardian*, Wed 29th June, 17:07 BST

http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/29/frenzy-hatred-brexit-racism-abuse-referendum-celebratory-lasting-damage, accessed 30th June, 08:23 BST

Khalifeh, H., Howard, L., Osborn, D., Moran, P., & Johnson, S. (2013). *Violence against people with disability in England and Wales: findings from a national cross-sectional survey.* PL o S One , 8(2), doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0055952. Downloaded on 12th November 2015, 10.20 GMT.

Knowles, . S. (1980), *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy*, Chicago, II: Follett.

Knowles, M. (1990), *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species*, Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Knowles, M. S. (1984), *Andragogy in Action*, San-Franciso, C.A.: Jossey-Bass.

Landman, R. (2014) 'A counterfeit friendship': Mate Crime and People with Learning Disabilities. *The Journal of Adult Protection*, 16, 6: 355 – 366.

Laville, S. (2016) Research reveals huge scale of social media misogyny, The Guardian, 26th May 08:14 BST

https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/may/25/yvette-cooper-leads-cross-party-campaign-against-online-abuse, accessed June 10th, 12.30 BST

Law Commission (24th May 2014) *Hate Crime: Should the current offences be extended?* Summary of Final Report.

http://www.lawcom.gov.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2015/03/lc348_hate_crime_english_summary .pdf, accessed December 3rd 2015, 21.05 GMT

Leicester Hate Crime Project (2014)

http://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/research/copy_of_project accessed 12th December 2015, 13.05.

Lewin, B. (2007) Who cares about disabled victims of crime? Barriers and facilitators for redress, *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 4 (3) 170 – 176.

LGiU (2012-2015) Policy Briefing Document, Gypsies and Travellers: two new Government Reports.

http://www.lgiu.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Gypsies-and-Travellers-two-new-government-reports.pdf, accessed 15th January 2016, 14.29

Loftus, B. (2008) Dominant culture interrupted recognition, resentment and the politics of change in an English Police force. *British Journal of Criminology*, 48 (6), 756 – 777.

Loftus, B. (2010) Police occupational culture: An International Journal of Research and Policy, *Policing and Society*, 20 (1), 1 – 20.

Marsh, S. (2016) My family doesn't feel safe here anymore: Eastern Europeans on Brexit, *The Guardian*, 27th June,

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jun/27/family-safe-eastern-europeans-brexit-britain-eu-referendum, accessed 27th June, 13:25 BST, accessed 19.08 BST

Mason-Bish, H. (2013) Conceptual issues in the construction of disability hate crime, in Roulstone & Mason-Bish, H. (Eds). *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence* pp11-24. London: Routledge

Mason, G. (2005) Hate Crime and the Image of the Stranger. *British Journal of Criminology* 45 (6): 837-859.

Matharu, H. (2015) New Police Officers may need a 'degree in policing' to join the ranks in the future, *The Independent*, November 13th, accessed 21st December 15, 10:05 GMT

Matthews, M.A. (1995), The ever changing face of the adult learner", *Adult Learning*, 7 (2), November/December, 19 – 30.

McAfee, J. & Musso, S. L. (1995) Training police officers about persons with disabilities: A 50 state analysis, *Remedial and Special Education*, 16 (1) 53 – 63.

Mencap (2009) *Living in Fear*

https://www.mencap.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/2009-10/Livinginfear.pdf

Accessed 15th November 2015, 21.34

Mencap, (2011) *Stand by Me.*

https://www.mencap.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/SBM%20Easy%20read%20guide%20vrn2.pdf, accessed 12th November 2015, 21.40

Mencap, (2012) *How to Stand by Me.*

https://www.mencap.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/How%20to%20stand%20by%20me.pdf, accessed 12th November 2015, 22.30 GMT

Merriam, S. B. and Caffarella, R. S. (1999), *Learning in Adulthood*, 2nd ed, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Micklewaite, J. (2016) Police probe 'Racist signs distributed after Brexit Vote in EU Referendum', *The Evening Standard*, Sun 26th June.

Ministry of Justice, *Code of Practice for Victims of Crime*, 2015. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/476900/code-of-practice-for-victims-of-crime.PDF accessed 28 January 2016.

Ministry of Justice, *The Witness Charter: Standards of Care for Witnesses in the Criminal Justice System*, December 2013. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/264627/witness-charter-nov13.pdf, accessed 29 January 2016.

Morris, N. (2016) Crime figures rise sharply amid fears gang members becoming more ruthless in an attempt to secure territory: Increase in number of murders is due to surge in London and the South East, *The Independent*, Thursday 21st January, 2016 http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/crime-figures-rise-sharply-amid-fears-gang-members-becoming-more-ruthless-in-attempt-to-secure-a6826246.html, accessed 22nd January, 2016, 14.00 GMT

Morris, S (2015) Harassed then beaten to death, Bijan Ebrahimi's calls for help were in vain, *The Guardian*, 21st December, 18:01 GMT

http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/dec/21/harassed-then-beaten-to-death-bijan-ebrahimis-calls-for-help-were-in-vain, accessed 23rd December 2015, 19.20 GMT

Mortimer, C (2015). Hate Crime Against Disabled People rises 41 per cent in one year, *The Independent*, 8th November 2015.

http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/hate-crime-against-disabled-people-rises-41-per-cent-in-one-year-a6713546.html, accessed 20th November 2015, 17.34 GMT

Muslim Council of Britain, 27th June 2016, *Concern raised over post referendum division and hate crimes*

http://www.mcb.org.uk/concern-raised-over-post-referendum-division-and-hate-crimes/, accessed 28th June 2016, 21:00 BST

Ness, J. (1991) The relevance of basic law enforcement training: Does it prepare recruits for police work? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19, 181 – 193,

Neyroud, P. (QPM) (2010) *Review of Police Leadership and Training Report.*

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/police-leadership-and-training-report-review, accessed 16th December 2015, 20.15 GMT

Nixon, J. et al (2007), Anti-Social Behaviour and Disability, *People, Place and Policy on-line*, 2 (1) 37 – 47.

Novis, A (2013) Disability Hate Crime: A Campaign Perspective in A. Roulstone, & H. Mason-Bish (Eds.), *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence*, Oxon: Routledge.

O, Hara, M. (2016) Why are the police failing too many victims of disability hate crime? Daniel Smith an autistic man was charged with assault by police after an alleged attack on him, his is not an isolated case, *The Guardian*, 29th June, 07:30 BST

https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/jun/29/police-failing-victims-disability-hate-crime-daniel-smith, accessed 30th June, 07:45 BST

Oliver, W.M. (2000), "The third generation of community-policing: moving through innovation, diffusion, and institutionalization", *Police Quarterly*, 3 (4), 367-88.

Oliver, W. (2001), *Community Orientated Policing: A Systematic Approach to Policing*, 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Orrod, J.E. (1995) *Human Learning*, (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill Publishing.

Ortmeier, P.J. (1997), |"Leadership for community-policing: a study to identify essential officer competencies", *The Police Chief*, Vol. LXIV, No. 10, 88-96.

Paddy Tipping Wins – PCC Election Results in, *West Bridgford Wire*, May 6th 2016, 4.00 p.m.

Palmiotto, M. J. (2000), *Community Policing: A New Strategy for the 21st Century*, Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishing.

Palmiotto, M. J., Birzer, M. I. And Unnithan, N. P. (2000), "Training in community-policing: a suggested curriculum", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23 (1), 8 – 21.

Paoline III, E. A. (2003) Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31, 199-214.

Parveen, N. & Sherwood, H. (2016) Police report fivefold increase in hate crimes since Brexit result, *The Guardian*, 30th June 18:38 BST

https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jun/30/police-report-fivefold-increase-race-hate-crimes-since-brexit-result, accessed 30th June, 19:00 BST

Perry, B. (2001) *In the Name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crimes*, London: Routledge.

Perry, J. (2013) 'The wrong war? Critically examining the "fight against disability hate crime"', in: A. Roulstone and H. Mason-Bish (Eds.), *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Pettitt, B., Greenhead, S., Khalifeh, H., Drennan, V., Hart, T., Hogg, J., Borschmann, R., Mamo, E. & Moran, P. (2013) *At risk, yet dismissed: The criminal victimisation of people with mental health problems*. London: Victim Support & Mind.

Piggott, L. (2011), Prosecuting Disability Hate Crime: A Disabling Solution? *People, Place and Policy Online*, 5: 1 25-34.

Press Association (2016) Man jailed over keeping slave, Dorset Echo, 7th Jan, http://www.dorsetecho.co.uk/news/national/news/10919080.Man_jailed_for_keeping__slave, accessed 7th Jan 2016, 20:08 GMT

Press Association (2016), Man held in London over alleged racist posts on social media: Police say investigation relates to posts of an extreme rightwing, Islamophobic and Antisemitic nature, *The Guardian*, 29th June, 13:15 BST

https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jun/29/man-arrested-london-alleged-racist-social-media-posts, accessed 29th June, 21:55 BST

Pring, J. (2014) *Criminal Justice System should do more on Disability Hate Crime, says policing expert*, Feb 21st.

http://www.disabilitynewsservice.com/criminal-justice-system-should-do-more-on-disability-hate-crime-says-police-expert/ accessed January 12th 2016, 20.08 GMT

Pring, J (2013) Bijan Ebrahimi murder: killings 'bear hallmarks of notorious hate crime killings', November 1st 2013

http://www.disabilitynewsservice.com/bijan-ebrahimi-murder-killing-bears-hallmarks-of-notorious-hate-crime-killings/, accessed January 12th 2016, 20:58 GMT

Pring, J. (2014) *South Yorkshire Police left isolated over hate crime failure*, Jan 24th

http://www.disabilitynewsservice.com/south-yorkshire-police-left-isolated-over-hate-crime-failure/, accessed January 12th 2016, 20:38 GMT

Pring, J. (2015) *Trio who 'avoided hate crime sentence for a second time' show law is a joke*, March 14th 2015,

http://longcaresurvivors.co.uk/2015/03/14/trio-who-avoided-hate-crime-sentence-for-second-time-show-law-is-a-joke/, accessed January 12th 2016, 20.08 GMT

Pring, J. (2015) About Access...for an inclusive world. *Police misconduct convictions 'show need for hate crime action.'* 23rd December 2015

http://www.aboutaccess.co.uk/access-news/police-misconduct-convictions-show-need-for-hate-crime-action/ accessed 29th December 2015, 14.32

Pring, J. (2015) Disabled Go News, *Police Misconduct Convictions 'show need for hate crime action.'*

http://www.disabledgo.com/blog/2016/01/police-misconduct-convictions-show-need-for-hate-crime-action/, 6th Jan 2016, accessed 19th January 2016, 15.22 GMT

Pring, J. (2015) *Justice System allows another murderer to escape a hate crime sentence*,

http://www.disabilitynewsservice.com/justice-system-allows-another-murderer-to-escape-a-hate-crime-sentence/, 29th May 2015, accessed 16th January, 2016, 10.05 GMT.

Pring, J. (2015) *CPS set for controversial action on Disability Hate Crime*

http://www.disabilitynewsservice.com/cps-set-for-controversial-action-on-disability-hate-crime/, July 17th, accessed on 12th December 2015, 14.23 GMT

Quarmby, K. (2007) *Getting Away with Murder*: *Disabled people's experiences of Hate Crime in the UK*, Scope.

http://www.scope.org.uk/Scope/media/Images/Publication%20Directory/Getting-away-with-murder.pdf, accessed 12th December 2015, 20:10 GMT

Quarmby, K. (2011) *Scapegoat: Why are we failing disabled people?* Portobello Press: London.

Quarmby, K. (2013) *No place to call home: inside the real lives of Gypsies and Travellers*. Oneworld: London.

Quinn, B. (2016) Yvette Cooper alerts police after Twitter death threat against family members, *The Guardian*, Wednesday 22nd June :18 BST 08:08 BST

http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/22/yvette-cooper-receives-death-threat-online-against-family, accessed 23rd June, 10.20 BST

Ramirez, S. M. (1996), "The need for a new learning culture in law enforcement", *The Police Chief*, Vol. LXII No. 11, 24 – 26.

Randeep R. (2016) Racism is spreading like arsenic in the water supply, *The Guardian,* Tuesday 28TH June, 15:48 BST.

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jun/28/racism-neo-nazis-britain, accessed 28th June, 16.21 BST

Reclaim the Internet: The web we want

http://www.reclaimtheinternet.com/, June 20th 2016, 20:30 BST.

Reiner, R. (2010) *The Politics of the Police*, 4th Ed, Oxford: OUP.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J. McNaughton Nicholls, C. and Ormston, R. (2014) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers* 2nd Edition, London: Sage.

Roberts, C., Innes, M., Williams, M., Tregidga, J. & Gadd, D. (2013) *Understanding who commits hate crime and why they do it*. Welsh Government Social Research No 38/2013.

Robertson, D. (2016), Call the Orlando shooting what it was: a homophobic hate crime not an 'attack on us all' *The Independent*, Monday 13th June, 10:15 BST

http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/orlando-shooting-pulse-florida-not-attack-on-us-all-owen-jones-homophobic-anti-gay-crime-omar-mateen-a7079221.html, accessed 14th June, 11:45 BST

Roulstone, A., Thomas, P. And Balderstone, S. (2011) 'Between hate and vulnerability unpacking the British criminal justice system's construction of disablist hate crime', *Disability and Society*, 26, 351 – 64.

Roulstone, A. & Mason-Bish, H. (2013) (Eds). *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence*. Abingdon: Routledge

Roulstone, A. & Sadique, K. (2013) Vulnerable to misinterpretation: Disabled people, 'vulnerability', hate crime and the fight for legal recognition, in Roulstone & Mason-Bish, H. (Eds). *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Rowe, M., and Garland, J. (2010) "Have you been diversified yet?": Developments in Police and Community and Race Relations Training in England and Wales, *Policing and Society*, 13 (4), 399 – 411.

Scior, K., Kan, K. McLoughlin, A. & Sheridan, J. (2010) Public attitudes towards people with Intellectual Disabilities: A Cross-Cultural Study, *American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities,* 48 (4) 278 – 289.

Scior, K. (2011) Public Awareness, attitudes and beliefs regarding Intellectual Disabilities: A Systematic Review, *Research in Developmental Disabilities,* 32 (6) 2164 – 2182.

Scior, K. (2015) Are attitudes changing towards the 1.6 million people in the UK with a Learning Disability? *The Conversation*, 27TH August , 2015 6.37 BST.

https://theconversation.com/are-attitudes-changing-to-the-1-4m-people-in-the-uk-with-a-learning-disability-46575, accessed 29th August, 12:20 BST

We need to confront the ignorance surrounding learning disabilities, The Guardian reporting on Katrina Scior in The Conversation, Friday 28th August 2015, 10:42 BST

http://www.theguardian.com/profile/katrina-scior, accessed 29th August, 12:08 BST

Scott, J. (2016) Hundreds gather in Old Market Square to call for unity after Brexit Vote, *The Nottingham Post*, June 28th 2016,

http://www.nottinghampost.com/hundreds-gather-in-old-market-square-to-call-for-unity-after-brexit-vote/story-29454583-detail/story.html, accessed 29th June, 07:55 BST

Sentencing Guidelines Council

https://www.sentencingcouncil.org.uk/explanatory-material/item/aggravating-and-mitigating-factors/, accessed 20th December 2015, 11.01 GMT

Shah. R. & Giannasi, P. (2015) (eds) *Tackling Disability Harassment and Disability Hate Crime: A Multi-Disciplinary Guide*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Sharp, H. (2001), Steps Towards Justice for People with Learning Disabilities as Victims of Crime: the Important Role of the Police. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 29:1 88 – 92.

Sheikh, S., Pralat, R., Reed, C., & Sin, C. H. (2010) *Don't Stand By - Ending Disability Hate Crime Together*: Hate Crime Research Report.

http://www.mencap.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Stand%20by%20me%20 research%20report.pdf, accessed on 22nd November 2015, 21.10 GM.

Sherry, M (2011) Disability Hate Crime: Does anyone really hate disabled people? *Contemporary Sociology 40 (5) 619 -620.*

Sherry, M. (2013) International perspectives on disability hate crime, in Roulstone & Mason-Bish, H. (Eds). *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence*, London: Routledge

Sherwood, H., Dodd, V. Khomani, N. & Morris, S. (2016) Cameron condemns xenophobic and racist abuse after Brexit vote, The Guardian, Monday 27th June, 18: 03 BST

https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jun/27/sadiq-khan-muslim-council-britain-warning-of-post-brexit-racism, accessed 27th June, 19:40 BST

Sherwood, H. (2016) UK faith leaders unite in condemning post-referendum rise in xenophobic abuse: UN Human RIGHTS Chief urges UK authorities to prosecute those responsible after police record 57% rise in hate crime following Brexit vote, *The Guardian*, 28th June, 17: 27 BST

http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/28/uk-faith-leaders-unite-in-condemning-post-referendum-rise-in-xenophobic-abuse, accessed 29th June, 20:09 BST

Sherwood, H. (2016) Incidents of Anti-Muslim abuse up by 326% in 2015, says Tell MAMA: Monitoring group paints picture of an explosion of Anti-Muslim hate, with women disproportionately targeted by mostly teen perpetrators, *The Guardian*, 29th June, 07:00 BST

https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/jun/29/incidents-of-anti-muslim-abuse-up-by-326-in-2015-says-tell-mama, accessed 29th June 2016, 13:54 BST

Sherwood, H. (2016) Cameron announces plan to tackle hate crime after vote to leave the EU, *The Guardian*, Wednesday 29TH June, 17:25 BST

http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/29/david-cameron-plan-tackle-hate-crime-vote-leave-eu, accessed 29th June, 20:08 BST

Silvera, S. (2016) Jo Cox murder: House of Commons reissues security advice to MPs after fatal shooting, ibtimes, June 17th 2016 09:56 BST

http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/jo-cox-murder-house-commons-reissues-security-advice-mps-after-fatal-shooting-1565987, accessed June 18th 2016 20:10 BST

Silverman, D. (2013) *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*, 4th Edition, London: Sage.

Social Research Association, Ethical Guidelines, December 2003.

http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ethics03.pdf, accessed 4th January 2015.

Sin, C H., Hedges, A., Cook, C., Mguni, N. & Comber, N. (2009) *Disabled people's experiences of targeted violence and hostility.* EHRC Research Report 21. EHRC & Office for Public Management

Sin, C. H. (2013) Making disablist hate crime visible: Addressing the challenges of improving reporting, in Roulstone & Mason-Bish, H. (Eds). *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence* pp147-165. London: Routledge

Sin, C. H. (2015) Hate crime against people with disabilities, in Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P. & Grieve, J.G.D. (2015) (Eds) *The Routledge International Handbook on Hate Crime*, pp193-206. Oxon: Routledge

Skogan, W. G. And Hartnett, S.M. (1997), Community Policing: Chicago Style, New York: Oxford University Press.

Sleezer, C. I. (1991) "Performance, developing and validating the performance analysis for training model' *Human Resources, Development Quarterly*, 2 (4), 355 – 372.

Social Research Association, Ethical Guidelines, December 2003.

http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ethics03.pdf, accessed 4th January 2015.

Smart, J. (2001) *Disability,Society, and the Individual*, Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.

Smith, M. (2015) Disability Hate Crime – A Call for Action in Shah. R., Giannasi, P., (eds) *Tackling Disability Harassment and Disability Hate Crime: A Multi-Disciplinary Guide*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Stephenson, K. (2004) *Towards a theory of government*, DEMOS.

http://www.drkaren.us/pdfs/networklogic03stephenson[1].pdf

Stop Hate UK

http://www.stophateuk.org/

Survey of Adults with Learning Disabilities in England 2003/4: Final and Summary Report.

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130107105354/http:/www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/PublishedSurvey/ListOfSurveySince1990/Generalsurveys/DH_4081207

Accessed 15th November 2015, 10.23

TELL MAMA, 2014-2015 *Findings on Anti-Muslim Hate*, http:tellmamauk.org/ (accessed 30th January 2016)

Tennant, M. (1999) Is teaching transferable in? Boud, D. & Garrick, J (eds) *Understanding Learning at Work*, London: Routledge.

The Local (2016) Far-Right Groups targets Madrid Mosque after Brussels Attacks, 23rd March 2016, GMT, +01.00 accessed 10th May 2016, 20:08 GMT

The Metropolitan Police Act 1829

Thomas, P. (2011) "Mate Crime": ridicule, hostility and targeted attacks against disabled people', *Disability and Society*, 26, 107 – 11.

Thomas, P. (2013) 'Hate crime or mate crime?', in: A Roulstone and H. Mason-Bish (Eds) *Disability, Hate Crime and Violence*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Torrence, D. R. (1993), "Motivating trainees to learn". *Training and Development*, 47 (3), March, 55-8.

Toynbee, P. (2016) The mood is ugly and an MP is dead, *The Guardian,* Thursday 16th June, 20:47 BST.

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jun/16/mood-ugly-mp-dead-jo-cox, accessed, 17th June, 11:48 BST

Travis, A. (2015) Hate Crime Against Muslims in Britain spike after 'jihadi' attacks, study finds. *The Guardian,* Wednesday 17th June, 19:00 BST, accessed 3rd January 2016, 16.00.

Tyson, J. (2013) *A scar on the conscience of the criminal justice system?: The examination of police service provision through the eyes of people with learning disabilities*, MA Thesis http://www.report-it.org.uk/files/jemma_tysons_ma_thesis_disability_hate_crime.pdf, accessed 12th December 2015, 20:15 GMT

Tyson, J., Giannasi, P. & Hall, N. (2015) Johnny Come Lately? The International and Domestic Policy Context of Disability Hate Crime in Shah. R., Giannasi, P., (eds) *Tackling Disability Harassment and Disability Hate Crime: A Multi-Disciplinary Guide*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Victim's Commissioner: Report for the Secretary of State of Justice 2013-2014

https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/victims-commissioner/victims-commissioner-annual-report-2013-14.pdf, accessed 21 January 2016.

Victim's Commissioner: Report for the Secretary of State of Justice 2014-2015.

http://victimscommissioner.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/VC-Annual-Report-2014-15.pdf, accessed 21 January 2016.

Walters, M. A. (2014) *Hate Crime and Restorative Justice: Exploring Causes, Repairing Harms*, Clarendon Studies in Criminology, Oxford|: OUP.

Whitfield, D. (2016) Safety Pin Campaign to show solidarity with immigrants is joined by Nottingham people, *The Nottingham Post*, 29th June.

http://www.nottinghampost.com/safety-pin-campaign-to-show-solidarity-with-immigrants-is-joined-by-nottingham-people/story-29455989-detail/story.html, accessed 30th June, 07:35 BST

Wintour, P. (2015) Police told to treat anti-Muslim hate crimes in same way as Anti-Semitic attacks. *The Guardian*, 12th October, BST 00:01, accessed 14th October 2015 08:20.

Woods, J. B. (2010) 'Policing hatred: a case study of an English police force', *Journal of Hate Studies*, 9, 127 – 48.

Yeung, P. (2016) EU Referendum: Report of hate crime increase of 57% following Brexit vote: National Police Chiefs' Council say it is 'monitoring situation closely', *The Independent*, Monday 27th June 2016

http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/brexit-hate-crime-racism-reports-eu-referendum-latest-a7106116.html, accessed 28th June, 08:34 BST

Yeun, P. And Duncan, P. (2016) Race Hate Crimes reported on UK Railways rise 37% in five years. The Guardian, Wed 27th Jan 2016, 8:38 GMT

http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jan/27/race-hate-crimes-uk-railways-rise-37-per-cent-five , accessed 29th January 2016, 11:38

Zemke, R. And Zemke, S. (1988) "Thirty things we know for sure about adult learning", *Training*, 25 (7), 57 – 61.

Zempi, I., and Chakraborti, N. (2014) *Islamophobia, Victimisation and the Veil*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.