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Terms of Reference

Verbal-textual hostility (VTH) plays a significant role in victims’ subjective perceptions of hatred and police officers’ assessment of prejudice-related violence. Yet, to date, the role of VTH in ‘hate’ crime has been under-researched. The aim of this research has been to assess and evaluate the forensic possibilities contained in a closer reading of the words used in these crimes.

Through a content analysis of incident characteristics and officers’ narratives of incidents, this report maps out how key speech-text indicators may assist to better evaluate the force and effects of prejudice-related violence. It is expected that this type of contextual analysis will lead to the development of more sophisticated risk assessment tools for use in frontline policing, and more targeted service-enhancements for victims.

At the core of this research is the 99,797 hate crime case files collated by London Metropolitan Police Service from January 2003 to December 2007. Due to privacy regulations on personal and private data, limited fields of information in each case file were made available for detailed analysis. Central to the critical discourse analysis of verbal-textual hostility is the abridged narrative of the incidents provided by the reporting officer. In approximately 21 per cent of these incidents, the reporting officer recorded verbatim verbal and/or textual exchanges between victims, perpetrators, witnesses and/or officers. This selective sample offers important insights into:

- Hate crime reporting mechanisms,
- Frontline officers’ construction of hate crime, and the importance they place on forensic evidence such as the words used in hate crimes
- Patterns of verbal-textual hostility
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Black and Minority Ethnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Critical Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIS</td>
<td>Crime Record Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>Hostile Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTIQ</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans(gender), Intersex and Queer (or Questioning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>(London) Metropolitan Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSP</td>
<td>Suspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>Violent behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIW</td>
<td>Victim/Informant/Witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTH</td>
<td>Verbal-textual hostility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

Table 1  Number of MPS Hate Crime Records & Incidents x Year 18
Table 2  Representative ‘Fit’ between Total Database & Recorded Hate Speech 19
Table 3  Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility 21
Table 4  Examples of Coding for Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility 22
Table 5  Hate Crime Flag 25
Table 6  Hate Crime Location 27
Table 7  Hate Crime Offence 28
Table 8  Existence of Relationship between Victim and Suspect 30
Table 9  Hate Crime Relationship 31
Table 10  Reported & Recorded Verbal-Textual Hostility x Hate Crime Flag 34
Table 11  Reported & Recorded Verbal-Textual Hostility x Offence 34
Table 12  Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility x Hate Crime Flag 37
Table 13  Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility x Offence 40
Table 14  Public Hate Crime (Model 1) 45
Table 15  Private Hate Crime (Model 2) 46
Table 16  Private Hate Crime (Model 3) 47
Table 17  Familial Hate Crime (Model 4) 47

List of Figures

Figure 1  Continuum of Violence and Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility 53
Figure 2  Hate Crime Flag and Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility 54
Figure 3  Continuum of Violence and Contextual Factors 55
Key Findings

Verbal-Textual Hostility (VTH)

- Violent behaviour is 70 per cent less likely in the same incident if the offender uses terrorisation or threats of violence
- Violent behaviour is 45 per cent more likely in the same incident if the offender uses interpellation only

Forms of Hate Crime (Flag)

- While there is some variation in characteristics of hate crime incidents, at the level of predictive analyses, there is no significant overall differences in experiences of hate crime
- Faith-based hate crimes are 20 per cent less likely to include reported VTH
- Homophobic incidents are 30 per cent less likely to include a verbatim record of VTH

Location

- Violent behaviour is 40 per cent more likely to occur in public spaces (such as streets and parks)
- Violent behaviour is 30 per cent less likely to occur in and around the victim’s home
- Criminal damage is 2.2 times more likely to occur in and around the victim’s home

Relationship between Victim and Suspect

- Homophobic and faith-based incidents are 1.3 times more likely to be perpetrated by someone known to the victim
- Homophobic incidents are 1.5 times more likely to be perpetrated by someone from the victim’s wider familial network
- Familial offenders are 1.6 times more likely to use violent behaviour or violence against the person
- Familial offenders are 1.8 times more likely to threaten the victim or use terrorisation in their verbal-textual hostility
- Familial offenders are 2.7 times more likely to mediate their threats and verbal-textual hostility via a mobile telephone or the internet
Executive Summary

Over the last ten years, the London Metropolitan Police Service has become a world leader in the policing of hate crimes. This is not only as a direct consequence of the Lawrence Enquiry and the introduction of penalty-enhancement measures. The MPS—along with other Home Office agencies and the Metropolitan Police Authority—has developed and modified its data collection, collation and analysis processes, and fundamentally transformed the service provided to victims of hate crime, above and beyond the Lawrence measures. Throughout this time, both the Violent Crime Directorate and the Citizen Focus Directorate have consistently reviewed and evaluated policing practices, with the aim of facilitating an increased reporting of hate crime, and the prosecution of hate crime offenders. Yet, throughout this time, the matter of verbal-textual hostility (VTH) has remained largely uninterrogated, with the exception of matters relating to hate mail and the criminal incitement of hate violence. Uncovering the forensic possibilities available through a closer linguistic analysis of the words used in hate crime is a significant gap in the research undertaken by the MPS. This project aims to fill some of that vacuum.

This is the final report documenting the comparative analysis of two complete annual hate crime data sets. These data are drawn from the 2003 and 2007 cases, which consist of 27,164 incident files. Five thousand, five hundred and eighty-four of these incident files (or 20.6 per cent of total database, and 26.9 per cent of those cases involving VTH) contained verbatim recording of verbal or textual exchanges.

These two data sets represent, in many ways, two significant moments in contemporary hate crime regulation. In 2004, a variety of legislative, policy and practice reforms—both within and outside of the policing services—changed the ways in which hate crimes were regulated in the UK. The 2003 data provide a snapshot of hatred in Britain in the post-9/11 era, yet precedes the more significant changes in the experiences of hate crime and its regulation that were to occur in the post-7/7 era. In this report, the 2003 data have been compared and contrasted with the last data set from 2007. By this time, earlier legislative changes had been transformed to policy and systematically disseminated through practice documents.
and changes to reporting mechanisms (including a radical re-engineering of hate crime reporting in CRIS in the years after the data analysed in this report).

Concurrently, the annual number of reported hate crimes and incidents had increased, plateaued and then decreased, while the number of sanctions and prosecutions had increased. This trend could be read multiple ways, including:

- Increased regulation of hate crimes led to a decrease in the number of actual incidents
- Decreased reporting of hate crimes by victims, informants or witnesses (as a consequence of lack of trust or belief in a policing response, or alternative mechanisms for responding to incidents) led to a decrease in the number of reported incidents
- Increased awareness by VIWs of what constitutes a reportable offence led to a decrease in the number of non-crime incidents documented by the police
- Increased number of cases reaching the level of sanction led to legal and practice precedents streamlining and facilitating an increase in the number and level of punishment/sanctions

Verbal-textual hostility plays a significant role in victim’s perception of hate, and frontline officers’ perception and assessment of hate crimes. Yet, the forensic value of this evidence—as with any evidence reliant on VIWs’ memories—is severely reduced if verbatim exchanges are not immediately recorded by either the victim, witness or reporting officer. In the data analysed, reporting officers indicated that approximately 76 per cent of incidents included some form of verbal-textual hostility. However, in the abridged narrative, only 26.9 per cent of these reported incidents included details about what was said or written. These details may have been included in the larger narrative of the incident (which was unavailable for analysis due to privacy provisions); however, if these are not recorded in either narrative, the investigation and prosecution of these incidents may be hampered. ‘Words that wound’ are not easily dismissed, especially when the verbal-textual exchanges with perpetrators include speech acts beyond just profane naming (such as “fucking Paki”, “bloody black”, “lesbian cunt”). Recording the forensic details of crimes is vitally important no matter the offence, victim or perpetrator. When the offence includes
penalty-enhancement measures for hate motivation or aggravation, forensic details such as verbal-textual hostility become fundamental to the assessment and adjudication of motivation.

The recording of VTH was largely consistent across the two data sets and across victim groups, with the exception of homophobic violence. In these cases, reporting officers were less likely to include a verbatim record of these exchanges in the 2003 data. The reporting of the 2007 data was also slightly skewed. If the forensic assessment of these incidents relies upon the details provided by reporting officers, then it stands to reason that cases of homophobic violence may face additional barriers in proving hate motivation or aggravation. More important, however, for an evaluation of policing practices, is the analysis of recorded VTH when considered in light of signal hate crimes, such as Other Accepted Crime, Harassment, Public Order Offences (POA) offences, Criminal Damage, Common Assault and ABH/GBH.

When the analysis switches from hate crime flag to substantive hate crime offence, the role of VTH in hate crime becomes apparent. As the level of physical violence increases, the use of verbal-textual hostility and the number of speech acts in each incident decreases. This could be the result of differential policing practice or differential experience of hate crime. If the former, the reduced reporting and recording of VTH in incidents involving violent behaviour may be due to the reporting officer being more concerned about collecting and reporting on the substantive offence rather than the forensic details required to prove hate motivation/aggravation. Concurrently, when the offence is a ‘speech’ crime (such as VTH and threats), the reporting officer is focussed on the speech-text that substantively constitutes the crime. If the differential experience of verbal-textual hostility is the result of specific characteristics of hate crimes—not policing practices—then the opportunities for developing targeted responses increases.

The harm caused by VTH can be enhanced by concurrent violence. No matter the words used, or in fact whether words are used at all, physical and sexual assault causes physical, psychological and social harm well beyond the actual incident.
However, standalone acts of verbal-textual hostility can also be traumatising depending on the context of this violence, and the speech acts employed by the perpetrator. Any hate violence in and around the family home of the victim is bound to have additional consequences given that the family home is, for some marginalised groups, the only sanctuary from vilification, discrimination and hatred. Similarly, hate crimes committed by family members will have ongoing consequences not encountered by victims of ‘stranger-danger’ violence. Another significant way in which additional harm is created by verbal-textual hostility can be found in a Critical Discourse Analysis of the words used in hate crime. This approach allows for a critical analysis of the context of verbal-textual hostility, and offers insights into the meaning, force and effect of specific words.

There are conventional forms of verbal-textual hostility shared by all victims. Beyond the rudimentary practice of naming (*interpellation*), perpetrators of all forms of hate crime use four main themes in VTH. These are: *terrorisation* (20.6 per cent), *expatriation* (15.6 per cent), *sexualisation* (15.1 per cent) and *demonisation* (13.5 per cent) (see Tables 3 and 4 for descriptions of these themes and prevalence). These additional speech acts do more than name individuals and groups. These substantive speech acts reduce individuals to their most private experiences and body parts, incite fear of ‘evil incarnate’ or the mongrelisation of community, and seek the exile, extermination or elimination of the addressee. As such, addressing marginalised individuals using these speech acts can create additional harms. However, the success of these speech acts pivots on the addressor’s clear identification that specific individuals and groups are the object of that hostility. In this way, through convention, the names attributed to addressees become reductive versions of the stronger themes of verbal-textual hostility. While simultaneously, the stronger themes are without context unless the addressee is named, or their identity can be assumed from their appearance, attire or cultural practices. Given this social context to verbal-textual hostility, there are some practices specific to particular forms of hate crime, such as:

- Faith-based hate crime (including antisemitism) is more commonly include threats of violence (*terrorisation*),
• Racist hate crime is more commonly include demands to leave the neighbourhood or nation (*expatriation*), and
• Homophobic hate crime is more commonly include only naming (*interpellation*) and extreme *profanity* (and much more commonly include extreme physical violence)

If officers are aware that some communities are consistently threatened, they may understand the need for service enhancements rather than perceiving the reporting of these speech crimes as an over-reaction on the part of the victim. Victims rarely learn about hatred from their first experience of hate crime; hate crime is a social act that informs, warns and threatens not only the individual victim but also their families and communities. In this way, frontline officers are not dealing with just a single incident of threatening behaviour; they are dealing with all the threats made against the victim, their family and their community. Importantly, while victims of faith-based hate crime (including antisemitism) are more likely to experience threatening speech acts (*terrorisation*), as can be seen in Appendix A, apart from *interpellation*, the most common form of VTH used against all victims is *terrorisation*. It is therefore important that frontline officers understand that hate crime victims may not experience this as a single incident, and that the harm of *in terrorem* can be as disabling as physical violence.

Just as some selected signal hate crimes are more likely to include verbal-textual hostility, there are also clear patterns of VTH in these offences. If policing practices are factored out as a reason for the differential recording of VTH, several relationships can be proposed for these patterns. As mentioned above, as physical violence increases, the use of VTH, and the number of speech acts in each incident decreases; so too does the force of the language. While there is an increased use of extreme *profanity* (multiple uses of “fuck” and its derivatives, and “cunt”), perpetrators are less likely to use any other speech act, and much less likely to use *terrorisation*. This could be the result of needing few words when the body is ‘doing the talking’. The limited VTH in violent crimes contrasts with the violent verbal-textual hostility in cases of criminal damage. Here, the mediation through objects, perhaps gives perpetrators the ‘safest’ prospect for an anonymous, opportunistic
threat, which unlike direct verbal threats allows the perpetrator to be absent at the time of the harm experienced by the victim.

At the other end of the hate crime spectrum is verbal-textual hostility (predominantly, Other Accepted Crime). In these offences (which are meant to contain nothing more than verbal-textual hostility), the primary practices are expatriation and sexualisation. This heightened prevalence is perhaps the outcome of the extended exchanges necessary to constitute hatred without threats, physical violence or criminal damage. There were, however, a significant number of incidents classified at the lower offence of Other Accepted Crime, yet these contained explicit threats of violence (terrorisation). Either these incidents have been incorrectly assigned to the lower offence, or the perceived threat or harm from these speech acts have been under-estimated by the reporting officer, informant or victim. Key tools of forensic linguistics could therefore play an important role in assisting frontline officers in judging the harm, force and effects of these speech acts.

In the time since the introduction of penalty-enhancement measures, significant resources have been dedicated to the policing and regulation of hate crime and servicing of hate crime victims in the UK. Throughout this time, constant innovation has ensured that the MPS has developed a sophisticated system for responding to reported hate crimes, and building community partnerships to increase the reporting of hate crime. This policy and practice development is the result of a superior knowledge about these criminal offences. The sheer depth and breadth of information about hate crime available in MPS case files is unmatched anywhere else in the world. It is within this context that a Critical Discourse Analysis of verbal-textual hostility is made possible, and that the use of linguistic analysis as a tool of investigation can even be proposed.

Three critical insights have been crystallised from this research. First, despite adopting a variety of analytical tools and coding techniques, there is no significant difference in text or context of hate crime when considered through the lens of victim identity. Racist violence may be a dominant practice in terms of reported prevalence, but it is enacted by offenders in complementary ways to homophobic
and religious hatred (including faith, antisemitic and islamaphobic). Second, verbal-textual hostility is a significant forensic artefact in hate crime. As such it warrants a more dominant position in the collection of evidence; at the level of frontline officers, and at the level of the CRIS database. And third, risk assessment instruments used by frontline officers in their evaluation of harm could be enhanced by the inclusion of a linguistic checklist that would assist in assessing the additional harms experienced by some victims of hate crime, which could lead to refined targeting of service enhancements for victims. These measures would assist in developing superior policing practices; they would also lead to increased knowledge about the text and context of hate crime.
Theoretical Approach

In 1955, J.L. Austin presented a series of lectures on *How to Do Things with Words*. In his reconstruction of orthodox linguistic philosophy, he argued that:

> [w]e first distinguished a group of things we do in saying something, which together we summed up by saying we perform a *locutionary act*, which is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference … [for example, ‘the sky is blue’]. Second, we said that we also perform *illocutionary acts* such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking, &c., i.e., utterances which have a certain (conventional) force [for example, ‘I promise’]. Thirdly, we may also perform *perlocutionary acts*: what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading [for example, ‘it’s in your best interest to eat organic food’] (Austin 1980 [1955]: 109, emphasis in original).²

From this classification of speech and the ways in which speech can be action, theorists such as Bourdieu (1991), Butler (1997) and Langton (1993), have developed a sophisticated system for assessing the force and effects of subordinating and silencing speech. However, particularly for Bourdieu and Langton, it is Austin’s deeper analysis of the forms of illocutionary speech that provides a basis for their claims about the authority to speak, and the power of authorised speech.

Austin (1980: 163), in his analysis of speech acts, detailed five classes of illocutionary utterances: verdictives (exercise of judgement), and exercitives (exercising of power) being the two most significant classes of illocutionary speech acts for the study of verbal-textual hostility. These have been re-constituted by Langton (1993: 305) as *authoritative* illocutions. The first of these authoritative illocutions relates to the ‘delivering of a finding, official or unofficial, upon evidence or reasons as to value or fact’ (Austin 1980 [1955]: 153). It is important to note that Austin clearly states that exercising judgement can be either official or unofficial—judgements by unaffiliated individuals as easily as judgements by criminal justice officials. Verdictive illocutions aim to rank and value the addressee and thus establish a verdict on the ‘truth and falsity, soundness and unsoundness and fairness and unfairness’ of their identity or contributions to the marketplace of ideas (Austin 1980
In verbal-textual hostility, verdictive illocutions consist of speech acts that name addressees within a hierarchy of subject positions according to their proximity to dominant representations of the body and identity.

The second class of illocutions in the analysis of verbal-textual hostility are exercitive performatives. Unlike verdictive illocutions, exercitives are a judgement that ‘... is to be so, as distinct from a judgement that it is so: it is advocacy that it should be so, as opposed to an estimate that it is so; ... it is an award as opposed to an assessment; it is a sentence as opposed to a verdict’ (Austin 1980 [1955]: 155). Exercitives include statements that warn, order, advise and command. More than verdictives, exercitives require an authorised force in order to be successful. Further, where verdictives are temporally present or an assessment of the past, exercitives are statements about how the future should look: an advocacy or threat of things to come. As such, if exercitives are spoken with authority or by an authorised delegate, they are capable of influencing addressees in more ways than verdictives.

Understanding the harm generated out of successful illocutionary speech acts allows for a deeper analysis of how words wound. Equally, understanding the consequential—or perlocutionary—effects enables us to understand the process of incitement and the power of infecting others’ minds—and perhaps their actions. Therefore, Austin’s (1980) speech act theory, and its re-working by Bourdieu (1991), Butler (1997) and Langton (1993), offers a theoretical approach that neither privileges action over speech, nor force over effects. It also offers a framework that acknowledges that authorisation to act with hatred is both institutionally-bound and socially contingent.
Methodological Approach

It is difficult to understand the role of verbal-textual hostility (VTH) in hate crime without getting access to what is said during a hate crime incident. Unfortunately, without an audio recording, effective forensic linguistics relies on the memory of victims or witnesses, and the verbatim recording of this evidence by police officers. At both points, the quality of the data can deteriorate. In the first instance by the trauma of violence—which can lead to memory loss and distortion—and in the latter, by the legislation, policies and practices of policing hate crime—which may prioritise physical evidence over linguistic evidence; perhaps because of the first issue of data distortion. Despite these problems in working with forensic linguistics, police case records—as with other hate crime reporting data—are unique documents that offer an insight into role of verbal-textual hostility in hate crime. Just as important, critical analyses of hate crime records—as both instruments of measurement and as snapshots of policing practice—can provide policy and practice options that could lead to more effective policing and prosecution of hate crime incidents.

Methodology and Methods

In order to ‘get at’ the meaning of verbal-textual hostility in hate violence, this research is based on a triangulation between the quantitative analyses of the hate violence context characteristics and VTH content characteristics, and the qualitative, discourse analysis of the policies, programs and legislation developed in the UK to respond to hate violence. The theoretical threads between these two are also investigated through the etymological analysis of ‘words that wound’ and the social and historical contexts of the changes in meaning, and targets of this VTH. Combining methodological approaches such as this requires a framework that is not committed to disciplinary boundaries; rather it builds upon transdisciplinary frameworks such as that offered by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has developed out of the growing influence of social sciences on linguistics, especially since the emergence of sociolinguistics as an orthodox approach to language and discourse analysis. However, CDA—and its
methodological companion, Mediated Discourse Analysis (MDA)—differs significantly from sociolinguistics in that they do not begin from the point of language. In particular, unlike sociolinguistics, CDA and MDA do not reduce social encounters to the words used, nor privilege language use as an ideal representation of social action. Further, Wodak argues that the social actions important to researchers using CDA are often those that use language or discourse to express social inequalities. However, the actual words are not the foregrounded data: rather, they are perceived as one of many contexts to social action (Wodak, 2001).

Researchers working with this methodological approach use at least a triple validation process. This means that one source of data cannot be ‘read’ in isolation from the historical, cultural and political contexts of at least two other sources of data. For this research, these three layers of validation come from subjective experiences of violence (from police case files), historical analysis of discursive practices that contribute to violence (such as the historicity of verbal-textual hostility), and a mapping of institutional responses to hate violence (such as legislation, media reports of violence, campaign materials).

This research is based on the approach used by van Dijk in his studies of racism, which he developed for his initial study into ethnic prejudice in thought and talk, and later refined for his analysis of elite discourse and racism (van Dijk, 1987; van Dijk, 1993). This approach foregrounds the contextual factors that, if not determinative, at least predispose particular intersubjective relationships between the dominated and dominant. In Communicating Racism, van Dijk (1987) details the steps necessary to adequately account for the varying layers of social, individual and cognitive factors in prejudice. He states that these can be answered by addressing six questions:

1. **What do people actually say?** The content of such talk can be accounted for in terms of a semantic or topical analysis.

2. **How do people talk about others?** This question requires discourse analysis of the narrative and argumentative structures, local semantic moves, style, rhetoric and other conversational features of verbal-textual hostility including the use of illocutionary and perlocutionary performatives.
3. What are the communicative sources of verbal-textual hostility? What sources of information do people refer to when they account for their information or justify their opinions?

4. What and how does such talk express or signal underlying structures and strategies of prejudice in social cognition? What are the structural, cultural and social factors that bind particular sets of actions?

5. What are the real or possible effects of prejudiced talk? How do these speech acts contribute to physical acts of containment?

6. What are the social contexts of such talk? What type of interaction is involved, who are the participants, what the social functions of prejudiced conversations and which relations of power are at stake, or what roles are played by the elite and the media in the reproduction of verbal-textual hostility? (van Dijk, 1987, p. 384).

Using these six questions as a guide, the socio-historical roots of the words used—and how they are used—in verbal-textual hostility can be highlighted along with the institutional factors that predispose the use of abuse against particular marginalised groups, and the role that this verbal-textual hostility plays in the larger field of hate violence. The audience for this larger project is not, however, the Metropolitan Police Service. Rather, in this final report, the focus will be on ‘what is said?’ ‘how do people talk about others?’ and ‘what are the real or possible effects?’. These three questions are central to understanding how verbal-textual hostility relates to specific offences and the policing of hate crime, more generally.

Data Source

Although the verbal and textual exchanges recorded in police records offers unique insights into hate crimes, access to these records is severely limited. Access is limited by legislation, (such as Data Protection Act 1998), by regulations governing access to the intellectual property of the Metropolitan Police Service, and by the resources allocated to collaborative research with external partners. As can be seen in the table below, despite these barriers, in September 2009, the Metropolitan Police Service granted limited access to 99 727 hate crime case records dating from January 2003 to December 2007. In order to comply with the MPS regulations governing access to private and personal information, the data provided was restricted to five fields, which contained no identifying information. The five fields of de-identified data provided were:


- Hate Crime Flag
- Location
- Offence
- Relationship between Perpetrator and Informant
- Abridged Narrative of Incident (less than 250 characters)

While not being a complete record of the incident, the last of these fields offers up a rich variety of additional information about the incident. The complete narrative of the incident would have been a more ideal source for a critical analysis of verbal-textual hostility; however, this field was unavailable due to privacy concerns. Most importantly for this research, in approximately 21 per cent of all hate crime case records, the abridged narrative includes a record of the verbal-textual exchanges. This sub-set of the data is a manageable, largely representative, selective dip sample of the larger database. However, it is important to be cognisant that failure to record the verbal-textual exchanges in the abridged narrative does not necessarily translate to a failure to record this information in the complete narrative. As such, the capacity to analyse policing practices in relation to the recording this information is limited.

Additional features of the data that may influence the results of this research are the shift in reporting processes and changes in reporting instruments (which occurred in 2004, 2005 and 2006), and the system of recording case files rather than incidents. In the first—reporting processes—the data accessed from the MPS shifts in late 2005 from Initial Report to Final Classification. Between frontline officers assigning a case file as a hate crime, and the charging of a suspect with a specific offence, a variety of more senior and more specialist officers review the case for inconsistencies. For example, an initial case file may be assigned the offence of Common Assault but later re-assigned as a higher or lower offence upon review. The 2003 data only includes the initial offence recorded; the 2007 data records the final classification.

The second feature of the data—reporting instruments—also influences the results, and as a consequence, the claims that can be made from this data. Changes to laws relating to hate crime—such as amendments to the Crime and Disorder Act in 2004—resulted in significant changes to the CRIS reporting system. Changes to the
reporting system occurred in March 2006 with the inclusion of new hate crime flags such as Islamophobia, Transphobia and Disability. Additionally, the list of offences recorded as hate crimes increased from 29 in 2003 to 137 in 2007. Comparing earlier offences to the new categories of offences was not simple. Nor was it easy to analyse key variables that contain over one hundred attributes. In the case of offence codes, the differences between the 2003 and 2007 data were so significant that a complete re-code was performed on each individual file; taking into consideration the MPS code (either initial or final) and the abridged narrative. Recoding in this way reduced the offence variable to nine attributes that were shared between the 2003 and 2007 offence codes. New codes were also developed to capture the ‘essence’ of these offence codes. The new variables created to capture this ‘essence’ included:

- Violent Behaviour (VB), Threats, and Verbal-Textual Hostility (VTH)
- Violent Behaviour (VB), Hostile Behaviour (HB), Verbal-Textual Hostility (VTH)
- Behaviour, Verbal-Textual Hostility (VTH)

These variables were instrumental in identifying and measuring the relationship between speech/text and action.

The final feature of the data was the system of recording case files rather than incident files. The number of case files for each incident varied depending on the number of hate crime flags, offences, locations and number of perpetrators. As such, a single incident could contain multiple case files. To get a better understanding of hate crime incidents—and to reduce the number and variety of offence, location and relationship variables—the cases were processed and consolidated.

Data Processing

In order to analyse the social context of verbal-textual hostility, the first step in data processing was the conversion of case files into incident files. For the 2003 data, this conversion was completed manually in Excel, and then converted into SPSS for quantitative analysis. For the remaining data, the conversion was completed using an Excel formula that automatically consolidated files. The latter process was 100%
reliable; the former, whilst initially 95 per cent reliable, was further cleaned up in a secondary data processing.

As can be seen in Table 1, consolidating case files into incidents resulted in approximately 24 per cent fewer files. In the 27,164 consolidated incidents from 2003 and 2007, reporting officers indicated that 20,756 incidents (76 per cent) included verbal or textual hostility, and 5,584 incidents (20.6 per cent of total incidents; 26.9 per cent of those incidents that included verbal or textual hostility) included a verbatim record of the actual text or speech used in the incident.

Table 1: Number of MPS Hate Crime Records and Incidents by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPS DATASETS</th>
<th>MPS CASE FILES</th>
<th>CONSOLIDATED INCIDENTS¹</th>
<th>VTH REPORTED</th>
<th>VTH RECORDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20,979</td>
<td>16,103</td>
<td>11,359</td>
<td>2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14,671</td>
<td>11,061</td>
<td>9,297</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,650</td>
<td>27,164</td>
<td>20,756</td>
<td>5,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This selective dip sample is relatively representative of the total database. However, there are distinctive patterns where the two datasets diverge. These patterns reflect differences in experiences of hate crime (including, verbal-hostility) based on the victim status, location, and particularly the offence. Yet, these differences could also illustrate differential policing practices.

For example, as can be seen in Table 2, while homophobic incidents constitute 9.6 per cent of the total dataset, the percentage of these incidents that include recorded hate speech was 30 per cent less likely (7.6 per cent). Concurrently, the percentages of racist and antisemitic incidents are slightly increased (88.4 per cent vs. 90.3 per cent; 1.8 per cent v 2 per cent, respectively). This may represent a differential experience of verbal-textual hostility. That is, perpetrators may be less likely to use verbal or textual abuse in homophobic incidents than in racist and antisemitic incidents. However, this difference in reported verbal-textual abuse may also be the result of reporting officers recording the details more often in the non-homophobic incidents.
### Table 2: Representative ‘Fit’ between Total Database and Recorded Hate Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE FIT BY FLAG</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>VTH Only</td>
<td>VTH Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophobic</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisemitic</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamaphobic</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not necessarily the result of discriminatory policing practices; rather, more likely, this is the result of what Hall et al (2009) call the ‘Lawrence effect’. Hate crime regulation in the UK is informed by the Macpherson Enquiry, and the implementation of the hate crime recommendations generated from the enquiry. This ‘policy career’ (Jenness & Grattet, 2001) of hate crime regulation informs what is popularly understood about hate crime, and in turn, informs the ways in which hate crime is policed through the lens of racist hate violence. Initially, other victims who experience hate crime were an afterthought, and racist hate violence was the template through which all other violence was policed.

### Data Recoding

As briefly introduced earlier, several features of the MPS data made it difficult to undertake an analysis of the social contexts of the VTH content. In order to prepare the data for logistic regression, three fields of data were re-coded. It is important to note several problems that arose in this recoding process. In the first instance, as offence variables changed during the research period, a new offence code was created from a contextualised reading of the officers’ narratives and the MPS code (as discussed above).

The second problem to arise from the recoding process relates to the reduction of responses. In consolidated incident files where up to five responses are available for each field, and each field could contain over 137 variables, it is inevitable that
duplicate multiple re-codded responses would emerge in data processing. For example, the recoding of MPS Locations resulted in the new attribute, ‘Public Spaces’. This new variable includes locations such as parks, streets and footpaths. If an incident included violence that started in the street, and then led into a park, the recoded responses would be two ‘Public Spaces’. Obviously, this skews the results. All duplicates to emerge from the recoding of offence, location and relationship fields were eliminated at the second stage of data processing.

**Coding for Content and Context**

The final preparation stage for data analysis involved coding for additional features of hate crime incidents. In the first instance, all incident files were coded for the presence of:

- verbal and/or textual hostility, and
- a record of that verbal and/or textual hostility

In addition to the variables of location, flag and relationship, new codes were developed to capture a range of undocumented contextual practices. For example, until March 2006, the MPS did not have an independent variable for Islamaphobic violence. Prior to this time, these types of hate violence were most commonly recorded as Racist and/or Faith. To capture the concealed incidents of Islamaphobic violence across the two datasets, the incident narrative was used to code for the presence of:

- actions or speech that were explicitly anti-Muslim (such as the removal of hijab, or the targeting of a mosque)
- the use of the term, ‘Paki’

While the latter of these fields may not capture Islamaphobic violence per se, the use of the term ‘Paki’ represents a liminal hate crime practice. It was initially thought that coding for the presence of VTH including the term, ‘Paki’, could capture some of the concealed Islamaphobic violence. After analysis of the 2003 data, and then again, when the 2007 data was added, it was found that the second of these
variables was ineffective in identifying possible cases that would be flagged as Islamophobic hate crimes.

During the offence re-code, when all narratives where closely reviewed, an additional five variables were inductively created. Through the narrative review, it was identified that in addition to VTH, criminal damage, theft/burglary and violent behaviour, offenders also used spitting, and the dumping or throwing of rubbish, food, excrement and meat to deepen the effect or force of their actions. New codes were created for each of these behaviours.

Table 3: Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>FREQUENCY Incidents n=11,421</th>
<th>FREQUENCY Incidents n=5,584</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpellation</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>Naming the other; calling the other into being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathologisation</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Dirt and disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonisation</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>Devils, demons and mongrels (turning people into animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexualisation</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>Sexual organs, sexual acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalisation</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Liars, cheats and criminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriation</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>Exile from space, neighbourhood, nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorisation</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>Threats of violence and death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profanity</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>Cursing and swearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>Silly, stupid, ugly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last stage of the data processing—thematic coding for verbal-textual hostility—is at the centre of this research project’s outputs. All but one of these themes (see Table 3) was identified in earlier research into verbal-textual hostility in Australia (Asquith, 2008a). However, as this earlier research investigated only antisemitic and heterosexist violence, an additional category inductively emerged during the coding of the UK (MPS) data to capture what appears to be a practice dominant to racism—that of, expatriation.
These themes of verbal-textual hostility have been subject to multiple reviews over the last ten years and two additional reviews since the introduction of the new category of *expatriation*. In Table 4, examples of this coding process have been provided to illustrate how the data has been prepared for analysis.

**Table 4: Examples of Coding for Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODING FOR SPEECH/TEXT THEMES</th>
<th>INTERPELLATION</th>
<th>PATHOLOGICATION</th>
<th>DEMONISATION</th>
<th>SEXUALISATION</th>
<th>CRIMINALISATION</th>
<th>EXPATRIATION</th>
<th>TERRORISATION</th>
<th>PROFANITY</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“here comes the nigger”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“white trash”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“fucking faggot, piece of shit”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Chinese bitch, I hope you get SARS”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“brown rats, go back to your own country”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“get out, Gypsy whore”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“fucking Paki cunt”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“fuck off, you lying Jewish bastard”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“fuck off, you black nigger, you’re a slave”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m going to have you, you fucking Paki!”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“fucking lesbian, fucking dyke”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“die cunt”</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 4, in some cases the theme of *profanity* acts as an enhancement to the primary speech act. Some profane speech acts (such as “shit”, “bitch”, and “cunt”) are coded within the substantive category (*pathologisation*, *demonisation* and *sexualisation*, respectively) and the additive category of *profanity*. While this may mean that a single word may be coded twice—and thus, may appear to skew the data—the objective was to understand the complex interplay in the uses and meanings of VTH in these exchanges. These words serve two purposes, and, as such, have been identified twice in the content analysis.

Another anomaly in the coding of *profanity* was the multiple uses of “fuck” and its derivatives. Beyond acting as an intensive (“I’m going to fucking get you”), fuck
can also act as a verb, noun and adverb (“fuck”—as in an act of copulation—“fucker”, and “fuck off”, respectively). In these additional uses of “fuck”, the word is doing more than simply intensifying the feelings of the addressor. As a noun, it names the addressee, and/or sexualises them. As an adverb, it seeks the expatriation of the addressee. However, it is important to note that once the addressor chooses the intensification of “fuck”, they are also more likely to use it in its other forms. “Fuck” was coded as profanity only when it served the purpose of intensification; in all other incidents, its meaning was extracted from the sentence structure and coded to the substantive categories of interpellation, sexualisation and expatriation.

In the analysis to follow, the theoretical and methodological approaches discussed in this prefatory material are employed to assess the harms, force and effects of verbal-textual hostility in hate crimes. The most significant constraint on this research is the limited access to incident details. In the first instance, the abridged narrative analysed in this research cannot be considered the ‘full story’ about hate crime. Behind the snapshot offered in the abridged narrative is the deeper story about what happened and what was said or written. Finally, the majority of these data are third-hand accounts; at each step, memory about the events—including what is said—can deteriorate. Despite these data limitations, police case narratives offer a unique insight into the text and context of hate crime.
Hate Crime

Before discussing the linguistic properties of the verbal-textual hostility recorded in hate crimes reported to the MPS, it is important to understand the context of this violence. Hate crime regulation in the UK was initially a response to a series of controversial hate crimes, particularly the murder of Stephen Lawrence in 1993. The Macpherson Enquiry facilitated the introduction of hate crime offences (Hall et al. 2009), which created a ‘policy career’ (Jenness & Grattet 2001) of hate crime regulation. This career informs what is popularly understood about hate crime, and in turn, informs the ways in which hate crime is policed through the lens of violent racist hate violence that occurs in public places.\textsuperscript{5} The ‘template’ of racist hate violence is clearly illustrated in the frequency of each of the forms of hate violence captured in the MPS data (see Table 4). If taken at face value, the heightened frequency of racist violence gives the impression that this form of hate crime is more prevalent than that of antisemitic, faith-based or homophobic violence. However, it is important to remain mindful of the mediating factors in reporting crimes to the police. In particular, the responses to the Lawrence Enquiry clearly demonstrated to Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities that the government was concerned about facilitating the reporting of racist hate violence.

Hate Crime Flag

Table 5: Hate Crime Flag

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HATE CRIME FLAG</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 27,164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist</td>
<td>23,356</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophobic</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisemitic</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamaphobic</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Two incidents are missing from this analysis as these were identified as disability hate crimes.

In creating a dual system of justice—with racist (and later, faith-based) hate crimes named under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, and all other forms of hate
violence covered only by sentencing legislation (*Criminal Justice Act 2003*)—the government and police may have contributed to a perception that other victims are not deserving of the heightened attention that comes with specific hate crime provisions.

Further, some victims of hate crimes have—and continue to have—an acrimonious or estranged relationship with the police. This is especially the case for gay men, who have had their sexuality criminalised in the past, and who, along with lesbians, continue to face discrimination within the criminal justice system (GALOP 2008). This is also the case for those UK residents who identify, or who are identified as Muslim, and have become subject to a range of disciplinary practices relating to counter-terrorism measures in the UK (such as the *Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001*, *Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005*, *Terrorism Act 2006*). The criminalisation of identity in both of these cases could lead to a decreased willingness to report hate crimes to the police. It is therefore important not to assume that BME communities in the UK experience heightened levels of hate violence. Rather, it may demonstrate that these communities have developed a conditional trust in the police and their capacities to remedy the injustices raised by hate violence.6

**Hate Crime Location**

Public spaces (such as streets, parks and footpaths) are the primary sites of reported hate crimes, with 34-45 per cent of all incidents occurring within this environment (Table 6). Despite this shared pattern, the template of racist violence informs the contours of the consolidated results. There is only a slight variation between the total database and the experiences reported by BME communities in relation to racist violence—with a insignificant increase in the likelihood of racist violence occurring in a commercial or business environment. However, the ‘template’ of racist violence also puts into stark relief variations in the site of violence when viewed through the experiences of faith-based and homophobic violence. In particular, it is more common for faith-based and antisemitic hate violence to occur in and around public buildings (ranging from 7.8 per cent for Islamophobic hate crimes to 15.4 per cent in faith hate crimes; compared with 5 per cent overall). In the majority of these
cases, the site is a religious institution such as a mosque, temple or religious community organisation.

Table 6: Hate Crime Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>RACIST</th>
<th>HOMOPHOBIC</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>ANSEMETIC</th>
<th>ISLAMAPHOBIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 23,801</td>
<td>n = 2,580</td>
<td>n = 584</td>
<td>n = 470</td>
<td>n = 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space Only</td>
<td>9,911</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space &amp; Residential</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Only</td>
<td>7,140</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Business Only</td>
<td>3,999</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Building Only</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Only</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Only</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, Islamophobic hate crimes more frequently occurred on or near public transport (7 per cent), when compared with other forms of victimisation (2.8 per cent overall). This may be attributed to the socioeconomic status of victims, or the public spectacle of Islamophobic violence, especially in greater London, where there is a history of public transport being used in terrorism-related incidents (such as IRA bombings in the 1970s and 80s, and the 7/7 bombings).

It is, however, surprising—given the tenacity of antisemitic financial conspiracies—to find that antisemitic hate violence occurred less frequently within the business or commercial environment. The business environment constitutes 14 per cent of the reported antisemitic violence, which is lower than the overall rate of 16.1 per cent. Clearly, whilst some of the strongest antisemitic propaganda relates to the financial and business world, the perpetrators of this violence do not belong to the same world.
Table 6 also highlights the differences faced by LGBTIQ communities. Homophobic violence more commonly occurs in and around the home of the victim/informant (36 per cent vs. 30.6 per cent). While this increased frequency is marginal, it is nonetheless significant when considered in light of the social prohibition of public displays of same-sex relationships. With only the private space of the home left for gay men and lesbians to freely demonstrate their sexuality, an increased prevalence of the home as a site of violence creates the impression to victims that there is no place safe from homophobic violence.

Hate Crime Offence

Table 7: Hate Crime Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENCE5</th>
<th>RACIST</th>
<th>HOMOPHOBIC</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>ANTI-SEMITIC</th>
<th>ISLAMOPHOBIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Behaviour Only</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Behaviour &amp; Criminal Damage</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Behaviour &amp; Theft/Burglary</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Behaviour &amp; Threats</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Behaviour &amp; VTH</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage Only</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage &amp; VTH</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats Only</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats &amp; VTH</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/Burglary Only</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal-Textual Hostility Only</td>
<td>8,651</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between forms of hate crime victimisation are also highlighted when the analysis turns to the recoded offence. While 36.5 per cent of all recorded
offences involved Violent Behaviour (including for example, common assault, ABH, GBH, and malicious wounding), as can be seen in Table 7, homophobic incidents more commonly included violent behaviour (40.5 per cent) or violent behaviour combined with other offences. The exception to this is violent behaviour with VTH; in which case, there is a notable reduction in homophobic incidents.

Concurrently, antisemitic and faith-based hate violence less frequently included these violent behaviours, but correspondingly, included a higher prevalence of criminal damage (to dwellings, cars and other buildings). This finding may relate the increased frequency of faith-based hate violence in public buildings; that is, attacks against religious institutions and organisations. Further, faith and homophobic violence were marginally less likely to include only verbal-textual hostility (29 per cent, and 34.1 per cent, respectively, compared to an overall 35.9 per cent). Finally, a practice that appears more commonly in homophobic violence is the use of only theft/burglary, particularly against gay men (2.9 per cent compared to 1.8 per cent overall). This targeting of gay men for this type of violence is perhaps a result of feminisation of gay men by the suspects, a misperception that they are easy marks, and a perceived unwillingness on the part of victims to report to police because of homophobia or a desire to remain closeted.9

Hate Crime Relationship

The final context characteristic to inform the role of verbal-textual hostility in hate violence is the relationship between suspects and victims. Early definitions of hate crime (such as Mason 1993; Cunneen et al 1997) constructed this type of violence as a matter of ‘stranger-danger’. However, recent research on police case files has clearly demonstrated that there is a division between the ‘stranger-danger’ model of motivated hate crime and the more domesticated nature of aggravated hate crime (see for example, Mason 2005; Moran 2007; Iganski 2008). There is also ambiguity around whether ‘known’ perpetrators can be considered as such when they are only ‘known’ in passing (in the street, shared hallways or shops: Mason 2005; Iganski 2008).
Between a fifth and a third of all recorded incidents of hate violence were perpetrated by someone known to the victim or informant (see Table 8). There are distinct differences in this experience however; not only in terms of the proportion of cases with known perpetrators, but also the type of ‘known’ perpetrator.

Table 8: Existence of Relationship between Suspect & VIW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>RACIST (N = 24,023, p = .001)</th>
<th>HOMOPHOBIC (N = 2,612, p = .001)</th>
<th>FAITH (N = 592, p = .002)</th>
<th>ANTI-SEMITIC (N = 479, p = .001)</th>
<th>ISLAMAPHOBIC (N = 131, p = .001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7,814</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16,209</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homophobic violence is more commonly perpetrated by a known offender (37 per cent), and antisemitic and islamophobic violence is less frequently perpetrated by a known offender (21.7 per cent and 18.3 per cent, respectively, compared with 32.7 per cent overall). In the case of the latter forms of hate crime victimisation, this is perhaps a result of a large minority of these incidents involving anonymous criminal damage against religious buildings and organisations. In the case of homophobic hate crimes, however, this is perhaps the result of 50 per cent higher likelihood of the violence being perpetrated by familial offenders (including friends and acquaintances). As with victims of some forms of inter-faith hatred, sexual and gender diverse communities, at times, face extreme violence at the hands of their family members, including parents and siblings.

Victims of homophobic and faith-based hate crimes more frequently experience violence at the hands of their families (4.7 per cent and 10.7 per cent, respectively, compared with 2.3 per cent overall) (see Table 9). The cases assigned as familial in the faith-based hate crimes are commonly related to incidents also known as Honour-Based Violence (HBV), where multiple, often male, members of the victim’s family are empowered to mete out punishment for perceived breaches of religious and moral codes. The applicability of the label of ‘hate crime’ in these types
of cases is problematic; and, equally, problematises the complementary intrafamilial homophobic hate violence.

Table 9: Hate Crime Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP^10</th>
<th>RACIST</th>
<th>HOMOPHOBIC</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>ANTI-SEMITIC</th>
<th>ISLAMOPHOBIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 8,873</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>n = 7,814</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>n = 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate (ex)Partner</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ex)Family Member</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemate</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Work Colleague</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Other</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When re-coded as a dichotomous variable of familial (or more widely, familiar)—including intimate (ex-) partner, (ex-) family member, friend and housemate—and non-familial, the differences in experiences are more stark. While only 11.8 per cent of all cases included a broader familial relationship, homophobic and faith incidents were more likely to be committed by someone familiar to the victim (18.7 per cent and 22.4 per cent, respectively). When the category of ‘familial’ is broadened beyond direct, blood relatives to include other close relationships (which are more reflective of many sexual and gender diverse ‘families’), we are able to more clearly see the deeper affect these incidents may have on specific victims.

Other than this unique subset of relationships between some victimised communities and their offenders, the relationship associations are to be expected
given the growing knowledge and understanding of this aspect of victimisation. The majority of known offenders are known to the victim as a result of their everyday life, as part of their movement through public space for work, leisure, shopping, and education. Therefore, as is to be expected, the majority of known offenders are neighbours, landlords or housemates (ranging from 37 per cent in faith-based violence to 55 per cent in race hate crimes). The lower proportion of faith-based hate crimes with offenders known in the neighbourhood is perhaps due to the heightened frequency of this form of hate crime occurring in and around public buildings rather than residential spaces.

This contextual analysis of hate crimes reported to the Metropolitan Police Service offers an insight into the unique patterns of racist, antisemitic, homophobic and faith-based violence. However, more importantly, it demonstrates the ground shared between those who experience hate violence. There are shared experiences in spite of the great differences in identity and identity-formation, and the legislative and social boundaries of both. Reported hate crime—no matter who is the subject of this violence—predominantly involves violent behaviour and verbal-textual hostility and/or threats, in and around the victim’s homes or local public spaces, and, of those perpetrators known to the informant/victim, the violence is most likely to be carried out by neighbours or landlords. If there is a convention of hate, then this is it. At the very least, this offers governments and victimised groups an ideal starting point for finding shared solutions to the everyday experiences of hate.
Verbal-Textual Hostility

While there is a shared contextual pattern in hate crimes, the force and effects of this violence varies considerably. In this section, the variation in force and effect is highlighted through a Critical Discourse Analysis of the words used in hate crime to give life to the (sub)conscious intentions of perpetrators. Addressors may not clearly understand the force of ‘words that wound’ (Matsuda 1993). However, the force of these words is passed from generation to generation, with each generation learning anew what these words do. In this way, while young people may not understand what it means to be gay, they are in no way mistaken about the force and effect this label has on the sense of self—and, in the case of boys, sense of masculinity—of the addressee. Therefore, in addition to understanding the contextual factors of hate violence, it is vitally important to understand the words used before, during and after incidents to enhance the force of this violence.

Reported and Recorded Verbal-Textual Hostility

Reporting officers indicated in the abridged narrative of MPS files that approximately 76 per cent of incidents included some form of verbal or textual abuse, and 26.9 per cent included a verbatim recording of the speech-text used in these incidents. However, this prevalence of reported and recorded VTH is not consistent across the five forms of hate crime analysed in this report. Importantly, as can be seen in Table 10, incidents of homophobic and faith-based hate violence less frequently included reported verbal-textual hostility (71.9 per cent and 68.4 per cent, respectively).

Homophobic hate violence was also 30 per cent less likely to include a verbatim recording of the verbal-textual hostility used before or during incidents (22.6 per cent vs. 27 per cent). As the decreased use of reported VTH in faith-based hate crimes was not replicated in recorded VTH, it is believed that the decreased recorded VTH in homophobic incidents may represent differential policing practices, not differential experiences of VTH in hate crimes.
Differential patterns of reported and recorded verbal-textual hostility also emerge when these variables are considered in terms of offence. Incidents that included violent behaviour (such as ABH, GBH and Common Assault), criminal damage, or theft/burglary less frequently contained reported or recorded verbal-textual hostility (60.1 per cent, 43 per cent and 37.3 per cent vs. 76 per cent overall). This could be due to perpetrators of these types of incidents preferring not to use verbal or textual hostility. In the case criminal damage, these incidents rarely require verbal or textual hostility—with the exception of graffiti. In the case of violent behaviour, there is a pattern of decreasing reported and recorded VTH as the behaviour increases in severity, with VHT less commonly reported or recorded for ABH/Malicious Wounding and GBH. This may be due to the severity of the substantive offence, but could
equally be an artefact of a pattern whereby as the physical violence increases, the need for verbal-textual hostility decreases. This trend is also reflected in the patterns of VTH used by offenders, and also the ‘tipping-point’ category of terrorisation. Both of these are discussed in more detail below and in the next chapter.

The absence of explicit VTH in these offences involving violent behaviour (against people or objects/buildings) raises, however, concerns about how victims/informants ‘know’ that this violence and criminal damage is hate motivated or aggravated. In cases without verbal-textual hostility, an ongoing pattern of violence between the perpetrator and victim—that included reported/recorded verbal-textual hostility, at some time—would be necessary to understand these incidents as hate crimes. However, as Iganski (2008:12) details, a majority of respondents to the British Crime Survey stated that they perceived crime as having a hate component purely on the basis of the victim’s perceived race/country of origin.

Importantly, though, the differential practice of reported and recorded VTH could also reflect reporting officers’ belief that proving the substantive offence of physical violence is more important than providing forensic evidence of the hate motivation or aggravation. In cases where ‘hate speech’ constitutes the substantive offence (such as VTH and threats), these speech-text acts are more likely to be reported (95.5 per cent and 99.5 per cent, respectively vs. 76 per cent overall). Importantly, though, only threats were more likely to be recorded (31.3 per cent vs. 27 per cent overall). The consistency in recorded VTH across all these categories highlights the impact that policing practices can have on the hate crime data.

**Number of Acts of Verbal-Textual Hostility**

The number of recorded speech acts in each incident also illustrates differential practices in the use of verbal-textual hostility. Homophobic violence is significantly more likely to include a single speech act than all other hate violence incidents (55.7 per cent vs. 35 per cent overall). This single speech act consists predominantly of naming the addressee (*interpellation*) (see Table 12 below), and perhaps illustrates the force and effect of publicly identifying someone’s sexual and/or gender identity.
Hate crime committed by family members (56.9 per cent vs. 36.6 per cent overall), and in private, residential environments (48 per cent vs. 36.8 per cent) also more commonly include a single speech act.

At the other end of the scale, racist and faith-based hate crimes were more likely to include four or more speech acts (7.8 per cent and 7.4 per cent, respectively) than homophobic or antisemitic (3.1 per cent and 5.4 per cent, respectively). These incidents were more frequently textual (hate mail) rather than verbal (hate speech), or they were VTH only incidents in captive audience situations such as public transport (10.1 per cent vs. 7.2 per cent). The number of speech acts in each incident also increases with a decrease in violent behaviour, but conversely, the number of speech acts increase with an increase in violent speech. These incidents involving four or more speech acts were more also likely to include threats than VTH alone (12.9 per cent vs. 7.1 per cent, respectively). Despite these differences in ‘speech crimes’, the number of speech acts in these offences contrast significantly with theft/burglary (0 per cent), criminal damage (5.3 per cent), and violent behaviour (4.7 per cent).

**Verbal-Textual Hostility Themes**

To get a better understanding of the force and effects of verbal-textual hostility, it is also vital to understand how the characteristics of hate crime relate with the actual words used in these incidents. In this sense, while violence perpetrated by neighbours or family members in and around the family home using extended speech acts may lead to heightened harm, equally, a well-timed, well-placed single speech act can create a crippling response from the addressee. For example, in a case file managed by the Lesbian and Gay Anti-Violence Project (Sydney, Australia) in the mid-1990s, occupants of a passing car called the victim ‘poofta’. In itself, this speech act meant little to the victim (who identified as a heterosexual); however, other people standing near him took this as a statement of truth and pushed him into oncoming traffic. This example illustrates not only the inefficacy of some illocutionary speech acts, but correspondingly, the perlocutionary—or consequential—effects of a single speech act on the audience of that VTH. It is therefore important to be cognisant of
how VTH can bring about harm in the saying/writing, and as a consequence of the saying/writing.

Table 12: Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility x Hate Crime Flag

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTH: INTERPELLATION</th>
<th>RACIST</th>
<th>HOMOPHOBIC</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>ANTI-SEMITIC</th>
<th>ISLAMOPHOBIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 5,584</td>
<td>n = 5,040 p = .001</td>
<td>n = 424 p = .001</td>
<td>n = 107 p = .001</td>
<td>n = 112 p = .001</td>
<td>n = 30 p = .968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpellation</td>
<td>4,116</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpellation (&amp;) (An)other Themes</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpellation Only</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profane Naming</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Interpellation</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTH: OTHER THEMES</th>
<th>Pathologisation</th>
<th>Demonisation</th>
<th>Sexualisation</th>
<th>Criminalisation</th>
<th>Expatriation</th>
<th>Terrorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* 220</td>
<td>^ 18</td>
<td>* 7</td>
<td>* 7</td>
<td>^ 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>716</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>^ 16</td>
<td>^ 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>778</td>
<td>* 57</td>
<td>* 11</td>
<td>* 11</td>
<td>^ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* 30</td>
<td>^ 3</td>
<td>^ 1</td>
<td>^ 4</td>
<td>^ 1</td>
<td>^ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>849</td>
<td>* 17</td>
<td>* 11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>^ 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>^ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>994</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

no notation, \(p < .05\)  \* \(p = .05 - .5\)  \^ \(p > .5\) or insufficient responses

As shown in Table 12, central to the verbal-textual hostility recorded in the MPS incident files is the practice of naming the addressee—with approximately 81 per cent of incidents including the use of *interpellation*, and 22.4 per cent of incidents consisting of only *interpellation*. Further, as with Stokoe and Edwards’ (2007) research, a complementary practice to *interpellation* is *profane naming*. This intensifies the *interpellation* by the simple addition of *profanity* (such as the use of the intensive, ‘fucking’). *Profane naming* constitutes 17.1 per cent of those incidents with recorded verbal-textual hostility. However, the prevalence of naming the
addressee—or profane naming—varies considerably in terms of the form of hate violence.

All forms of religious hatred more commonly included interpellation, alone or in combination with profanity or other themes of VTH (66.4 per cent and 68.7 per cent respectively vs. 81.0 per cent overall). Conversely, homophobic violence more frequently included interpellation only. As mentioned above, in the case of homophobic violence, the use of only interpellation may illustrate that the force of those names (poof, dyke, batty boy etc) is sufficient to give life to the addressor’s hatred or hostility. The higher prevalence of interpellation in racist violence may be due to addressors identifying the most obvious feature of addressees that mark them as different—the colour of the victim’s skin.

These acts of VTH contrast with religious hatred, where difference may not be so obvious (except when the victim is wearing religious clothing, or sited near a religious building), or naming may not be sufficiently hostile to instantiate the addressor’s hatred or hostility. While interpellation or profane naming can create a hostile environment, the dominance of this single form of verbal-textual hostility masks more forceful speech acts. Given the dominance of interpellation in all VTH, it is only in its absence, that the patterns of deeper and more forceful VTH can be identified and evaluated. In the bottom half of Table 12, these other themes are documented without the influence of interpellation or profanity.

Beyond the conventional form of interpellation, the verbal-textual hostility used by offenders and reported in the MPS data draws upon four main themes: demonisation, sexualisation, expatriation and terrorisation. Each of these additional acts of VTH does more than name individuals and groups. These substantive speech acts reduce individuals to their most private experiences and body parts, incite fear of ‘evil incarnate’ and the mongrelisation of culture, and seek the exile, extermination or elimination of the ‘other’. As such, addressing marginalised individuals using these speech acts can create stronger illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects. However, the efficacy of these acts of VTH pivots on the addressor’s clear identification of specific hated individual or groups. In this way, through convention,
the names attributed to addressees become reductive versions of the stronger themes of VTH. Simultaneously, the stronger themes are without context unless the addressee is named, or their identity can be read from their appearance, attire or cultural practices.

There are clear differences in the prevalence of each of the additional themes. Most stark is the disproportionate use of terrorisation in antisemitic and faith-based hate crimes. In the UK, as with many other first-world nations, it has often been the case that the terrorisation of BME and gay and lesbian communities has led to increased regulation of hate crime. For example, the 25 BME men—in additional to Stephen Lawrence—who were murdered in racially motivated hate crimes between 1991 and 1999, and the nail bomb attacks against gay clubs in 1999 and the murders of Anthony Walker and Jody Dobrowski in 2005. Yet, as can be seen in the results in Table 12, religious hatred is more likely to include terrorisation. In the case of antisemitic violence, this could be due to the efficacy of ‘calling down’ the Shoah as reminder of what could happen (such as ‘Hitler had the right idea with the final solution’ or the use of the swastika in the majority of criminal damage cases of antisemitic violence). However, it is important to note that while terrorisation is more likely to occur in religious hatred, this form of VTH was the most prevalent practice—apart from interpellation—in all forms of hate crime. The harm caused by these speech acts is intensified by the higher likelihood of terrorisation being used by familial offenders (15 per cent vs. 10.0 per cent overall), and in/around the victim’s home (40.5 per cent vs. 37.0 per cent in public spaces).

Oliver Cromwell Cox (1970 cited in Fraser 1995: 77f19), in comparing antisemitism with white supremacy, suggested that there is a continuum to outsiderhood. For the white supremacist, the presence of blacks can be disquieting but, for the most part, their presence is tolerated in order to exploit them as a cheap labour supply (that is, slavery). But for the antisemite, the very presence of Jews is an abomination, which must be resolved through either forced conversion or extermination. In this sense, Cromwell Cox is arguing that for the white supremacist, blacks are endured, if they stay in their place; on the other hand, for the antisemite, Jews are always out of place and need to be permanently removed from that space.
This argument is borne out in this data. While terrorisation appears to be a dominant practice in religious hatred (particularly, antisemitism), racist violence more commonly included calls for the exile of the addressee (expatriation) from the space shared by victim and perpetrator; whether that is the neighbourhood or the nation. Seeking the exile of cultural difference from our shared space may appear to be less harmful than the extermination sought in terrorisation. Yet, it is only marginally so given the warning contained in expatriation. These speech acts, and, ultimately, the violent behaviour experienced by hate crime victims, operate on a continuum; unheeded directions to ‘fuck off, go home’ can easily morph into threats of violence, which, in turn, can quickly and easily turn to violent behaviour.

Table 13: Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility x Offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTH: INTERPELLATION</th>
<th>VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>CRIMINAL DAMAGE</th>
<th>THEFT/ BURGLARY</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
<th>VERBAL-TEXTUAL HOSTILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 5,584</td>
<td>n = 1,569</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>n = 434</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>n = 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpellation</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpellation &amp; (An)other Themes</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpellation Only</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profane Naming</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Interpellation</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTH: OTHER THEMES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathologisation</td>
<td>^ 74</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>* 14</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>^ 2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonisation</td>
<td>* 220</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexualisation</td>
<td>^ 229</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>* 8</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalisation</td>
<td>^ 4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>^ 1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>^ 1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriation</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>* 58</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>* 11</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorisation</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>* 11</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Other offences have been excluded from these results as this attribute contained too few responses. no notation, p < .05 * p = .05 - .5 ^ p > .5 or insufficient responses
There are clear differences in the experience of verbal-textual hostility when considered in light of the identity of victims/informants. However, in order to better understanding of the harm generated out of these speech acts, it is also important to consider how these themes of VTH are deployed in different types of hate crime. As can be seen in Table 13 above, interpellation was more common in incidents involving violent behaviour or theft/burglary (87.7 per cent and 82.6 per cent respectively); with a significantly higher frequency of profane interpellation, especially in the latter of these (19.9 per cent and 27.9 per cent, respectively vs. 17.1 per cent overall).

Further, there was a considerably lower likelihood of interpellation in cases of threats (53.6 per cent, respectively vs. 81 per cent overall), yet when combined with other themes (particularly, terrorisation), interpellation was disproportionately employed in threats (44.1 per cent vs. 22.1 per cent in theft/burglary incidents). However, cases of interpellation only were more likely to occur in extreme violent behaviour (ABC/GBH) and theft/burglary (36.3 per cent, 32.6 per cent). In the former, this may be due to the body—particularly, the fists—doing the talking.

With interpellation removed from the data set, clear patterns and markers emerge around particular offences. At the extreme ends of hate crime—violent behaviour and verbal-textual hostility—there is a spike in the use of sexualisation. This is in large part the result of perpetrators using the word ‘cunt’ more often in these offences. Further, there is a significant drop in terrorisation in violent behaviour (8.9 per cent vs. 20.4 per cent overall). This is perhaps because there is no need for putting into words that which the perpetrator seeks to achieve through physical means. This reduced use of terrorisation in violent behaviour also highlights the tipping point between speech and action, whereby words become insufficient to instantiate the offender’s hatred. Beyond terrorisation, offenders are only left with violent behaviour if they choose to escalate their hatred, or if the victim fails to heed the warning.

At the nexus between violent behaviour and speech crimes lay property crimes such as criminal damage and theft/burglary. In criminal damage, the primary speech
act is that of terrorisation (32.0 per cent vs. 20.4 per cent overall). Directing their violence against objects and structures (rather than human bodies) may lead perpetrators to risk a mediated, perhaps even an opportunistic, threat that they may not have been willing or capable of in person. On the other hand, incidents of theft/burglary were primarily limited to interpellation, with a relatively low use of terrorisation or expatriation (12.8 per cent for both vs. 15.7 per cent and 20.4 per cent overall, respectively). When considered overall, theft/burglary incidents appear to represent opportunistic, aggravated (rather than motivated) incidents. However, the higher frequency of theft/burglary in homophobic incidents also points to the strategic targeting of some victims, under the preconception that gay men (in particular) are easy ‘marks’. Whilst not explicitly motivated by homophobic hatred, these incidents are based on prejudiced conceptions of gay men as effeminate, or possibly that gay men would be too ashamed to report these incidents as hate crimes.

At the lower end of the hate crime spectrum is verbal-textual hostility. In these offences (which contain nothing more than verbal-textual hostility), the primary practices are expatriation and sexualisation (16.6 per cent and 16.0 per cent vs. 15.7 and 15.1 per cent overall, respectively). This heightened prevalence is perhaps the outcome of the extended exchanges necessary to constitute hatred without physical violence or criminal damage. A disturbing anomaly found in incidents of VTH was the presence of terrorisation. Terrorisation is the only form of VTH that could constitute a criminal (rather than civil) offence, in and of itself; whether committed as a hate crime or not. One hundred and seventy incidents were assigned as ‘other notifiable offence’ in 2003, and 634 offences were assigned as threats (its comparable category) in 2007. While this represents a noteworthy increase in the reporting of threats over the time period of these data sets, there were a significant number of comparable incidents that were reported at the lower offences of ‘other accepted crime’ and harassment. In 2003, an additional 427 incidents assigned as ‘other accepted crime’, and 1,411 incidents assigned as harassment were found to include threats of violence. In 2007, the assignment to the lower offences are not as stark, though still present, with 327 harassment incidents, and 666 ‘other accepted crime’ incidents also including threats of violence.
Either these incidents have been incorrectly assigned the lower offence, or the perceived threat or harm from these speech acts have been under-estimated by the reporting officer, informant and/or victim. Enhancing frontline policing practice could assist in reducing the ambiguity between the lower offences of ‘other accepted crime’ and harassment and higher offences of threats and ‘other notifiable offence’, and would assist in identifying the ‘tipping point’ of hate crime. Key tools of forensic linguistics could therefore play an important role in assisting frontline officers in judging the harm, force and effects of these speech acts. In the final chapter, the findings from this and the preceding chapter are considered in light of the predictive output from logistical regression. When the analysis shifts from descriptive to predictive, the opportunities for identifying risk factors for more violent offences are highlighted.
Using Verbal-Textual Hostility to Predict Violent Behaviour

Predicting the conditions under which the risk of verbal-textual hostility transforms into violent behaviour is wholly dependent upon two contextual variables:

- emotional proximity between victim and offender
- physical proximity of the victim to their home

In general, though, the more speech acts used in hate crime—especially if *interpelling* is employed—the less likely offenders are to resort to violent behaviour. Logistic regression revealed four main models for predicting violent behaviour in hate crimes. Each of these models reflects the public/private and familiar/stranger contexts present in all forms of interpersonal violence.

**Models for Predicting Violent Behaviour**

Table 14 below exhibits the relationship between *expatriation*, *terrorisation*, public space (such as streets, parks or open sports field) and housing relationships, and the likelihood of violent behaviour occurring. Where there is a relationship between the parties, neighbourly offenders are 52 per cent less likely to use violent behaviour than all other types of known offenders. Controlling for VTH and relationship, violent behaviour is 1.4 times more likely in public spaces than private. Of particular note is the pattern in hate crime whereby the use of more forceful verbal-textual hostility (such as *expatriation* and *terrorisation*) is less likely to occur in the same incident an offender uses violent behaviour (45 per cent and 77 per cent, respectively).

**Table 14: Public Hate Crime (Model 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>N = 1,822</th>
<th>95% CI for ODDS RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
<td>SIG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriation</td>
<td>-.60 (.16)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorisation</td>
<td>-1.48 (.17)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space</td>
<td>-.33 (.12)</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Relationship*</td>
<td>-.50 (.11)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.59 (.10)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes neighbours, housemates, landlords and tenants*
Once an incident moves from a public space to the more intimate, private realm of the victim’s home, as can be seen in Table 15 below, in case of violent behaviour, the primary relationship between victims and offenders is familial. When controlling for interpellation and terrorisation in the private sphere, familial offenders are 1.9 times more likely to use violent behaviour. This move from violent neighbourly offenders to violent familial offenders—with the concomitant move from the public to the private sphere—reflects similar results found in relation to many forms of interpersonal violence, but especially in relation to violence against women and children. Further, offenders using violent behaviour were 45 per cent more likely to use interpellation, but 70 per cent less likely to use terrorisation. The latter of these reinforces the division between violent speech and violent behaviour; offenders will employ one or the other, but rarely both, whether in the private or public sphere.

Table 15: Private Hate Crime (Model 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>95% CI for ODDS RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpellation</td>
<td>-.37 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorisation</td>
<td>-1.18 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Space</td>
<td>-1.399 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial*</td>
<td>.652 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.01 (.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes (ex-) intimate partner, friends, housemates, family members

When offence is substituted with location as the dependant variable (see Table 16 below), an additional model of private hate crime emerges. When controlling for demonisation, terrorisation, profanity and criminal damage, violence against the person is 33 per cent less likely in the private sphere. However, criminal damage is 2.2 times more likely, and terrorisation is 1.5 times more likely in the private sphere. Additionally, when controlling for the other variables, demonisation becomes a significant practice in the private sphere, with a 42 per cent higher likelihood.
Table 16: Private Hate Crime (Model 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIVATE SPACE</th>
<th>N = 1,768</th>
<th>95% CI for ODDS RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
<td>SIG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonisation</td>
<td>.35 (.09)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>.79 (.11)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorisation</td>
<td>-.43 (.07)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profanity</td>
<td>-.26 (.06)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the Person</td>
<td>-.41 (.07)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.763 (.05)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the final of the four models (Table 17 below), the relationship between the victim and offender is substituted as the dependent variable. When the focus is on familial relationships, and the analysis controls for expatriation, demonisation, violence against people and virtual locations (that is, those incidents occurring via mobile phones and on the internet), terrorisation is 1.8 times more likely.

Table 17: Familial Hate Crime (Model 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>N = 1,822</th>
<th>95% CI for ODDS RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
<td>SIG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonisation</td>
<td>-1.04 (.31)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriation</td>
<td>-.61 (.27)</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorisation</td>
<td>-.59 (.17)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>1.00 (.35)</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the Person</td>
<td>-.48 (.18)</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.37 (.13)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, familial offenders are 2.7 times more likely to use mediated violence through mobile phones and the internet than they are in situated violence. When familial offenders are situated (whether public or private), they are 1.6 times more likely to use violent behaviour.
Concluding Remarks

Contrary to the platitudes of our parents, names can, and do hurt, and under the right circumstances can result in harm and distress. However, most people—no matter their personal, social or religious characteristics—face this situation at some time in their lives; especially at the hands of the schoolyard or workplace bully. What brings us the greatest offence, or causes the greatest harm and distress will have as much to do with who we believe ourselves to be, as it does with how others perceive us. In this sense, naming one’s subjectivity can be a positive act of nomenclature and an act of subordination, depending on who has the power to name. Subordinating the other through *interpellation* creates a hierarchy of subject positions. Equally, for those assigned a subordinate position, the performative act of *interpellation* is essential to participation in the polity, and consequentially, the opening up of opportunities for moving out of a subordinate position. Therefore, the force and effects of naming is always ‘out of our control’ and up for negotiation (Butler 1997).

In cases of ongoing incidents of verbal harassment, the harm and possible effects increase and, as such, must be managed more closely by policing services. In single acts of verbal-textual hostility, however, it may be dangerous to criminalise, censor or chill those incidents that contain nothing more than *interpellation*.

Understanding what is said in hate crime assists us in understanding when hate is a crime, and, necessarily, the responsibility of policing services. A more critical use of forensic linguistics, as illustrated in the preceding analyses, can assist us to develop sophisticated instruments with which to judge the possible harm, force and effects of verbal-textual hostility. Further, the use of VTH in incidents of violent behaviour (for example, ABH/GBH, sexual assault and, to a lesser extent, common assault)—such as the decreased number of speech acts and the ‘softer’ themes of verbal-textual hostility employed by perpetrators—underscores the way in which verbal-textual hostility acts as a surrogate for physical violence. The role of surrogate is also illustrated by the use of *terrorisation* in incidents not involving violent behaviour.

There are some variations in the text and context of hate crimes when considered through the lens of victim-status. This differential practice is especially
highlighted in the increased frequency of homophobic hate crimes that are more violent (with a higher prevalence of ABH/GBH, (attempted) murder and sexual assault), and the higher likelihood of the use of terrorisation in faith-based violence. Yet, in predictive analyses, the data clearly shows that these differences between victim groups are not statistically significant. In this sense, more binds victims of hate crime together in shared experiences, than separates them as unique to any particular victim group. The conventional form of hate crime in the UK consists of:

- violence against the person,
- in public spaces in and around the victim’s home,
- with neighbours using verbal-textual hostility, harassment and common assault to evidence their hatred and intolerance

Their primary speech acts consist of interpellation and terrorisation. This conventional form of verbal-textual hostility translates into the Austinian illocutionary speech act of in terrorem (Iganski 2002: 28-9)—or more precisely, ‘I terrorise thee’. These are not mere words, and they are not easily shaken off. Beyond the discriminatory action represented in these illocutions, these speech acts make addressees more vulnerable to a series of perlocutionary psycho-social and biomedical consequences that harm the individual and community long after the incident of hate crime (such as increased fear of prejudice, distrust of ‘strangers’, depression and drug and alcohol misuse) (Asquith and Fox, 2013).

The more said by an offender—especially, when this VTH includes interpellation—the less likely they are to engage in violent behaviour. However, there is a tipping point in this escalation. When the verbal-textual hostility includes interpellation, the speech/text escalates in force, with the incident commonly terminating in terrorisation (or threats to the person and/or property). Yet, when no interpellation is recorded, suspects quickly move from hostile VTH (such as expatriation, demonisation and sexualisation) to violent behaviour.

The capacity to respond effectively to the harms caused by hate crime and verbal-textual hostility is not equally shared among victims; yet, this is not due solely to how people identify themselves or are identified by suspects and policing services.
It is also about the individual, social and institutional resources available to seek and find justice. Shared experiences provide enough common ground for shared responses and resources, and a unitary system for regulating hate crime that does not privilege one victim of hate over another solely because of identity. Evaluating who is harmed in hate crimes must be a matter of text and context. Employing forensic linguistics to this task ensures that the matter of power—and the symbolic violence adhered to language use in hate crime—is not forgotten.
Appendix One—Conventional Forms of Hate Crime

Figure 1: Continuum of Violence and Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility
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Figure 2: Hate Crime Flag and Themes of Verbal-Textual Hostility
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Figure 3: Continuum of Violence and Contextual Factors
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Endnotes

1 The number of cases originally reported in the MPS database during these two years was 35,650. However, all 2003 incidents included multiple case entries depending on the number of offences, offenders, sites of incident or relationships between the victim and offenders. When these cases were consolidated into single incidents, and all duplicate and out-of-jurisdiction case were eliminated, the number of cases were significantly reduced (in 2003, from 20,979 to 16,103; in 2008, from 14,671 to 11,061).

2 Austin's illocutionary speech acts were epitomised by the first-person singular present indicative verb statements such as ‘I promise’, ‘I thee wed’, ‘I condemn thee’ or ‘I name this ship’.

3 See Asquith (2009) for an extended discussion of speech act theory and the harms generated out of illocutionary and perlocutionary speech acts.

4 When the 2007 data were combined with the 2003 data all incidents that included notes that the file was a duplicate or out-of-jurisdiction were deleted from the database (n = 165 [2003]; 271 [2007]). The deletion of these files had no effect on the overall results as none of these cases included details about the presence and content of verbal-textual hostility.

5 It is important to note that this situation is not unique to the UK; the ‘policy career’ of hate crime legislation and policing practices is very similar across western democracies, with racist hate crime gaining the most attention of policy makers.

6 This trust is conditional in large part because of the continued differential policing practices in relation to stop and search powers and the collection of DNA, and the failure of policing services to meet their Lawrence Enquiry commitments on the recruitment and retention of BME officers. In all three practices, policing services in the UK continue to provide an unequal service; under-representation on the latter, and over-representation on the former (EHRC 2009).

7 The seven location variables in this table are user-defined recodes, which reduced 40 separate MPS locations into workable categories that highlight the role of verbal-textual hostility.

8 The eleven offence variables in this table are user-defined recodes, which reduced 137 separate MPS offences into workable categories that highlight the role of verbal-textual hostility.

9 Similar constructions of failed-masculinity have been mooted in relation to violence against Indian students in Australia.

10 The eight relationship variables in this table are user-defined recodes, which reduced 58 separate MPS relationships into workable categories that highlight the role of verbal-textual hostility.

11 Islamaphobic incidents are not included in this analysis as there were too few responses to provide valid statistics.
This was a case managed by the author in her role as Client Advocate at the Lesbian and gay Anti-Violence Project in 1994/95, and is part of the data set analysed in Text and Context in Malediction (Asquith, 2008).

See Asquith (2004; 2007; 2008) for an extended discussion of these themes. In previous research based on reported antisemitic and homophobic hate violence in Australia, the most common themes identified were pathologisation, criminalisation and terrorisation (Asquith, 2008). The inclusion of all faith-based and racist hate violence in this study has clearly altered the prevalence and use of these themes in UK hate crime. This could also be the result of cultural differences in the enactment of hatred, or institutional differences (community-based data vs. police data). An important difference between the MPS and community-based data is the extensive Holocaust Denial that appears to escape reporting to policing services, but is often collated by Jewish community organisations.

Familial relationships include (ex-) intimate partners, friends, family members, and housemates.