Written evidence submitted by the Centre for the Study and Reduction of Hate Crimes, Bias and Prejudice, Nottingham Trent University

1) Who is making this submission?

This submission is by Dr Loretta Trickett on behalf of the Centre for the Study and Reduction of Hate Crimes, Bias and Prejudice, Nottingham Trent University. Other scholars at the Centre include Dr Irene Zempi who has published extensively on Islamophobia, Dr Michael Sutton who has undertaken research on media campaigns to reduce prejudice and Dr Paul Hamilton who has published on hate crime, offenders and prisons. The aim of the centre is to produce quality research and work with public and private agencies to inform practice on preventing and responding to prejudice and hatred. Nottingham Trent University is a global university that has been awarded numerous awards for its teaching and research including significant increases in REF 2014 ratings and recent accolades for the Business School and Law Departments.

Dr Trickett is also an active member of the Hate Crime Steering Group in Nottingham which includes the police, the CPS, the Probation Service (NOMS), Court Services, Nottingham Community Safety Partnership and other groups who support hate crime victims. Dr’s Trickett and Hamilton have recently worked with Nottinghamshire Police to re-design their hate crime risk assessment forms and they are about to begin a research study on hate crime perpetrators in Nottinghamshire. Dr Trickett is also working on an evaluation of Nottinghamshire Police initiative of recording street harassment against women as hate crime.

In July 2015 Dr Trickett published a research report The Policing of Hate Crime in Nottinghamshire1 based on research with front-line officers on their experiences of hate crime training and dealing with hate crime which was funded by the Steering Group. The report was updated in July 2016 taking account of subsequent developments including substantial increases in hate crime following the EU Referendum.

1 http://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/28089
This report has featured widely in media publications including The Guardian, The Times, The Solicitors Journal, Law Society Gazette, Policing Professional and The Conversation amongst others.

2] Supporting Information

This submission is informed by the aforementioned policing report and recommendations from Sutton et al (2007) in *Getting the Message Across: Using Media to Reduce Racial Prejudice and Discrimination.* Consequently it touches on all aspects of the inquiry including the effectiveness of law enforcement for preventing and prosecuting hate crime, the barriers that prevent individuals from reporting hate crime and measures to improve reporting recording and measurement rates, the role of social media in awareness raising and preventing hate crime, the role of the voluntary sector, community representatives and other frontline organisations in challenging attitudes that underpin hate crime and the effectiveness of support that is available to victims and families.

3] Executive Summary of Main Points in the Submission

- Police training on hate crime fails to properly equip front-line officers for dealing with hate crime on the streets
- Changes should be made to the form, context and content of hate crime training delivery for police officers (and other agencies)
- The delivery of training must be informed by research on hate crime and research on policing
- The design of training must take account of educational literature on what works when teaching/training adults
- Those victims and communities most affected by hate crime and those working to support them must be involved in the design and delivery of training
- Differences in how hate crimes manifest and impact on communities must be reflected in training design – it cannot be ‘one size fits all’
- Dealing with hate crime cannot be the task of the police alone and a multi-agency approach must be incorporated into training and awareness raising campaigns

---

2 Department of Communities and Local Government.
Training must be designed so that it is both ‘value for money’ but ‘fit for purpose’ whilst maximising use of available resources.

- Training must be evaluated for effectiveness including measuring of impact on reporting/recording/prosecution and victim satisfaction.
- Awareness raising campaigns must be informed by research on tackling bias, hatred and extremism and evaluated for effectiveness.

4] The Submission

Since the original publication of our policing report there have been substantial increases in hate crime against established and new minority groups. Visible manifestations of hate, hostility and intolerance against EU citizens were evident during the EU Referendum campaign and following the result. The manifestation of hatred is taking increasingly diverse forms involving a wider range of victims and perpetrators. The latter have included extremists, including lone-wolf perpetrators and attacks by established minority communities against newcomers in addition to the more common types of hate crime attacks. A worrying trend is that perpetrators appear to be getting younger as demonstrated in attacks against Muslim women whilst out in public and also in examples of extremism.

With many minority groups feeling unsafe and uncertain about their future in Britain, how the police respond to hate and hostility has never been more important. At this challenging time, strong police leadership is needed to help foster trust and cohesion within communities. Frontline police officers must be effectively trained to respond appropriately to hate crime victims and to understand the nuances in manifestations of hostility and hatred and of differential impact for particular communities. Whilst the police cannot possibly be tasked with dealing with hate crime alone, it must be recognised that they are the gatekeepers to the criminal justice system and the cornerstone on which effective prevention and responses to hate crime depend. Without trust and confidence in the police, victims are unlikely to report and previous poor experiences with the police prevent future reporting. Whilst third party reporting centres may be useful in raising awareness and reporting, they are of are of little use if information is not passed to the police and no action is taken. Police responses are also implicated in challenging attitudes that underpin
hate crime and in promoting and maximising the support available to victims and their families.

Despite recommendations in the Coalition Government’s Hate Crime Plan in 2012 that criminal justice training be improved, progress has been poor as noted by the CIJ 2015. If the new Government’s Hate Crime Plan is to be successful, the issue of police training must be addressed.

To date, police hate crime training has been driven by austerity and a lack of vision among some leaders. Little academic or professional attention has been paid to the design and evaluation of police hate crime training. The 2010 Neyroud report on police leadership and training was forced to draw on evaluative research from elsewhere. This lack of evaluative engagement and slow progress on training improvement is worrying. Despite some localised examples of good practice, the overall national picture on police hate crime training is piecemeal, involving standardised training sessions, with no real context or personalisation, that do little to help frontline officers develop key skills in dealing with minority groups exposed to hate and hostility.

Whilst there is some improvement in reporting and recording of hate crime and more recently, prosecutions, hate crime still remains massively under-reported and prosecuted and repeat victimisation is commonplace. In NTU’s research, hate crime training was found to be overwhelmingly online and classroom based, involving a linear training environment at odds with the discretion, choices and complexity that officers faced when dealing with victims of hate and hostility.

While training helped officers to know procedures, there was a notable misalignment between training and frontline policing. The result is that officers rarely value hate crime training, viewing it as the force merely paying lip-service to hate and hostility issues. In the Nottingham study, police officers felt training fell short on articulating how hostility could be established (or not) and what courses of action, including prosecution, were possible. Police complained that the hate crime risk assessment form was flawed and not embedded within training which had also failed to provide them with information about who was best placed to implement safeguarding protocols. Too often the police are held responsible for hate
crime when a multi-agency response is needed – but this multi-agency response needs to be embedded and resourced within police training.

Police hate crime training has been impacted by the demands of austerity and a lack of vision among some police leaders leading to cheap, standardised training formats which deliver little practical benefit to officers and contribute to the growing problem of hate crime in society.

We argue there are a number of tangible ways to improve the effectiveness of hate crime training, some requiring little resourcing, others requiring a greater commitment. There are two important points to make – hate crime training for the police needs to be effective in educating them about effective prevention and responses but it also needs to be police specific. In this sense, police hate crime training must be a collaborative enterprise that is also tailored to the ‘needs’ of the police.

Dealing with HC effectively, requires a multi-agency approach, so training needs to take a more ‘holistic’ focus. 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 with the police.

This can help senior police managers to 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. To help make this switch, there may be some value in HC training taking place away from police facilities such as community venues.

There is a need to recruit local community trainers with a proven track record of delivering relevant, impactful and innovative HC/community cohesion training whilst also incorporating community members. Training should use experience to generate meaningful, quality examples/exercises. 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. What is important for building empathy with victims is to
recognise and respond to their needs. Consequently, there needs to be much more
emphasis and better use of visual imagery, role plays and interaction with victims and other
professionals in training. NCALT should NOT be used to replace face-to-face training, but to
compliment it and provide a resource for officers to go back to

Disability Hate Crime has been particularly problematic; whilst officers cannot be trained on
all types of disability, there is scope for more ‘bespoke’ training in this area drawing on input
from disabled people and those that support them (inclusion of those with learning
disabilities and/or mental health conditions will need to be properly thought through so
they are sufficiently supported and not detrimentally affected by the experience). This will
help the police to learn about how best to communicate with people with different
disabilities and those with mental health conditions and how to ensure that appropriate
safeguarding measures are in place. It can also help police officers to understand that hate
crimes against disabled people may manifest differently than in other types of hate crime.
Different examples of how hostility can be established in cases such as ‘mate crime’ are
needed. Any initiatives to facilitate this sharing of information between the CPS and the
police service are to be welcomed.

To be truly collaborative however hate crime training needs to be ‘with’ and ‘for’ the police
– not simply directed ‘at the police’. Too much police training takes the form of lecturing
police officers rather than engaging with them and fails to draw on their extensive expertise,
experiences of policing or address their specific training needs. This has the tendency to
alienate police officers switching them off from the ‘learning experience’. Training must
take account of educational research on the teaching of adults and of academic policing
research on working with police officers. It must also provide officers with opportunities to
meaningfully engage in the sessions, to ask questions and to work on problem solving with
other officers.

Training for the police must be ‘police specific’ in that it is geared to the experiences and
needs of police officers becoming more ‘skills focused’. With this in mind training needs to
be much more ‘experiential’ drawing on the wealth of policing experiences. This also
requires a focus on ‘why’ officers are doing the training and ‘how’ these skills might benefit them in their daily policing. For example, 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. This will also place greater weight on the ‘Why’ rather than on the ‘How’ so that there is a less formulaic approach to doing risk assessments. More attention must therefore be placed on the design and implementation of hate crime risk assessments within training.

There must also be opportunities for honest – but controlled – discussion. This is especially pertinent when considering potential police antipathy towards HC as a concept (or the often ‘blurred lines’ that exist in this area) and the corresponding legislation. Officers will come into this training domain with their own prejudices/misconceptions about the legislative response to hostility, its perceived lack of importance (...much could be learnt about how the police service have re-designed their training towards Domestic Violence) and the role of other organisations in dealing with and preventing HC. Challenging these prejudices is imperative for the delivery of effective training interventions. Officers in this study did not feel that hate crime was unimportant but dealt with much less hate crime than other types of offences and had less exposure to the people affected by it. We cannot ignore the fact that the receptivity of officers to hate crime training was greatly affected by the current mode and delivery of such training.

Ongoing evaluation of training must be undertaken by measuring impacts on reporting, recording, prosecution, other courses of action and victim satisfaction. However, we need to decide what success in hate crime looks like. 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. Multi-agency responses to the problem and the roles and responsibilities of other organisations as well as the police must be considered in 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.

Finally, a far greater range of resources needs to be made available to the police including information on identifying disability and communicating effectively with all victims and how to safeguard them. Much better use of technology is needed here and an on-line tool that can draw on the design of Pegasus (disability policing resource) would be helpful here. 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, social media platforms and members of the public could play a key role in helping with the design and production of the information that it requires.

With regards to awareness-raising around hate crime, careful consideration must be given to the development of awareness campaigns aimed at the general public. Whilst campaigns may be useful in providing information on what a hate crime is, how a victim can report it and what courses of action and support are available, even here it is necessary to evaluate whether such campaigns are reaching the targeted audiences and having an impact.

In terms of challenging prejudice through awareness campaigns however more caution is warranted. Research conducted by Sutton et al (2007) found limited evidence that such campaigns were an effective way to reduce racial prejudice and discrimination. They argued that intercultural education that presents only facts in order to change attitudes will not reduce prejudice and discrimination, since facts are interpreted through the experience and biases of recipients. Indeed, recipients may simply see the message as ‘manipulative propaganda’ with detrimental effects. At the same time, initiatives to reduce racial prejudice and discrimination that aim merely to raise awareness, or to evaluate their impact in this area alone, often constitute evaluation cop-out, and cannot present evidence that they have changed racially prejudiced attitudes or behaviour.
These researchers argue that using media effectively is scientifically complicated, and intellectually and creatively challenging and must draw extensively on academic and media research whilst implementing effective evaluation. Those planning initiatives will have to negotiate sensitive regional, social, political, ethnic and cultural nuances. Social and political change must be considered in the design and delivery of campaigns.

More precision is needed in targeting media-based initiatives and campaigns to reduce racial prejudice and discrimination at particular sections of the community. Initiatives to reduce victimisation might be best employed as part of a wider campaign rather than as a stand-alone programme.

A message’s impact will depend on presentation style, ease of understanding, and emotional pitch and repetition of the message is more likely to reduce prejudice. Positive similarities should be emphasised where possible. When emphasising differences, the value that difference adds to minority and majority groups should be highlighted. Those designing and implementing campaigns must have understand how and in what context change is achieved to inform other initiatives of what does and does not.

A more up-to-date piece of research on what works in this area is now warranted and scholars working at NTU would be interested in helping to design and conduct a piece of research working with other professionals in the field of hate crime and to assist Government in tackling the multi-faceted forms of this pernicious offence.