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Introduction

Filling in the Blanks is the final report of a landmark partnership between the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) voluntary sector in London, and the Metropolitan Police Service. The partnership sought to increase our understanding of unreported LGBT hate crime and of services available to victims of these crimes, particularly services relating to reporting.

The research stemmed from the recognition that the significant majority of LGBT hate incidents go unreported to the police, but may be either formally reported or informally described to the LGBT voluntary sector. Despite the fact that the voluntary sector holds this vital information, it was unclear to what extent the information was shared, either within the sector, or with the police. The research partners therefore recognised this potential important untapped resource, and sought to fill in the blanks in our knowledge and understanding of LGBT hate crime in London.

The research was funded by the City Parochial Foundation (CPF), the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA), and brought together LGBT voluntary sector partners, Galop, Stonewall Housing (SH)1 and London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard (LLGS).

The MPS and the MPA were particularly keen to become involved in the research due to their recognition of the extent of under-reporting of homophobic and transphobic incidents by the LGBT community to the police. This lack of crime information resulted in the MPS having a partial or limited view of this type of hate crime. The research was therefore designed to respond to this through the structured collation of information on homophobic and transphobic incidents by voluntary sector LGBT organisations, to establish levels and patterns of non-police reporting and perhaps identify some of the reasons why members of the community do not approach the police. This information would in turn allow the MPS to identify key strategies to encourage greater levels reporting through the development of more appropriate responses to this type of crime.

The research had a number of aims:

• to gain an insight into the range and nature of LGBT hate incidents in London
• to create a shared language in the LGBT voluntary sector on LGBT hate incidents
• to increase collaboration within the LGBT voluntary sector on LGBT hate crime, including sharing information on incidents
• to systematise the recording of information among partners, whilst also being responsive to the needs of each organisation
• to create a new set of data on LGBT hate crime and analyse the range and nature of incidents, comparing this data to MPS data where possible
• to find out what services exist for victims of LGBT hate incidents, particularly for reporting incidents, and to discover the extent to which these services meet need.

The research had three phases which together met the aims of the project. The first phase was to map current service provision across the capital and examine the extent to which information was shared, or was in a sharable format. The second phase involved working with three voluntary sector partners to systematise information collection in ways that were effective for each organisation. Data was then collected from each organisation on all incidents recorded for a year, in addition to an analysis of historical data from Galop which was also added to the dataset. The final phase of the project was a qualitative analysis of this data as well as a comparison to MPS data where this was possible.

1. Stonewall Housing is an LGBT housing charity and is separate and unconnected to Stonewall the lobby group.
The results of the research reveal important findings in all three areas, discussed in more detail in the following chapters. Primarily, the research highlighted the lack of strategic response to the reporting of homophobic and transphobic hate crime in London, and the ways in which this has led to uneven and sometimes ineffective service provision. The research emphasised the ways in which LGBT organisations can work together to standardise and share information, and the ways in which this joint working is reliant on appropriate resources to be effective. Finally, the statistical analysis revealed some of the differences between the types of cases that are reported to LGBT voluntary sector organisations, as opposed to the MPS.

Filling in the Blanks is presented in five chapters. Chapter one establishes a context for the report by reviewing previous research on homophobic and transphobic hate crime which establishes the low levels of reporting mentioned above. Chapter two discusses the methods used in the various project phases. Chapter three presents the findings of the mapping exercise and discusses where there are gaps and areas for improvement for service provision in London. Chapter four discusses the action research phase, with learning for organisations wishing to work in partnership and recommendations for how to further increase the sharing of information. Chapter five presents the statistical analysis of over 700 cases reported to the LGBT voluntary sector partners, and compares them to over 8,000 cases reported to the MPS over a five year period.
Executive summary

Introduction

Filling in the Blanks is a landmark investigation into homophobic and transphobic hate crime in London. The research aimed to increase our understanding about the nature of homophobic and transphobic hate crime, and about the options for victims to report their experiences and get the support they may need.

The research, funded by the City Parochial Foundation, the Metropolitan Police Service and the Metropolitan Police Authority, was undertaken by Galop in partnership with Stonewall Housing and London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard.

The research was approached in three phases. In the first phase the aim was to map the range of reporting and support services targeted at victims of homophobic and transphobic hate crime in London. The second phase involved a period of partnership working between the three organisations, to create a collated dataset of incidents reported to each organisation. In the final phase the data that had been collected was analysed and, where possible, compared with MPS data.

Mapping exercise

In this phase, the aim was to find out what kind of services were available for victims of homophobic and transphobic hate crime in London. A range of methods were used, including internet searches and phone surveys, to get a broad picture of the range of services and how they work. The full chapter on the mapping exercise gives details of the types of third party reporting schemes which exist, and some of the challenges faced in trying to ensure they are effective.

It is clear from the mapping exercise that a significant proportion of otherwise unreported homophobic and transphobic hate incidents are either informally ‘told’ or more formally reported to a range of agencies and organisations across London. However, in the majority of cases, these agencies do not have a system for recording this information – leading to a wealth of missing data and an inhibited understanding of homophobia and transphobia. Even where information is recorded, it tends to be retained by the individual organisation, with no shared recording systems and no method for wider dissemination. The mapping exercise also identified a lack of shared language and terminology relating to both hate crimes, and methods of reporting. This further inhibits shared understanding and action.

The research identified some good practice in individual London boroughs, and highlighted the fact that despite a lack of tools and guidance, many local authorities, police boroughs and voluntary sector organisations have sought to be proactive in combating LGBT hate crime. However, although committed to action, there were a number of challenges to overcome, including:

• No consistency or standardisation of third party reporting services across London, with no minimum standards in existence.
• No evidence base identifying what makes an effective hate crime initiative. There appeared to be little guidance for organisations funding or providing a LGBT third party reporting service to show what initiatives are likely to increase reporting and provide help to victims.
• Inconsistent involvement of the MPS, or of LGBT police liaison officers in third party reporting initiatives locally.
The research found no overall strategy on increasing reporting and providing third party reporting options in London. As a result of this and the challenges outlined above, there appears to have been a proliferation of initiatives across London, most of which were funded to work within a single borough or area. This has led to an uneven and inconsistent approach to encouraging the reporting of hate crime across London, with some boroughs having more than one reporting initiative, and others with none. Many schemes have proved ineffective, often because of a range of issues which, in addition to those outlined above, include:

- Inherent problems with a borough based approach which doesn’t always reflect the reality of LGBT people’s lives.
- Little sustainability for schemes because of a lack of long term funding commitments.
- Unrealistically low funding which didn’t include resources for training and relied on volunteers and under-resourced voluntary sector partners to deliver services.

There has been no effective evaluation of the delivery and performance of third party reporting services across the capital. Some respondents to the mapping exercise also questioned the effectiveness of True Vision, which has also not been evaluated.

The research also found that victims and organisations providing victims with support often encountered problems in contacting the police for example out of date information on websites, phone numbers that don’t work, and no central place listing reporting options. Emphasis appeared to be focused on increasing the numbers of incidents reported, rather than focusing on outcomes sought by victims and ensuring that reports are properly followed up.

**Mapping exercise recommendations**

**A strategic approach**

A strategic approach to reporting of homophobic and transphobic hate crime in London is needed. Leadership from the criminal justice system and London government, as well as Galop and other key stakeholders is needed to move this forward. Any strategy should ensure the following:

- A focus beyond simply increasing levels of reporting, which seeks to ensure positive outcomes for victims who report incidents.
- Minimum standards guidance for third party initiatives are developed (by Galop in partnership with other stakeholders), including shared language, standardisation of questions and information sharing protocols.

**Evaluate what works**

There is a need for effective evaluation of third party reporting initiatives. This should include:

- Which models are proven to provide a good service to victims.
- An evaluation of True Vision.
- An assessment of what kind of advertising is effective in increasing reporting levels.

**Increase the effectiveness of third party reporting initiatives**

Third party initiatives need to be provided with support to ensure that they are effective. This should include:
• A realistic assessment of voluntary sector capacity (including available resources) factored into initiatives.
• The MPS should play a more consistent role in local third party initiatives, and there should be increased consistency in the role of the LGBT Liaison Officer.
• An agreement about minimum standards on sending third party reports to police, and on police response time, including feedback on outcomes to organisations making third party reports.
• The MPS should provide a single point of contact to report inaccurate or out of date information on publicity and websites.
• Encouragement for LGBT organisations to record and share information.
• Setting up systems for central dissemination of learning and statistics to ensure improved understanding.
• Setting up systems for joint working between LGBT organisations to share good practice and take advantage of economies of scale.
• Coherent publicity for third party reporting should be developed, which could include a single telephone helpline for victims of LGBT hate crime.

**Improve funding**

A strategic and effective reporting service for victims of homophobic and transphobic hate crime requires on reliable and consistent statutory funding from central government, London government and London criminal justice system sources, which needs to include funding for:

• Pan-London reporting services.
• Galop to provide ongoing training and support to encourage other organisations to record information on hate crime.
• Galop to continue to collate and disseminate this shared information.

**Partnership phase**

During this second research phase, a working partnership between Galop, Stonewall Housing and London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard was established. This enabled all three organisations to improve and increase the amount of information that they were able to collect on incidents experienced by their clients.

The project worker worked with each organisation to develop recording and monitoring systems that were appropriate to the organisation, but which used common language and categorisation, enabling the sharing and comparing of the data that was collected. This phase of the research demonstrates the achievement, benefits and some of the obstacles to joint working with LGBT voluntary sector organisations to encourage them to record and increase intelligence on homophobic and transphobic hate crime. The project successfully brought together three voluntary LGBT organisations to work jointly to collect more data on homophobic/transphobic hate crime, and do so in a more coherent way. This led to the ability to share information both within the sector and with the MPS, which would not usually have been disseminated (or even collected).

It is clear from the process of collection and analysis that victims of incidents are reporting to LGBT voluntary organisations. However, numbers of cases reported to LGBT voluntary organisations suggest that homophobic and transphobic hate crime is under-reported. It will be important in future research to develop a more complex understanding of reasons for under-reporting, beyond a fear of the police, as this is only part of the problem.
The project particularly highlighted the ways in which relatively small changes to existing monitoring systems used by LGBT voluntary organisations can lead to more detailed data being collected on hate crime.

All organisations involved in the project were operating with restricted resources, for various reasons. For example, for a significant period Galop did not have funding for its full time caseworker role. During the project, Stonewall Housing’s funding for its hate crime advice worker ended. LLGS’s services are provided by volunteers, which though a strength of its business model, created restrictions in its ability to implement consistent monitoring and recording. As a result of these restrictions, as well as the different remits and focus of the organisations, it is clear that LGBT organisations are more likely to agree to minor additions to their existing data collection rather than use a separate system to record data, with some LGBT organisations being able to collect more data than others.

The project emphasised the fact that changes to the way voluntary organisations record data do not necessarily lead to an increase in the number of cases being reported but do result in more consistent data being collected about incidents.

Finally, it is clear that it takes considerable time to implement and sustain a joint initiative to gather data on hate crime because of insecure funding and staffing within the LGBT voluntary sector. The success of the joint working pilot was reliant on the additional resource that was provided by the project, as dedicated staffing had a key role in supporting change through negotiation, problem solving and staff development. Change takes time, and the expertise and leadership of the project were needed to create a standard for recording and reporting, as well as to implement this standard. Any longevity of the project is entirely dependant on securing funding to lead the collection, recording and analysis process. The goodwill of LGBT organisations themselves cannot be relied upon, as they do not have the capacity to collect/collate data alone.

**Partnership phase recommendations**

**Galop should:**

- Continue to collate and interpret shared data.
- Disseminate statistics from non-police reports to statutory organisations that collate figures on homophobic and transphobic hate crime.
- Work with partners to produce new guidelines on standardising recording and reporting methods.
- Provide training and support materials to assist volunteers and staff working in the LGBT voluntary sector to gather data on homophobic/transphobic hate crime.
- Work with organisations that are unable to record information about incidents to encourage them signpost victims to Galop and the MPS.

**LGBT organisations:**

- Current project partners should continue collecting and sharing data.
- Third party reporting initiatives across London should work with Galop to develop standardised reporting forms, and should share data with Galop for dissemination across London.
- Should build links with statutory services in education, health and housing to encourage more reporting and ensure that victims of homophobia/transphobia receive help and protection.
- LGBT Forums should disseminate information on homophobic/transphobic incidents reported to local organisations.


Central Government, London Government and London criminal justice partners:

- Should take account of the number of non-police reports when reporting on figures on homophobic/transphobic hate crime.
- Provide Galop and other LGBT partners with the funding and resources necessary to build and maintain an ongoing database of non-police reports.
- Work with Galop and other LGBT partners to standardise collection and reporting methods across London, and ensure that this standard is met in any new or existing reporting initiatives.

Statistical analysis

The final phase of the research was an in-depth statistical analysis of the data which had been collected during the partnership phase, in addition to some historical data from Galop which was added to the dataset. The voluntary sector dataset was made up of over 700 cases, and was compared, where possible, to comparable data from the MPS, to discover any relevant differences in the types of cases that were being reported within the voluntary sector. This analysis differs from traditional survey data, in that it reflects actual cases which were reported to LGBT organisations, as opposed to asking a survey sample about any experiences they may have had.

This analysis of the data reveals a number of key patterns. The figures reveal some of the ways in which different sections of the LGBT communities experience homophobic and transphobic hate crime. These differences mean that it is important for those responsible for hate crime initiatives to ensure that they target different sections of the community, and do not treat LGBT people as a homogenous whole.

There are a number of similar patterns discernable in the cases reported to the MPS and LGBT organisations; however there are also some important differences which highlight areas where people are less likely to seek help from the police instead approaching LGBT organisations for support and alternative outcomes. It is clear that LGBT organisations play a vital role in providing alternative routes for reporting experiences, and getting appropriate advice and support, and that without these services some victims would simply not report at all.

The data reveals that gay and bisexual men were most likely to report hate incidents, to both LGBT organisations and the MPS.

- About three quarters of all reports made to LGBT organisations were from men, and about four fifths of reports made to the MPS were from men.

A higher proportion of men reported violence, and a higher proportion of women reported sexual assault.

- Three in ten reports to LGBT organisations from men involved violent incidents, compared to two in ten reports from women

Higher proportions of trans people reported verbal abuse and repeat harassment.

- Almost six out of ten reports to LGBT organisations from trans people involved verbal abuse and/or repeat harassment, compared with just over three out of ten of reports from non-trans people.

Both younger (18 and under) and older (over 50) LGBT people appear less likely to contact either LGBT organisations or the MPS about incidents. BME LGBT victims of homophobic or transphobic incidents
appear more likely to be the victim of an incident in or near their home.

- This occurred in three quarters of incidents, compared to half of incidents targeted at white victims.

A significant percentage of victims contacting LGBT organisations were living with a disability. Those with mental health issues might be particularly vulnerable, and this underlines the importance of inclusive mental health and counselling services for LGBT people.

- More than a quarter of all clients contacting LGBT organisations were living with a disability, and more than three in ten of these clients had mental health difficulties.

In general verbal abuse and threats were the most commonly reported type of hate crime, followed by physical violence. There was also a range of other incidents which were also homophobic or transphobic in nature, including sexual violence, domestic abuse and damage to property.

- More than three in ten incidents reported included some form of verbal abuse or threats.
- Over a quarter of all incidents involved physical violence.
- Nearly one in ten incidents involved domestic abuse.

Despite perceptions about the nature of hate crime, victims were as likely to contact LGBT organisations about incidents that occur in or near to their homes as they were about incidents taking place in the street or near LGBT venues. Incidents also occurred in a wide range of locations, however there is likely to be particular under-reporting from certain settings such as PSEs and schools.

- Nearly three fifths of incidents reported to LGBT organisations took place on or near the home, compared to one fifth taking place in the street.

The MPS appear to be more likely to be contacted by victims who were attacked in public areas but less likely to be contacted about incidents occurring in/near the home. It appears that victims are more likely therefore to approach an LGBT organisation to report domestic abuse or ongoing harassment.

More incidents were recorded as taking place in inner London boroughs compared to outer London boroughs and incidents occurred at all times of the day/week/month, not just at night or during the weekend.

Victims contacting organisations about an incident appeared more likely to know the perpetrators(s) than for the perpetrator to be a stranger, which is likely to be because the majority of attacks took place in or near the home.

- Nearly half of all victims reporting to LGBT organisations knew the perpetrator of the incident, compared to over three tenths of cases in which the perpetrator was a stranger.

Perpetrators of incidents are most likely to be young men. Given the significant majority of perpetrators who fit this category this is a group that could be targeted in any initiatives seeking to prevent hate crime.

- Between five and six tenths of identifiable perpetrators were aged under 30, and in more than seven in ten incidents the perpetrator was male.

Around half of all callers to LGBT organisations did not report their experiences to the police, because
of lack of confidence in the police, or because they feared the consequences of reporting to them, such as reprisals. Significant proportions of victims, however, make contact with LGBT organisations after already reporting to the police or other statutory service, because they want further help or advice. A large number of these victims did not want to make a formal third party report to the police, but were seeking other sorts of outcomes. In addition, a large percentage of victims contacting LGBT organisations are dissatisfied with the response of the police after having reported an incident. One in ten felt the police response had been negative/unhelpful or homophobic/transphobic. The large percentage of victims expressing dissatisfaction with the police response, as well as the numbers choosing to contact LGBT organisations for additional support and advice, suggest that the emphasis on reporting alone may not be appropriate. As discussed in the findings and conclusions of the mapping exercise, many people ‘tell’ someone about their experiences, rather than directly wanting to report. These people are often seeking outcomes that the police cannot offer, such as emotional support or legal advice. It is vital both that these more supportive reporting services continue to exist, but also that the experience of reporting directly to the MPS is improved, particularly in ensuring communication with both victims and organisation which pass on reports.

**Statistical analysis recommendations**

**Victims**

Further work needs to be done in reaching specific groups, both in crime prevention and in reporting services and related advertising. All agencies working with LGBT victims of crime need to recognise and respond to these differences as well as the cross-sectional discrimination many LGBT victims experience. This might include:

- Different strategies to target men and women, and trans people, to encourage reporting due to their different experiences.
- Strategies for reporting should recognise the specific obstacles faced by both older and younger LGBT people, recognising that the need may be for alternative outcomes such as housing, rather than just reporting.
- A focus on BME people who experience particular problems with housing, following repeat incidents of homophobic or transphobic incidents.
- LGBT voluntary organisations providing hate crime services should build links with organisations that support people with disabilities and those with health problems. This could include building expertise in supporting LGBT people with mental health issues.

**Incidents**

Whilst attacks by strangers in public continue to be an important focus of hate crime initiatives, it is also important to recognise that significant proportions of incidents occur in or near the home, and that a focus on these types of incidents is also necessary. This might include:

- A strategic response within housing services to homophobic and transphobic harassment, including a recognition of the risk of escalation when no or ineffective intervention is made.
- An explicit agreement between third party reporting services and the MPS regarding the level of response a victim of verbal abuse can expect, which can be communicated to the victim.
- A continued attempt by both voluntary and statutory organisations to promote greater understanding of the nature and extent of domestic abuse experienced by LGBT people, including the recognition that domestic abuse can also involve hate crime.
- Central Government, London Government and London criminal justice partners should work
together to provide appropriate refuge space for gay and bisexual men, and trans people fleeing domestic abuse.

How often, where and when incidents occur

The data challenged some of the commonly held perceptions about when and where homophobic and transphobic crime can occur. Services need to consider the following:

• Establishing a system for hotspot mapping based on data from both LGBT voluntary sector groups and the MPS. This mapping should be disseminated widely via LGBT forums and other methods, to ensure that organisations can focus their resources appropriately.
• LGBT voluntary organisations should be provided with funding from central government to assist victims approaching them from outside the London area.
• Targeting interventions at homophobic/transphobic hotspots such as public transport hubs and public sex environments, with the MPS working in partnership with LGBT organisations.
• Using publicity to challenge the myth that attacks only happen in the evenings.
• Where possible, LGBT voluntary organisations should keep a clear record of the time and dates of incidents reported to them to identify any patterns or hotspots.

Perpetrators

The research highlighted the value of collecting information on perpetrators. Building on this information by continuing to analyse information on perpetrators would allow the development of programmes to prevent homophobic and transphobic hate crime. To assist with this aim:

• Where possible, LGBT organisations should consistently collect data on perpetrators to identify patterns.
• The MPS and LGBT voluntary sector organisations should develop interventions that target perpetrators of homophobic/transphobic hate crime, focusing on particular areas such as the home, local neighbourhoods and schools.
• Initiatives focused on homophobic and transphobic hate crime could consider interventions targeted at potential perpetrators, for example, by challenging the cultural values and prejudices of young men (the largest perpetrator group).

Outcomes

Victims of homophobic and transphobic hate crime seek a variety of outcomes which can only be achieved by an effective partnership between the MPS and LGBT voluntary sector organisations. Ensuring that both types of service deliver the outcomes that victims need would involve:

• Ensuring that LGBT third party reporting initiatives are funded to provide comprehensive assistance to victims rather than being used simply as a tool to increase the numbers of reports.
• Research by the MPS into why the levels of dissatisfaction exist following reports of incidents, and a strategic response to improving satisfaction levels. This may include minimum standards on reporting back on progress with a case, and a single point of contact to report out of date or inaccurate information in the public domain.
• Central Government, London Government and London criminal justice partners working together to provide appropriate resources to LGBT organisations to develop and maintain services for victims of hate crime who need help and support following homophobic/transphobic incidents. This service should be consistent throughout London.
• Where possible, LGBT organisations recording anonymous data on homophobic and transphobic incidents where a victim does not want to make a formal report.
1. SETTING THE CONTEXT
1.1 The national picture

There are few national studies that have looked at homophobic or transphobic hate crime. Most studies of homophobic and transphobic hate crime have focused on local LGBT communities or on a specific section of the LGBT community, such as young people.

There are three specific large-scale national survey of this topic. The first, Queer Bashing – a National Survey of Hate Crime against Lesbian and Gay Men (Mason et al, 1996) was carried out by Stonewall. The study found high levels of incidents experienced by lesbians and gay men - 34% of men and 24% of women reported homophobic violence to the police in the preceding five years. The second, Breaking the Chain of Hate (Wake, et al, 1999) found that 66% of respondents had been the victim of a homophobic incident, 38% during the previous year. Stonewall’s more recent survey, Homophobic Hate Crime: the Gay British Crime Survey (Dick, 2008) confirmed similar figures, finding that 20% of respondents had been the victim of a hate crime or incident in the last three years, with 12.5% in the last year.

Nationally, Home Office data such as the British Crime Survey does not record figures on levels of homophobic or transphobic hate crime. A number of regional police forces such as the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) collate figures on hate crime, including homophobic and transphobic incidents and from April 2008 the Home Office required all police services to collect data, which will be collated and published by the Home Office.

Some large-scale studies by statutory bodies such as the National Health Service have begun to collect information about discrimination and include questions about sexual orientation. For example, the Healthcare Commission carries out a yearly survey of staff and service users. The 2005 survey asked staff about physical attacks, bullying and harassment but did not ask about homophobic/ transphobic incidents (Healthcare Commission, 2006). The survey also asked a separate question concerning discrimination and found that 6% of all staff had experienced some form of discrimination. Of that number, 6% had been on the grounds sexual orientation. Local research in the boroughs of Greenwich & Bexley (Moran et al, 2004) also found that LGBT victims of hate crime sometimes reported incidents when using health services such as GPs and clinics.

Recent research by Stonewall has also highlighted the issue of homophobic bullying in schools and colleges. The School Report (Hunt & Jensen, 2007) examined the extent to which young LGBT people and teaching staff are affected by homophobia and transphobia. The Stonewall research found that 65% of young people experienced homophobic bullying at school. The report also highlights the problem of inconsistency in the way that schools deal with incidents. The National Union of Students (NUS) carried out a survey as part of their Bullying Sucks (2006) campaign and found that 63% of students claimed to have been bullied of which 7% were LGBT (NUS, 2006).

There are a number of studies of specific social groups within the LGBT community that have asked about experiences of homophobic/ transphobic hate crime. For example, research has focused on young LGBT people (NSPCC, 2006; Galop, 1998), LGBT people from BME communities (Galop, 2001), the trans community (Whittle et al, 2007), gay and bisexual men (Hickson, et al, 2003) and lesbian, bisexual and trans women (Paterson et al, 2008). All of the studies found similarly high levels of incidents amongst respondents.
1.2 The London picture

It is difficult to make a robust estimate of the size of the LGBT population both nationally and locally, since questions about sexuality and gender identity are not included in large-scale government surveys such as the Census or National Household Survey (McManus, 2003). The Office of National Statistics estimates that there are approximately 7.5 million people living in London (ONS, 2007). It is estimated that between seven and ten percent of the population defines themselves as part of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) communities (Stanko et al, 2003). This would indicate that there are up to 750,000 members of the LGBT communities in London.

There are ways of using national data, such as Sigma’s 2002 survey of gay and bisexual men, to look at homophobic hate crime specifically in London (Hickson, et al, 2002). The total number of respondents in the above Sigma study within London was 4233. If we take the number of respondents as indicative of the gay/bisexual community and apply the results to the estimated number of LGB people living in London, then the following is revealed.

- 25% stated they had been discriminated against by a stranger in public - representing 125,000 incidents of discrimination in one year within London.
- 31% stated they had been verbally abused because of their sexuality – representing 160,000 incidents of verbal abuse in one year within London.
- 5.9% stated they had been physically attacked because of their sexuality – representing 29,500 incidents of physical abuse in one year within London.

Whilst rudimentary, the data above gives an indication of the high levels of homophobic behaviour within a London context. There is little evidence to illustrate whether homophobic and transphobic incidents are increasing or decreasing from year to year. For example, annual data collected by MPS shows small fluctuations in the number of cases reported to the police during the last five years.

1.2.1 Local London borough-based surveys

A number of studies undertaken within individual London boroughs or areas have asked LGBT people about their experiences of hate crime as part of more general study of local LGBT needs assessments. These include a pan-London survey conducted by Stormbreak Research (2004), Greenwich & Bexley (Moran et al, 2004), Islington (Limbrick, 2007,), Lambeth (Keogh et. al, 2006), Kensington & Chelsea (Jackson, 2000), Camden (Wears, et. al, 2004] and Southwark (Bellos, et. Al, 2003). All of these studies have found similar high levels of homophobia and transphobia experienced by LGBT respondents. For example, the Greenwich and Bexley survey found that 38% of LGB respondents reported being a victim of a homophobic/transphobic incident during the preceding year. The Lambeth study found that 49% of LGBT respondents had been verbally abused and 7% physically attacked during the previous year.

Data from these local surveys is not always comparable in terms of estimating the overall number of incidents across London on an annual basis. This is because they ask LGBT people about their experiences of incidents over different periods of time. So, for example, a number of studies focused on lifetime experience of homophobia or transphobia, whilst others focused on the previous five years. Some studies did ask about recent experience, during the last year, but because the studies were conducted in different years it was not possible to compare all the data for one particular year.
1.3 Under-reporting

The Home Office document, Tackling Hate Crime: Homophobic Hate Crime (Home Office, 2006) estimates that as much as 80 – 90% of hate crime goes unreported to the police compared to 59% of overall crimes that go unreported (British Crime Survey, Nicholas et al 2006/7). The national survey Breaking the Chains of Hate (Wake et al 1999) found between 82% and 90% of victims did not report incidents. Stonewall (Dick, 2008) found that three in four victims of an incident did not report it to the police. Local studies also found considerable under-reporting of incidents to the police.

Several studies have examined why LGBT people do not report homophobic and transphobic incidents. Typically, research found that victims tend to think that some incidents are not worth reporting because there was no injury or loss of property. Victims also feel that the police are unable or unwilling to take action. Victims of homophobic incidents are also reluctant to report because they fear reprisals from perpetrators or other personal repercussions such as being outed to family or neighbours. A number of studies indicate that victims of physical assault are more likely to report to the police than victims of verbal abuse or harassment. For example, the Lambeth study (Keogh et al, 2006) found that 55% of victims of a physical attack reported to the police compared to seven percent of people who experienced verbal abuse. Though these differences in reporting may not seem surprising, verbal abuse can be very serious, and may be more likely to be repeated. For some people it can become a feature of their daily lives that greatly undermines their quality of life and damages feelings of safety and security at home (Michael Bell Associates, 2006).

Many studies focus on the reasons for victims not coming forward to report incidents rather than obstacles to reporting created by inconsistent or poor services. For example, victims may find it difficult to access police and third party reporting services because they are not publicised or difficult to contact. Similarly, lack of understanding or perceived prejudice towards LGBT people by the police may lead to incidents not being identified as homophobic or transphobic. For instance research to Victim Support (Michael Bell Associates, 2006) found that local third party reporting services in both the voluntary and statutory sector were under used. The research suggested key problems were a lack of capacity building of report sites and a lack of outreach to publicise the schemes. The majority of studies also focus on under-reporting to the police rather than considering where else victims go for help. For example, the Greenwich and Bexley survey (Moran et al, 2004) found that respondents sought help from friends and partners, health or housing services and LGBT voluntary organisations; a small percentage of incidents were first reported to the police.
2. METHODOLOGY
2.1 Service mapping phase

The aim of the service mapping was to get an impression of the diversity of services available in London to victims of homophobic or transphobic incidents. To this end, we surveyed a wide range of LGBT voluntary organisations in London (though we did not contact every voluntary or statutory organisation) to establish their level of contact with victims of homophobic/transphobic incidents. We also attempted to identify other voluntary and statutory sector services that may receive reports, such as local authority reporting sites, Primary Care Trusts and telephone helplines.

Details of LGBT organisations in London were gathered from the London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard online service directory, Queery. Internet searches were made of the websites of all the 33 London boroughs to identify hate crime services. The majority of organisations were contacted by telephone or via email. Making contact with some organisations was not always straightforward and some did not respond to requests for information. For example, a number of smaller voluntary organisations were staffed on a part-time or voluntary basis and could only be contacted at certain times or by email alone. Others were primarily web-based and restricted to members only. Those organisations who were contacted by email only were less likely to respond to requests for information. It also proved difficult to find a member of staff in larger organisations (for example primary care trusts or local authorities) to answer questions on behalf of their organisation. In cases where there was no initial response organisations were contacted more than once. In addition, it was possible to make direct contact with individuals at LGBT events such as conferences.

A total of 97 organisations were contacted via phone/email or in person. Respondents from organisations were asked five key questions about being contacted by victims of LGBT hate crime (see Appendix three). Information was written down on recording sheets and supplemented by written notes during longer conversations. A smaller number of face-to-face interviews (15) took place with individuals who were involved in third party reporting schemes.²

2.2 Quantitative analysis phase

The second phase of the project gathered and analysed 22 months of historical data from incidents reported to Galop between April 2005 and January 2007. Historical data from Stonewall Housing was not used because of issues of client confidentiality, and London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard (LLGS) did not make written records of client contact. The process of close analysis of Galop’s written data enabled us to identify key areas to incorporate into new forms to systematise data collection and have a larger number of incidents for analysis.³

In addition to the historical data, we gathered 12 months of data from Galop, Stonewall Housing and LLGS between February 2007 and January 2008, reflecting a year of new incidents. Galop provided information from case files and records of client contact. Stonewall Housing provided anonymous information taken from their database of client contacts. LLGS collected information about homophobic/transphobic incidents on a specially developed incident report form and also provided records from their

---

² These individuals included workers involved in LGBT hate crime projects, LGBT police liaison officers, members of the MPS Diversity and Citizen Focus Directorate, and managers of LGBT voluntary organisations.

³ This included the following: type of incident, date/time, location, demographic information on the victim and perpetrator, motivation for incident, organisation first reported to, contact/satisfaction with the police, referrals and outcome.
2006 Caller Survey. This data was used to create a dataset of incidents using SPSS. Each individual incident reported to an LGBT organisation was given a reference number and entered into the dataset. Further details about changes to each organisation’s data collection procedures, and the process of collection and partnership working are discussed in Chapter Four.

2.2.1 Metropolitan Police Data

The MPS is able to identify homophobic incidents through its electronic crime reporting information system (CRIS). By interrogating this CRIS database using the homophobic identifier this enables homophobic incidents to be analysed separately. Over the last five years the number of reported homophobic incidents to the Metropolitan Police Service has ranged from 1250 cases to just over 1650 cases in any one year.

In order to be comparable with the Filling in the Blanks dataset, incidents were taken from the calendar year 2001 through 2006. It was also possible to break down this data into variables similar to those used by the project. It was not always possible to obtain comparative data from the MPS for some variables, either because MPS did not collect this data or due to time constraints.

All ‘unknown’ data relating to victim characteristics is excluded from the analysis contained within this report. The large sample sizes of the known characteristics should ensure a sufficient level of accuracy for the purposes of this report. It is also recognised that there is a degree of under-reporting by the LGBT community (Wake et al 1999; Stanko et al, 2003) and again these findings may not be representative of all incidents of homophobic violence and abuse experienced by the LGBT community. Census data does not collect information on individuals’ sexual orientation and this is not available elsewhere. Only estimates on the LGBT population are available and these do not allow for the further breakdown of the other diversity features within this community for example gender and disability. For the purpose of this report, it is assumed that the LGBT community reflects the general population other than their sexual orientation.

The victim and accused data in this report refers to data recorded on those victims and accused classified as ‘victim1’ and ‘accused1’ respectively. It therefore does not include details of any additional victims or accused who might have been involved in these incidents. Whilst this might result in some under-counting, the majority of incidents in the dataset involve one victim and one accused and therefore the data can be seen as sufficiently accurate for the purposes of this report.

The analysis by ethnicity has used ethnic appearance data extracted from CRIS rather than self-defined ethnicity, as the completion rates for this are much higher. Self-defined ethnicity is currently only a mandatory field for information on persons accused of crimes, rather than for victims. The ethnic appearance categorisation relies on officer judgments, the accuracy of which is unknown. It also includes the option ‘unknown’, which is not an option that is found within self-defined ethnicity or the Census categories. While ethnic appearance categories do not directly match the Census categories, there is some overlap and the categories have been collapsed into ‘White’, ‘Black’, ‘Asian’ and ‘Other’

---


5. This report presents the results and findings from the analysis of MPS reported crime maintained by the MPS Performance Information Bureau (PIB).

6. Any incident involving homophobic/transphobic hate crime was previously recorded in the CRIS system and assigned the code (HO) to identify it code, and appeared part way through the data analysis period, MPS data relates only to the HO code.
There are a number of different estimates of the proportion of disabled people in London. Due to different definitions and methodologies used in these different sources of information, the estimates of the proportion of disabled people in London range from 10% to 17%. Consequently, for the purposes of this report, we will regard any MPS data sources falling substantially outside of this range as unrepresentative.

2.2.2 Demographic information

Where it is possible, demographic categories, such as ethnicity codes, were taken from the 2001 Census and used to record demographic information about the victims of incidents. LGBT voluntary organisations and the MPS sometimes used their own demographic identifiers, for example to define trans and sexual identities. In these cases new variables were created to record and re-code demographic information.

2.2.3 Defining hate crime incidents

LGBT organisations dealt with a wide range of homophobic and transphobic incidents. Some of these incidents might not have initially appeared to fit current definitions of hate crime used by the police or other organisations, either because of the nature of the incident or because of the context within which it took place. For example, a client might have experienced problems with the criminal justice system, or someone might have been abused at their place of work.

Each LGBT organisation had its own way of categorising the various forms of hate crime reported to them. One aim of this research was to bring these categories into line with each other by asking LGBT organisations collecting data to make a more specific record of the incident. Frequently, victims reported a series of events that took place over a period of several weeks or months. Though the variables in the dataset did allow for multiple incidents to be recorded, they could not reflect the complex nature of several cases. The primary nature of some incidents was summarised when the description of events was not recorded in detail.

2.2.4 Missing data

A baseline figure is given for each variable analysed. While sufficient data was available for most variables, others had considerably fewer numbers of cases to use in the final analysis. During the course of the project, data collection within all organisations became more rigorous and available data increased. The project provided guidance on data collection to staff and volunteers at all partner organisations, as well as developing systems suitable to the different working practices of each organisation. These efforts have ensured that we have the maximum amount of data, however for a number of reasons missing data still exists. The data set includes historical data from Galop, from before the collection period, taken from written qualitative case files. At this time, caseworkers did not always collect information about certain aspects of an incident and this data was therefore unavailable.

---

7. See Appendix A of the ACPO document on self-defined ethnicity and descriptive monitoring for further information at: http://www.acpo.police.uk/asp/policies/Data/self_defined_ethnicity.doc

Staff and volunteers in all organisations sometimes made casework-based decisions not to ask certain questions in case they might cause the person distress. In other cases clients did not provide information, for example, when they chose to remain anonymous. Galop collects some reports via a web-form, and in some cases clients did not fully complete these forms, leaving missing data. The project also collected data from LLGS’s annual caller survey, which did not cover all dataset variables. Finally, some variables in the dataset were not applicable to all incidents. For example, someone who had been cautioned by the police for cottaging was not asked questions about perpetrator[s].

In a number of cases more than one person was subjected to an attack. For example a partner or friend may have also been a victim or witness. However, for reasons of data management, demographic information was recorded about the person who reported the incident or the primary target in the incident. Similarly, organisations sometimes made records each time a victim contacted the organisation about the same incident. In these instances, the details of the incident were only recorded once. Cases where no homophobic/transphobic incident occurred and records of general enquiries were excluded from the dataset. All missing or unknown data was excluded from the final data analysis.
3. MAPPING OF REPORTING OPTIONS IN LONDON
3.1 Introduction

As discussed in Chapter one, an aim of the Filling in the Blanks project was to find out what services exist for victims of LGBT hate incidents, particularly for reporting incidents, and to discover the extent to which these services meet need. This understanding of the range and capacity of services currently available, when considered together with the analysis of experiences and need revealed by the quantitative data, highlights where service provision is working, and where gaps exist.

This Chapter is set out in four main sections. The first section discusses some initial findings on gaps in shared understandings of terminology, setting the context for the remaining chapter. The second section outlines the range of reporting services which are available in London, including both generic and LGBT specific schemes. The third section focuses upon how different types of organisations respond to LGBT victims who report or reveal their experiences, and the final section describes the mechanics of how different reporting schemes work.

3.2 Terminology and shared understandings

One of the aims of the project was to find out to what extent organisations had a shared understanding of terminology which is necessary to ensure a consistent and effective dialogue. The research revealed that some terms had different meanings for different organisations, and that this could be a barrier to partnership working.

3.2.1 Hate crime

Respondents were asked if their organisation received calls relating to homophobic and transphobic hate crime. The majority were aware of the terms homophobic and transphobic hate crime but did not share the same understanding. For instance, several respondents equated homophobic/transphobic hate crime with physical violence rather than a range of incidents. These respondents initially claimed not to have been contacted by victims of homophobic hate crime, assuming this meant violent attacks. Subsequently they went on to give examples of their service users who had experienced harassment or abuse.

There was also some confusion between discrimination and hate crime. For example a small number of respondents from non-LGBT organisations cited anti-discrimination policy when responding to questions about homophobic and transphobic hate crime within their organisation. For some respondents there was clearly some overlap between clients who had experienced discrimination and hate crime, particularly in cases involving employment, housing or education issues. For example, organisations working with young people often referred to homophobic bullying as well as homophobic hate crime. Young LGBT people were thought to experience bullying if it happened at school, whereas young people or adults who were abused in public were victims of hate crime. A person experiencing repeated verbal abuse at the workplace might be defined as experiencing discrimination rather than hate crime. The different terminology may affect where victims of homophobic/transphobic incidents look for help and how organisations, including the police, respond to particular incidents.

9. Brown’s report on LGBT third party reporting schemes (2006), cites the Rainbow Network in Blackpool who prefer to use the term homophobic incident because they feel the term hate crime is “too large, intimidating and off-putting a term and makes people think of murders”. (p6)
3.2.2 Third party reporting

The range of non-police reporting services available sometimes led to different understandings of what was meant by third party reporting (see Appendix two for Galop’s definition of various non-police reports).

Most respondents understood the term third party reporting to be when an organisation takes a report from a victim or witness and passes it on to the police. Some organisations also take anonymous third party reports, whereby a report is forwarded to the police without the name or address of the victim/witness. However, some respondents had different understandings of the term non-police reporting, with some considering it to mean much the same as third party reporting, and others considering that it described a third party report that is not passed to the police.

Several respondents also referred to self-reporting schemes such as True Vision as being third party. Although some self-reporting schemes could result in a third party report being made, True Vision reporting service is third party only in the sense that report packs are disseminated to community or statutory organisations. The victim/witness sends the report directly to the police and does not usually report through a third party.

There were also some differences in the understanding of third party report and assisted reporting. Though some organisations might offer both these services, they are not necessarily the same. For example, some third party reporting services only take a report and forward it to the police without further contact with the victim/witness. Conversely, an assisted reporting service might involve a caseworker liaising with a range of organisations or advocating on behalf of a victim over a period of time.

Finally, some respondents said that they made informal notes of incidents or monitored calls and emails from people looking for help. These respondents did not necessarily consider they had made a ‘report’ in the formal sense. This was significant because a number of organisations were indeed capturing data even though they may not have operated a reporting system.

3.3 Range of reporting services in London

There was a range of hate crime reporting services within London. As individual London boroughs largely have responsibility for commissioning these services, there was considerable variation between each borough and area. A number of borough initiatives to tackle hate crime were undertaken by the local authority hate crime unit. In other boroughs hate crime services were funded by the local borough but were provided by independent voluntary sector organisations, several of which were LGBT specific, whilst others dealt with a range of hate crimes. A small number of boroughs had provided funds for an LGBT worker[s] to tackle hate crime. In other boroughs voluntary sector organisations such as local branches of Victim Support or Stonewall Housing had successfully bid for funding for homophobic/transphobic hate crime projects from local, pan-London or national funding bodies. Some areas of London appeared to have no non-police hate crime reporting services.

3.3.1 Generic third party initiatives

A number of local authority third party reporting initiatives were funded to target all forms of hate crime, including homophobia and transphobia. Several respondents said that their initiative was designed to
encourage third party reports from victims from a range of communities and members of staff were
trained to deal with all forms of hate crime. However, other respondents argued that staff responsible for
taking third party reports would not necessarily have sufficient training or understanding to effectively
deal with homophobic/transphobic hate crime. While these reporting initiatives may be widely available
and advertised throughout a borough, they may not be specifically targeted to the LGBT community.
As a result generic schemes did not always have the confidence of the LGBT people and were likely to
receive few reports.

Several local authorities had funded initiatives targeting racist and religious hate crime or domestic
violence though they had not provided funding to target homophobic or transphobic hate crime.
A few respondents intimated that the absence of any strategy in their borough was in part due to
LGBT issues, including hate crime having been given a lower priority in the past. Other respondents
recognised that under-reporting of homophobic/transphobic hate crime was an issue in their borough
and said that they were in the process of consultation about how to best to develop services.

3.3.2 LGBT third party initiatives

The mapping exercise found that Galop was the only pan-London organisation specifically dedicated
to homophobic/transphobic hate crime. Other LGBT third party reporting initiatives were based within a
single borough or area.

A number of local authorities commissioned homophobic/transphobic reporting initiatives dedicated
solely or partly to homophobic/transphobic hate crime. Ongoing changes to funding and staffing of
such initiatives made it difficult to judge whether the number of third party initiatives were increasing
or decreasing. London boroughs were in different stages of development with regard to tackling
homophobic/transphobic hate crime. A few London boroughs had funded initiatives specifically to
encourage the reporting of homophobic/transphobic hate crime in their area. Several boroughs
appeared to have more than one initiative because a voluntary organisation had been able to obtain
funding to provide hate crime services in addition to the local authority. A number of these organisations
had initiated successful joint-working relationships to prevent duplication of services, though inevitably
there was some overlap. Conversely several outer London boroughs appeared to offer little or no
provision for people to report homophobic and transphobic hate crime, other than the local police
Community Safety Unit (CSU).

There were a range of different types of schemes running in individual boroughs. Several had funded
an LGBT worker whilst other local authorities had commissioned an LGBT voluntary organisation such
as Galop to work in the borough. Some local authorities had also funded a local LGBT forum partly to
work on LGBT community safety. In some boroughs the LGBT forum developed third party reporting
initiatives. Respondents from organisations argued that there were a number of other benefits to
LGBT specific schemes and examples of good quality services to LGBT people included the following:

• A commitment from project funders to provide sufficient resources and length of time to develop
  an assisted reporting service.
• Providing assistance, advice and appropriate referrals to victims rather than simply taking a third
  party report.

---

10. LGBT Forums were usually made up of representatives from the statutory and voluntary sectors and sometimes members of the local
    LGBT community. LGBT forums were in different stages of development with some more active than others.
• Good quality publicity material that targets LGBT people in a range of settings and gave the project a sufficiently high profile.
• Outreach work directly within the LGBT community and other settings.
• A co-ordinated approach including working with the police, statutory, voluntary and commercial organisations to raise the profile of homophobia/transphobia, including targeting potential perpetrators.
• Mapping homophobic/transphobic crime in the local area to tackle hot spots, where there are repeated incidents.
• Joint working with other boroughs to make the best use of resources and share intelligence.

Unsurprisingly respondents involved in local third party initiatives felt that funding a LGBT specific scheme had led to an improved service for victims of homophobic/transphobic hate crime. For example, a dedicated LGBT worker or voluntary organisation was often better placed to target the local LGBT community and work with local organisations to provide services. However, respondents focusing solely on each borough providing its own LGBT hate crime reporting service may have been unaware of some of the disadvantages.

There were few examples of LGBT organisations funded to work across more than one borough and most third party reporting initiatives were of a parochial nature. Service providers were funded on the understanding that they would only target LGBT people within the local borough. This strategy may have worked in a small number of London boroughs with a large visible LGBT community, though it could lead to an individual worker being overstretched. Conversely, it was likely to be much harder to reach LGBT people in boroughs with less visible LGBT communities, where residents accessed LGBT services or venues outside of the borough in which they lived.

Targeted campaigns aimed at the LGBT community within a borough or area did not necessarily result in an increase in third party reports. Respondents cited several examples of local projects that received small amounts of funding for a short period of time with unrealistic expectations of the number of third party reports being generated. Despite their best efforts, such projects lost the momentum to develop over time. They were unable to generate sufficient numbers of third party reports and were subsequently unable to secure future funding.

Overall, there appeared to be few examples of joint working between neighbouring boroughs and the opportunities to benefit from economies of scale were therefore missed. For example, a single borough initiative would usually have a publicity budget large enough to only advertise in local newspapers or services. The result is that it was likely to reach a fairly small number of LGBT people. Similarly, a local initiative would not have the capacity to run a LGBT hate crime helpline, whereas a pan-London initiative would be able to.

There was no consensus amongst respondents on the most effective strategy for encouraging LGBT people to report incidents. Service providers sometimes thought there was insufficient guidance available on setting up an effective third party scheme aimed at the LGBT community. A number of respondents said there had been a consultation process with statutory and voluntary organisations prior to setting up the local third party reporting service. Nevertheless, several said that it had been difficult to find robust evidence on which initiatives were the most effective. As a result, local organisations appear to develop their own third party reporting schemes with little idea as to whether or not they would be effective.

11. Exceptions include Galop, the East London Out Project [ELOP] or the West London Gay Men’s Project.
12. For example, see Brown’s (2006) evaluation of the Westminster ‘Tell a Friend’ Project.
3.4 Organisational responses to reports

3.4.1 LGBT voluntary sector organisations

LGBT community groups and voluntary organisations were contacted to find out if they were approached by people looking for help following a homophobic/transphobic incident. Most LGBT organisations surveyed reported receiving some or occasional calls from individuals wanting to report or get help with an incident. Not all respondents reported receiving requests for help and overall most LGBT organisations did not appear to be receiving large numbers of reports. The number of contacts an organisation received was largely determined by the services it provided. For example, LGBT organisations with a high profile and those that operated a telephone advice line were more likely than small volunteer-led campaign or social groups to be contacted by victims of hate crime.

**LGBT organisations with telephone helplines**

Prior to this mapping exercise a small number of LGBT voluntary organisations that operated telephone helpline services were found to be receiving significant numbers of LGBT clients contacting them about homophobic/transphobic incidents. The specific examples of Galop, Stonewall Housing and London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard are discussed elsewhere in this report. The mapping exercise revealed that several other LGBT organisations that did not have a specific remit to deal with homophobic/transphobic hate crime were being contacted by LGBT people seeking help following incidents. It was possible that victims of hate crime contacted these organisations because they were well known and operated telephone helpline services, so were easier to contact. Though some organisations were only funded to work in London, clients from areas of the country where there were few LGBT organisations also contacted them.

Respondents from these organisations gave various scenarios that might have led to them being contacted about an incident. Firstly, a victim may have specifically contacted an LGBT organisation because they wanted help and did not know who else to report to. Another example was when an incident was flagged up in the course of a client seeking advice on another matter, such as a housing or relationship issue. Often, a victim/witness may also have approached LGBT organisations for help because they had been dissatisfied with the response from the local police or housing service. In these instances, a victim could have approached several organisations to get help and this might result in several reports being made to different organisations.

LGBT organisations that offered specific services were more likely to be contacted about a hate crime that related to the service they provided. For example, respondents stated that the majority of victims who made contact with a housing organisation were looking for help with a housing matter rather than wanting help to make a report. Organisations with telephone helplines who did not make third party reports said they would encourage clients to report a homophobic/transphobic incident and would signpost to other organisations such as the police, Galop or other local LGBT services outside of London. Clients who did not want to report an incident, but wanted other kinds of help/advice were also signposted to relevant services. Any signposting depended on the wishes of the client who may not necessarily want to make a formal report.

**Other LGBT organisations**

A range of other LGBT organisations in London were contacted as part of the mapping exercise. Examples include LGBT health/welfare organisations, political/lobby groups, and social networking groups. Many of these organisations provide specific services to LGBT people or to particular sections of the community such as trans people. As many of these LGBT groups differed in size and remit it is
important not to generalise about the LGBT sector.

Many respondents from LGBT groups reported occasionally being contacted by an LGBT service user who needed help after experiencing a homophobic or transphobic incident. Several respondents suggested that individuals who had spoken to them about incidents were more often current service users or group members rather than unknown victims. Respondents implied that there needed to be a certain amount of trust between the person reporting the crime and the organisation they were reporting to. Organisations providing services directly to LGBT people appeared more likely to say they had been approached for help by victims of hate crime. Respondents from political/lobby or social groups were sometimes aware that hate crimes were under-reported but suggested that victims were more likely to contact groups such as Galop or report to the police. Not everyone shared this view. For instance, several respondents working with older or younger LGBT people argued that they were reluctant to involve the police because they were worried about the consequences. Individuals who had little contact with the LGBT community might not have known how or where to get help. Clearly, there is a continued need for both the police and non-police organisations to provide reassurance to victims who want to report but fear the consequences.

3.4.2 Statutory and non-LGBT voluntary organisations

A limited number of statutory and voluntary organisations were contacted during the mapping exercise, to find out if homophobic and transphobic hate crime was being reported to them. For example, several larger statutory and voluntary organisations such as trade unions had LGBT groups. In addition, some organisations advertised their services to the LGBT community and were likely to have LGBT service users.

Of the small number of non-LGBT organisations who responded to requests for information, most did not know of any instances where a homophobic/transphobic hate crime had been reported to them. For example, a respondent from a trade union said it was more likely to deal with cases of discrimination in the workplace rather than homophobic/transphobic incidents. Nevertheless, there were some examples of services that had been contacted by victims of homophobic/transphobic hate crime. In London several Victim Support branches had dedicated LGBT workers who had taken reports or provided further assistance to LGBT victims of hate crime. Most of these hate crime workers were funded from local authority Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) budgets and it was therefore difficult for Victim Support to offer consistency of service throughout London. Victim Support was in the process of issuing new guidance on supporting victims of hate crime, at the time of the mapping exercise.

A small number of non-LGBT helpline services were also surveyed. Two of these organisations reported receiving calls from victims experiencing hate crime, discrimination or bullying because of their sexuality or HIV/AIDS status. None of these services took third part reports or recorded details of any incidents. Clients would usually be referred on to an appropriate internal service or signposted to another organisation.

A small number of respondents from LGBT organisations who also worked in schools said that they had been contacted by young LGBT people and members of staff wanting help because of homophobic incidents that had occurred in schools and colleges. Data from Galop, Stonewall Housing and LLGS seemed to suggest that the under 18s rarely contacted them to report incidents. In addition, LGBT police liaison officers and LGBT community workers reported difficulty in gaining access to or working in schools and colleges. Respondents said that most incidences were likely to stay within the school or college (if they were reported) and were only occasionally signposted to other services, including the police.
None of the individual universities and colleges contacted via email responded to the mapping exercise. However, discussions with a number of LGBT Officers suggested that colleges and universities developed a range of strategies to deal with hate crime. For example, a victim might be referred to internal counsellors or welfare officers. Several universities in London had developed links with the local police, while others distributed True Vision self-report packs or promoted the NUS anti-bully initiative.

As part of the project the National Health Service (NHS) was identified as a possible site for the homophobic and transphobic hate crimes to get reported. The size of Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) meant it was difficult to find out how hate crime was reported and monitored. Three inner-London PCTs provided information about how their trust dealt with incidents. One respondent stated that most PCTs would record incidents that involved violence, threats, verbal abuse to both staff and patients. GP surgeries, community services and outpatient clinics were the prime areas where general incidents take place. For example, several respondents from organisations delivering sexual health services said that service users asking for help or advice following incidents occasionally approached them. Not all clients wanted to report to the police, especially sex workers or people who were not open about their sexuality.

Though there had been a standard report form used within the NHS, most trusts were likely to have refined their questions to breakdown information on attacks into more explicit criteria to include verbal abuse and harassment. Currently PCTs also recorded details of cases involving incidents of a racial or sexual nature, but did not specifically record details about sexuality or homo/transphobia. Respondents from PCTs also suggested that there may well be some under-reporting of homophobic incidents within PCTs/NHS because victims might not have the confidence to come forward. Staff were also reluctant to report minor incidents, such as verbal threats.

### 3.4.3 The Metropolitan Police Service’s role in third party reporting

As part the mapping exercise a number of respondents from the MPS were surveyed about their views on third party reporting. Several of the respondents mentioned the police’s national hate crime reporting scheme, True Vision. A number of respondents from the MPS argued that True Vision was a useful tool to encourage reporting and provide reassurance to the LGBT communities. True Vision had the advantage of being a nationally supported initiative. Self-report packs could be distributed to a range of voluntary and statutory organisations, including LGBT commercial and community venues. Completed forms could be sent directly to the police. True Vision had an online report site and a number of community safety organisations had links to the True Vision via their own web pages. However this service was withdrawn in 2007. There were some criticisms of True Vision from both police and non-police respondents. Some respondents suggested that only a small number of reports were made using True Vision and it was more productive for the police to support third party schemes in the voluntary sector. Others argued that True Vision was not a third party scheme, as the reports went directly to the police. There were also issues raised about the design and the difficulty of storing/maintaining the packs in venues.

Some respondents from the police were involved with supporting local third party initiatives, though this varied between boroughs. In some boroughs the police were active in the local LGBT forum, or
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promoted reporting through third party schemes. However, there were a number of boroughs where there appeared to be fewer opportunities to build partnerships between the police and the LGBT community. For example, a number of boroughs did not have LGBT liaison officers who engaged with the local LGBT community, or there was no LGBT community forum or third party scheme. Boroughs with dedicated LGBT police liaison officers were more likely to be closely involved in partnership work with LGBT organisations because they had the time and capacity to do so. Several of the police LGBT liaison officers and LGBT workers in the voluntary sector argued that it was crucial for any local third party initiative to have the full support of the police. Endorsement from the police at a senior level was more likely to lead to officers actively engaged in joint working. LGBT liaison officers argued that third party initiatives also supported the work they carried out and helped them to build partnerships with the LGBT community.

While there was general support for third party reporting, some respondents from the MPS were sceptical about the effectiveness of some local initiatives despite being involved in supporting them. For instance, two liaison officers suggested that previous attempts to operate third party schemes in their borough had not increased the numbers of reports being made because the initiative had not been adequately resourced and/or had lost momentum.

A number of liaison officers and respondents from LGBT voluntary organisations had found there were difficulties with third party reports reaching the appropriate investigation team in sufficient time for it to be acted on. Some respondents from voluntary organisations claimed that police gave insufficient feedback on third party reports which sometimes ‘disappeared into the system’. Organisations making third party reports were also not always clear as to who was dealing with a homophobic/transphobic incident. For instance, an LGBT liaison officer based at a Safer Neighbourhoods Team may not be aware of incidents being investigated by the Community Safety Unit. Conversely, an LGBT liaison officer may have intelligence about incidents that the CSU was not aware of because an incident had been reported to the liaison officer.

3.5 Mechanics of third party reporting schemes

3.5.1 Advertising and access

There were a variety of ways a witness or victim could contact an organisation to report an incident, including telephone, via the internet and in person. During the mapping exercise, the internet was used as the main source to identify ways to access reporting services. It was common for some London borough websites to provide several options for a victim/witness to report an incident, including the police, the local authority and voluntary sector organisations. While the range of reporting options provided a choice of organisations to contact, it might have been confusing for a victim or witness who might not be sure who to contact for help and may find it difficult to navigate their way through the information provided. A victim or witness may possibly report to more than one organisation or not at all. In addition, contact details on websites were sometimes found to be out of date, including contacts numbers for local police Community Safety Units, LGBT liaison officers and other helplines.

**Telephone helplines**

Numerous voluntary and statutory services operated telephone helplines. Several local authorities and voluntary organisations had helplines specifically dedicated to people wanting to make a third party report, while others dealt with a range of issues concerned with anti-social behaviour. Telephone helplines had a number of advantages. For example, they were easy to access and provided a certain
degree of anonymity and privacy to the client wanting advice or to report. A helpline worker could assist the victim in making a third party report and record relevant details about an incident. The organisation was also able to signpost the client to additional services, if required.

The disadvantage of telephone helpline services, especially those operated by single boroughs or voluntary organisations, is that they tend to have limited opening hours because they require staffing. People requiring help are less likely to want to leave messages and contact details, especially if they are ringing anonymously. As with other reporting service, helplines need to be advertised and targeted at the audience they are intended for. These problems with capacity presented difficulties for local third party schemes with limited, finite funding.

Web based self-reporting

Web based self-reporting allows victims to report in privacy or anonymously and reports can be forwarded to the police or others with a minimum amount of administration. Once set up, web-services are relatively cheap and easy to manage and advertise, as they do not need constant staff supervision. However, not everyone has the access or confidence to use the internet, compared to telephone access for example. Respondents to the mapping exercise revealed that self-completed web reports were sometimes incomplete and there may not be enough information provided by the witness or victim, especially if they did not provide contact details. Respondents in some LGBT voluntary organisations also raised questions about the length of time it took an organisation to respond to third party reports submitted via the internet. Victims often required more immediate help or support and any delay in response may result in the victim losing the impetus to report.

Paper report forms

Most third party initiatives had developed paper based materials such as report forms, packs, leaflets and cards. The advantage of these materials was that they could be distributed in a wide variety of venues and were a relatively cheap and simple way of promoting a third party scheme. At the same time, paper based materials required time to distribute and maintain. For example, a number of respondents who did outreach work in LGBT commercial or community venues found that paper based materials would get buried amongst all the other leaflets or postcards displayed in venues. It could also be difficult to specifically target members of the LGBT community in areas where there were few LGBT specific venues. Self-report forms relied on the individual completing and returning a report to the relevant organisation. Several respondents claimed that self-complete paper based forms were not particularly effective and only a small numbers of incidents were reported this way.

Designated reporting sites

A smaller number of hate crime initiatives had designated third party reporting sites where victims could access third party reporting materials and/or report face-to-face member of staff. For instance, many designated reporting sites were operated by local authorities who trained existing members of staff in housing services to take reports. Some third party schemes had offered training to community organisations to take third party reports. Respondents identified a number of advantages of offering services in community or social venues. Firstly, they may encourage victims to seek help with incidents that might otherwise go unreported. For example, a victim reporting a problem with neighbours to housing services may not have considered that they were experiencing a hate crime. Some victims of homo/transphobic hate crime might prefer to speak directly to a sympathetic person who could advocate or report on their behalf. Face-to-face contact was no guarantee that an adequate assessment of the victim’s needs would take place (Dunn, 2007). Ultimately the quality of service given to the victim was likely to be the most important factor.
There were some disadvantages with using designated third party sites as a basis for a third party report scheme. Third party reporting initiatives tend to put an onus on reporting sites within voluntary and statutory services or community settings, such as places of worship or youth clubs. This strategy may work well in terms of targeting victims of racially or religiously motivated hate crime for example, but it more problematic with LGBT hate crime. Arguably, LGBT people are less likely to access and make third party reports to some community settings, such as places of worship, because of perceptions of existing prejudice and exclusion. Furthermore in many boroughs in London there are few, if any, local LGBT community groups or venues. Those that do exist often lack funding and rely heavily on volunteers (Kairos in Soho, 2007). Where there are LGBT groups it is likely that the majority of LGBT people in an area do not regularly use them and it is therefore more difficult to target local third party report schemes at them.

Respondents engaged in promoting schemes said that community and commercial venues provided an important point of contact to reach LGBT people, particularly in areas where they were one of the few visible signs of the LGBT community. Several LGBT hate crime workers said that they had taken reports by providing surgeries in LGBT social venues. Other third schemes had attempted to encourage staff in social/commercial venues to take third party reports but found that they had generated very few reports.  

3.5.2 Contacting the police

A small number of London boroughs did not appear to operate any third party reporting service. Police Community Safety Units were therefore the only local contact listed on some internet sites for reporting homophobic/transphobic hate crime. During the mapping exercise the CSU telephone number provided on the Queery was used to contact all CSUs to find out how easy it was to get through to them. CSUs were also asked for contact details of the borough LGBT police liaison officer[s]. While it was possible to contact some CSUs or LGBT liaison officers, it sometimes proved difficult to make contact. Contact details on websites were inaccurate or out of date. Calls were not answered or went directly to answer machine and a response was given only after a number of days.

In addition, it was sometimes difficult to make contact with LGBT police liaison officers for similar reasons. While some officers were able to promote their role to the LGBT community, most victims contacting Galop did not know of their existence. LGBT liaison officers could be based in any department of the MPS and therefore had varying roles and responsibilities.

3.5.3 Systems for recording information

Systems for recording homophobic and transphobic hate crimes varied between organisations. Voluntary and statutory organisations with a dedicated third party reporting service were most likely to use a structured form to record details of an incident. In most cases these forms are designed to report a range of hate crimes, though a small number of LGBT services had specific forms to report homo/transphobic incidents. Typically, structured forms ask the victim for demographic information, as well as information about the incident, though to varying degrees of detail. Self-complete forms are often accompanied by guidance or explanatory notes about hate crime. A structured format provides continuity and consistency of information collected, guiding both the person reporting and the person
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taking the report. It is also easier to pass the report form onto the police or other agency dealing with the report. However, short self-complete third party report forms may not be able to capture enough detail about some incidents. Providing some detail is particularly important when encouraging victims to self-report or report anonymously as it is not always possible to contact a victim or witness once a report had been taken. In addition, structured forms may place too much emphasis on gathering monitoring data to make a report rather than asking victims what assistance they require. Dunn (2007) argues that third party reports need to strike a balance between collecting sufficient information and asking for too much information from victims who may be reluctant to provide details about themselves or perpetrators.

Organisations that provided assistance as well as third party reports were also likely to have made case notes about incidents. The advantage of notes is that they enable as much detail as possible about an incident and the victim to be recorded, and can be referred back to if necessary. However, unstructured notes rely on a caseworker having the skill to obtain the appropriate information from the victim/witness questioned otherwise the necessary information required to make a full third party report might not get recorded. It was less likely that information about incidents written up in case notes could be shared between organisations; it was time consuming to collate statistical information from unstructured notes and organisations could not breach client confidentiality by passing on non-anonymous records.

Organisations that did not take third party reports sometimes recorded a limited amount of information about homophobic and transphobic incidents. For example, telephone helpline services reported taking a small amount of demographic information from clients, usually for internal monitoring. Three of these LGBT organisations made a record of clients who contacted them about a homo/transphobic incident, but did not record additional details. Anonymous information about the calls and the client would be entered on to a database. Any confidential information about a client recorded in case notes for example, was kept separately. Some LGBT organisations such as youth services said that they would keep a record if a group member approached them about an incident and would use this record if the victim wanted to make a third party report. Similarly, respondents from counselling or support services said that they may have recorded information about a homo/transphobic incident if it related to a client’s case.

Many LGBT organisations said that they did not record information about homophobic and transphobic incidents. In particular, small LGBT groups or organisations that reported receiving occasional reports of incidents rarely recorded information. Respondents cited lack of time and resources to keep records, while others said that they would signpost clients on to the police or others so there was no need to record any information. Victims of incidents may also be reluctant to provide an organisation with information because they did not want to take the matter further or had concerns about confidentiality. As a result, information and intelligence about incidents may have been lost if it was not reported elsewhere.

3.5.4 Disseminating information on hate crime

Third party reporting schemes usually had an agreed system of passing reports on to the police or other organisations dealing with incidents. Details of the victims (and perpetrators) in third party reports are treated as confidential, and were not normally available beyond the organisation providing the service and the police. Third party reports are included in MPS figures on homophobic crime once they have been recorded by the police. Information about the number of homophobic incidents recorded each
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year by the police in all London boroughs is available on the MPS website.

Information about homophobic/transphobic incidents not reported to the police was rarely disseminated beyond the organisation they were reported to. A number of voluntary organisations with telephone helplines collated statistical information about the client contacts. While some organisations published these figures in annual reports most information remained within the organisation it was reported to. Most LGBT organisations were not asked to collate and disseminate data on hate crime unless required by funders.

There were some good examples of organisations sharing information about incidents reported to them within a local LGBT forum. One forum had begun to map incidents reported to both voluntary organisations and the police to identify possible hot spots of homophobic/transphobic incidents. Respondents from these forums said that disseminating this information would lead to a more joined-up approach from organisations combating hate crime in the borough. However, information sharing and mapping only took place within the confines of the local borough. Forums would not have information about incidents reported outside of the local borough or to organisations not participating in the local forum.

3.6 Conclusions

It is clear from the mapping exercise that a significant proportion of otherwise unreported homophobic and transphobic hate incidents are either informally ‘told’ or more formally reported to a range of agencies and organisations across London. However, in the majority of cases, these agencies do not have a system for recording this information – leading to a wealth of missing date and an inhibited understanding of homophobia and transphobia. Even where information is recorded, it tended to be retained by the individual organisation, with no shared recording systems and no method for wider dissemination. The mapping exercise also identified a lack of shared language and terminology relating to both hate crimes, and methods of reporting. This further inhibits shared understanding and action.

The research identified some good practice in individual London boroughs, and highlighted the fact that despite a lack of tools and guidance, many local authorities, police boroughs and voluntary sector organisations have sought to be proactive in combating LGBT hate crime. However, although committed to action, there were a number of challenges to overcome, including:

- No consistency or standardisation of third party reporting services across London, with no minimum standards in existence.
- No evidence base identifying what makes an effective hate crime initiative. There appeared to be little guidance for organisations funding or providing a LGBT third party reporting services to show what initiatives are likely to increase reporting and provide help to victims.
- Inconsistent involvement of the MPS, or of LGBT police liaison officers in third party reporting initiatives locally.

The research found no overall strategy on increasing reporting and providing third party reporting options in London. As a result of this and the challenges outlined above, there appears to have been a proliferation of initiatives across London, most of which were funded to work within a single borough or area. This has led to an uneven and inconsistent approach to encouraging the reporting of hate crime.
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across London, with some boroughs having more than one reporting initiative, and others with none. Many schemes have proved ineffective, often because of a range of issues which, in addition to those outlined above, include:

- Inherent problems with a borough based approach which doesn’t always reflect the reality of LGBT people’s lives.
- Little sustainability for schemes because of a lack of long term funding commitments.
- Unrealistically low funding which didn’t include resources for training and relied on volunteers and under-resourced voluntary sector partners to deliver services.

There has been no effective evaluation of the delivery and performance of third party reporting services across the capital. Some respondents to the mapping exercise also questioned the effectiveness of True Vision, which has also not been evaluated.

The research also found that victims and organisations providing victims with support often encountered problems in contacting the police for example out of date information on websites, phone numbers that don’t work, and no central place listing reporting options. Emphasis appeared to be focused on increasing the numbers of incidents reported, rather than focusing on outcomes sought by victims and ensuring that reports are properly followed up.

### 3.7 Recommendations

#### 3.7.1 A strategic approach

A strategic approach to reporting of homophobic and transphobic hate crime in London is needed. Leadership from the criminal justice system and London government, as well as Galop and other key stakeholders is needed to move this forward. Any strategy should ensure the following:

- A focus beyond simply increasing levels of reporting, which seeks to ensure positive outcomes for victims who report incidents.
- Minimum standards guidance for third party initiatives are developed (by Galop in partnership with other stakeholders), including shared language, standardisation of questions and information sharing protocols.

#### 3.7.2 Evaluate what works

There is a need for effective evaluation of third party reporting initiatives. This should include:

- Which models are proven to provide a good service to victims.
- An evaluation of True Vision.
- An assessment of what kind of advertising is effective in increasing reporting levels.

#### 3.7.3 Increase the effectiveness of third party reporting initiatives

Third party initiatives need to be provided with support to ensure that they are effective. This should include:
• A realistic assessment of voluntary sector capacity (including available resources) factored into initiatives.
• The MPS should play a more consistent role in local third party initiatives, and there should be increased consistency in the role of the LGBT Liaison Officer.
• An agreement about minimum standards on sending third party reports to police, and on police response time, including feedback on outcomes to organisations making third party reports.
• The MPS should provide a single point of contact to report inaccurate or out of date information on publicity and websites.
• Encouragement for LGBT organisations to record and share information.
• Setting up systems for central dissemination of learning and statistics to ensure improved understanding.
• Setting up systems for joint working between LGBT organisations to share good practice and take advantage of economies of scale.
• Coherent publicity for third party reporting should be developed, which could include a single telephone helpline for victims of LGBT hate crime.

3.7.4 Improve funding

A strategic and effective reporting service for victims of homophobic and transphobic hate crime requires on reliable and consistent statutory funding from central government, London government and London criminal justice system sources, which needs to include funding for:

• Pan-London reporting services.
• Galop to provide ongoing training and support to encourage other organisations to record information on hate crime.
• Galop to continue to collate and disseminate this shared information.
4. PARTNERSHIP WORKING AND INFORMATION SHARING
4.1 Introduction

The second part of the Filling in the Blanks Project was an innovative action research phase designed to try to increase the total amount of information on hate crime available, by working across organisations with different remits to improve and increase data collection.

As discussed in Chapter one, there is considerable evidence demonstrating that the majority of homophobic and transphobic incidents are not reported to the police. Within London there are a variety of voluntary sector organisations which have the confidence of the LGBT communities. These organisations collate data which the police, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and other statutory bodies do not have sight of. This information is not collected in a consistent way and therefore cannot be easily analysed or compared to data collected by the police or through victim surveys.

An example of this lack of consistent monitoring is found when comparing the statistical data from the three LGBT voluntary organisations which took part in this project; Stonewall Housing, London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard and Galop:

- In 2005, Stonewall Housing dealt with 101 clients who were categorised as having experienced ‘violence’ and 174 victims of ‘harassment’.
- London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard dealt with 512 victims of ‘abuse’.
- Galop dealt with 36 victims of ‘assault’ and 93 victims of ‘harassment’.

In comparison to the approximately 1500 homophobic and transphobic incidents reported to the MPS each year, the total of up to 916 cases dealt with by these three organisations represents an untapped resource to all those trying to understand and tackle homophobic and transphobic hate crime in London.\

4.2 Aims of action research

Having identified this potential untapped resource of information on hate crime, the action research phase sought to bring together these three organisations to act as a pilot in information collection and sharing. The intention was to work together and explore the processes necessary to creating compatible systems and eventually a comparable dataset. The phase explored and worked to combat some of the barriers which exist when LGBT voluntary sector organisations work together, including resource issues. It also highlighted the potential of cross sector working to create a unique new resource. Overall, the aims of this phase of the research were to:

- Facilitate joint partnership work between LGBT voluntary organisations to increase the level of data being recorded about homophobic and transphobic incidents.
- Develop a common monitoring system between project partners, to capture key data on incidents in a more systematic way.
- Build a data set of homophobic and transphobic incidents reported to the project partners, to analyse and highlight any key patterns and trends including comparison to police data.
- Have a better understanding of the nature of incidents reported to the LGBT voluntary sector in comparison to incidents reported directly to the Metropolitan Police Service.
- Highlight some of the successes and barriers of collecting data from the LGBT voluntary sector.
4.3 The organisations

4.3.1 Galop

Galop is the only voluntary London-wide LGBT organisation exclusively dedicated to combating homophobic and transphobic hate crime and providing advice to people who come into contact with the criminal justice system. Galop provides an assisted reporting service via a telephone helpline staffed by an experienced LGBT caseworker. In addition Galop has an internet reporting service that enables a victim/witness to report 24 hours a day. Galop provides the MPS with the greatest number of third party reports on homophobic/transphobic hate crime. It also takes reports from victims who do not want to report to the police or who have already reported an incident elsewhere but require further assistance. Galop advocates on behalf of clients who wants to make a police complaint and victims seeking compensation following a criminal injury. Other than reporting, clients to Galop might be looking for practical help or support following an incident and Galop can signpost them to other organisations, such as housing or counselling services. Galop has developed links with a range of voluntary and statutory services throughout London such as LGBT police liaison officers, Victim Support and LGBT-friendly solicitors. Galop's website also provides information on a range of issues including reporting, sexual offences and police complaints. In common with most small voluntary sector organisations, there are some constraints placed on the service offered by Galop, due to its limited funding. For example, Galop does not have the capacity to staff its helpline full time and has a limited publicity budget.

4.3.2 Stonewall Housing

Stonewall Housing is a voluntary sector LGBT charity that offers advice and assistance to LGBT people in London who are experiencing difficulties relating to housing and/or homelessness. Stonewall Housing is frequently contacted by clients with housing problems partly or solely as a result of homophobia or transphobia. Stonewall Housing operates a telephone advice line and also runs a number of drop-in surgeries throughout London for people wanting face-to-face advice. Stonewall Housing’s advice workers are trained to give advice to clients reporting homophobic/transphobic hate crime issues. Where appropriate an advice worker will encourage clients to report homophobic/transphobic incidents to Galop. However, clients contact Stonewall Housing to get help/advice on housing rather than to report a homophobic or transphobic incident.

4.3.3 London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard (LLGS)

LLGS provides an information, support and referral service for lesbians, gay men, and bisexual people. LLGS provides advice and support via its telephone helpline service, open seven days a week. LLGS differs from Galop and Stonewall Housing in that its services are staffed by volunteers. Whilst LLGS has its own system to monitor calls, volunteer phone operators need encouragement to gather additional information about homophobic/transphobic incidents. LLGS refers clients to Galop if the client wants to make a third party report or get specialist advice, though not all victims contacting to LLGS want to report to Galop or the police.

4.4 Original methods of recording information

Galop, Stonewall Housing and LLGS each had their own way of recording data on homophobic and transphobic crime based on the service each provide and the monitoring requirements of funders.
4.4.1 Galop

Galop records the most detailed information about incidents because it provides an assisted reporting service to victims of homophobic/transphobic hate crime. Prior to the Filling in the Blanks project, Galop monitored calls to its helpline using an ‘Initial Record of Attendance & Advice Form’. This form allowed the caseworker to take notes about the case and record a few demographic details about the client that would be used to monitor who contacted Galop and the type of incident they had experienced. Additional follow-up notes and contact details were added to the form if the client required more help or advice. Galop’s on-line self-report form was structured to encourage users to provide as much detail about the incident as possible. If a client wanted to make a third party report, a Galop caseworker would fill in a separate third party report form and email it to the police to be disseminated to the appropriate borough Community Safety Unit.19

Written case notes recorded by Galop caseworkers often provided detailed information about an incident. However, information collected in case notes was not always recorded in a systematic way. The amount of information recorded about the client, the incident and the perpetrator could vary. The amount of detail given also depended on the amount of information a client was willing or able to provide. Alternatively, the case worker may not have asked the client to provide information about themselves or the incident because it was not appropriate or required to advise the client. Similarly, reports submitted via the internet sometimes omitted information about an incident. Limitations in data collection meant that it was potentially difficult to build up a complete profile of incidents reported through Galop. Most of the rich source of data recorded in case notes had never been analysed because Galop did not have the capacity to do so.

4.4.2 Stonewall Housing

Stonewall Housing recorded contacts onto its client database. Data collected included demographic information about the client and details about the nature of the enquiry. Housing problems involving homophobia or transphobia would be recorded as either ‘homophobic harassment’ or ‘homophobic violence’. The database did not record any additional information about the incident. Similarly to Galop, confidential written case notes about incidents were recorded if a housing advice worker opened a case file. These notes were kept as record of contact and a tool to help support a housing case, rather than as a method of data collection.

4.4.3 London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard

LLGS recorded basic information about all calls received including some demographic details about the client and the nature of the call. Calls about experiences of homophobia/transphobia were recorded as ‘homophobic abuse’. However, no further information about the incident was recorded. LLGS did not take third party reports but had facility to email Galop information from clients who wanted to make a third party report, known as the ‘Fast Track Assisted Reporting System’. Evidence from Galop’s records suggested that very few clients were referred on to Galop using this system. Very little descriptive information was provided about the incident itself because the form was unstructured and volunteers did not know what information to record.

19. Third party reports generated by Galop are sent centrally to the LGBT Strand of the Diversity and Citizen Focus Directorate of the MPS. These reports are then logged, and forwarded to the relevant Community Safety Unit.
4.5 New methods of recording and sharing information

A project steering group was set up and proved particularly useful in bringing a range of organisations together. For example, staff from LGBT voluntary organisations met with the Metropolitan Police Service and the Crown Prosecution Service to discuss how each organisation approached recording LGBT hate crime and how to bring about change. The three voluntary organisations agreed to change the way they recorded information about homophobic/transphobic incidents and to provide the Filling in the Blanks project with data on incidents over a 12 month period. The MPS also agreed to carry out a comparative data analysis on incidents reported directly to them.

4.5.1 Galop

During the first year of the project a new ‘Homophobic/Transphobic Incident Report Form’ was developed and piloted by Galop staff. The new form was more structured with specific questions designed to capture as much information as possible about an incident. The web self-report form was also amended to ensure the user provided as full a report as possible. For example, drop-down menus were added to make the form easier to complete since the user only had to select pre-defined categories. Both forms still allowed the victim to provide qualitative information about the incident, so as to provide vital detail and context. The incident report form could also be completed electronically and sent directly as a third party report, therefore saving time.

In the second year, Galop used the incident form as a template for an electronic database jointly developed by Galop staff and a Galop volunteer. The database has the advantage of allowing anonymous information about incidents to be stored electronically and accessed for analysis or to create third party reports. A total of 198 incidents were recorded by Galop during the data collection period using the new system.

The Filling in the Blanks researcher provided vital additional capacity to enable these changes to take place. The process of identifying the most appropriate questions to include in a new form was a painstaking one, involving historical analysis of past case notes. Negotiations then took place with caseworkers, and new forms were piloted and evaluated. Support and training was provided to caseworkers. The development of the database allowed a much more consistent and effective collection process, and its instigation as a direct result of the Filling in the Blanks project has created a lasting resource for Galop.

4.5.2 Stonewall Housing

Stonewall Housing agreed to capture more data about incidents reported to it by adding a number of specific questions about homophobic or transphobic incidents to its client database. These included questions about the location, time/date of the incident, the perpetrator and if the incident had been reported to the police. Anonymous data was passed to the Filling in the Blanks project every three months and added to the data set. A balance needed to be struck between collecting too much and not

---

20. The group consisted of representatives from each of the voluntary LGBT organisations, the researcher on the Filling in the Blanks project, two external from the Crown Prosecution Service.
enough information. On the one hand the number of questions about an incident was kept to a minimum so as not to deter both the advisor collecting information and client providing it. For example, housing advice workers had to be particularly sensitive about asking questions concerning perpetrators, as many housing cases involved domestic violence from family members or partners. On the other hand, it was necessary to ask for enough information in order to get a full picture of an incident. Occasionally it proved difficult for housing advisors to record some of the more complex cases that involved repeat incidents or multiple perpetrators. Inevitably not all the details could be recorded and some information would remain missing.

A total of 135 cases of homophobic/transphobic hate crime from Stonewall Housing were added to the dataset. The number of incidents dealt with by Stonewall Housing was lower than previous years partly because funding ended for its hate crime worker. The relatively minor change to the way incidents are recorded enabled Stonewall Housing to provide data about homophobic/transphobic hate crime that might otherwise have not been available. Stonewall Housing is also better placed to understand more about its clients’ experiences of homophobic and transphobic hate crime as a result of these changes.

4.5.3 London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard

LLGS also agreed to capture more information when clients contacted them about incidents. Galop held a series of meetings with LLGS staff to develop and pilot a short form for phone operators to record details about incidents reported to LLGS. The form also gave clients the option of being referred to Galop or supplying contact details if they wanted to make a full third party report. Completed forms were then passed to Galop. LLGS and Galop worked together to encourage LLGS volunteers to fill in the new incident forms. For example, LLGS placed forms and reminder messages on telephone operators’ workstations. Bulletins and mail outs were also sent to volunteers. Galop provided volunteers with written information about the project and also gave two presentations to volunteers about the Filling in the Blanks Project. Talking to volunteer phone operators in LLGS raised the profile of the organisation’s role in encouraging clients to report incidents and provide intelligence. Galop was able give examples of a number of cases initially reported to LLGS and passed on to Galop which led to action being taken by the police. For example, one third party report contributed towards charges being brought against a man involved in a series of assaults and robberies of gay men in London.

LLGS provided the project with more detail about incidents using the forms and continued to refer clients to Galop. However, the number of forms completed was significantly less than had been indicated by the number of incidents logged in the 2005 LLGS Annual Caller Survey. Only 25 incidents were recorded using the Galop/LLGS Incident Report Forms, with a further 55 incidents being recorded via the LLGS 2007 Caller Survey. This made a total of 80 incidents.

The difference in the figures collected by the Filling in the Blanks project and the 2005 LLGS Caller Survey were no doubt due to the fact that the 2005 LLGS survey had specifically asked all callers to LLGS whether they had ever experienced a homophobic/transphobic incident, rather than callers contacting LLGS about a recent incident.

There were also a number of other factors that limited the number of forms completed by LLGS. Firstly, LLGS had its own electronic call monitoring system that was in the process of being updated. LLGS felt it was not possible to add the incident form to their existing system during the period of data collection.

---

21. Incidents: larly, repeated calls that appeared to be about the same incident were not recorded twice.
The paper copy of the incident report form therefore remained separate to LLGS’s electronic system and so volunteer may have been less likely to fill it in. Volunteers may still be signposting clients to Galop but they were not necessarily recording information about the incidents. Secondly, the period in which LLGS began to collect data for Galop also coincided with the period that they conducted their 2007 Caller Survey. Volunteers were therefore less likely to ask callers to complete both the incident form and the LLGS survey.

As a result of the possible conflict between the Filling in the Blanks project and the LLGS caller survey, a number of specific questions about homophobic/transphobic hate crime were added to the LLGS internal 2007 Caller Survey (LLGS, 2007). Anonymous data from all the callers who had reported recently experiencing a homophobic or transphobic incident was then passed to Galop. The caller survey data had only a limited amount of information about incidents compared to information recorded on the incident report forms. However, the survey provided data about the type of calls LLGS received about homophobic/transphobic hate crime and included some information about reporting to the police. In spite of these difficulties, Galop and LLGS continued to work closely together to keep the momentum going with volunteer phone operators in recognition that a sustained effort would be required over a longer period of time.

4.6 Conclusions

The Filling in the Blanks Project demonstrates the achievement, benefits and some of the obstacles to joint working with LGBT voluntary sector organisations to encourage them to record and increase intelligence on homophobic and transphobic hate crime. The project successfully brought together three voluntary LGBT organisations to work jointly to collect more data on homophobic/transphobic hate crime, and do so in a more coherent way. This led to the ability to share information both within the sector and with the MPS, which would not usually have been disseminated (or even collected).

It is clear from the process of collection and analysis that victims of incidents are reporting to LGBT voluntary organisations. However, numbers of cases reported to LGBT voluntary organisations suggest that homophobic and transphobic hate crime is under-reported. It will be important in future research to develop a more complex understanding of reasons for under-reporting, beyond a fear of the police, as this is only part of the problem.

The project particularly highlighted the ways in which relatively small changes to existing monitoring systems used by LGBT voluntary organisations can lead to more detailed data being collected on hate crime.

All organisations involved in the project were operating with restricted resources, for various reasons. For example, for a significant period Galop did not have funding for its full time caseworker role. During the project, Stonewall Housing’s funding for its hate crime advice worker ended. LLGS’s services are provided by volunteers, which though a strength of its business model, created restrictions in its ability to implement consistent monitoring and recording. As a result of these restrictions, as well as the different remits and focus of the organisations, it is clear that LGBT organisations are more likely to agree to minor additions to their existing data collection rather than use a separate system to record data, with some LGBT organisations being able to collect more data than others.

The project emphasised the fact that changes to the way voluntary organisations record data do not necessarily lead to an increase in the number of cases being reported but do result in more consistent data being collected about incidents.
Finally, it is clear that it takes considerable time to implement and sustain a joint initiative to gather data on hate crime because of insecure funding and staffing within the LGBT voluntary sector. The success of the joint working pilot was reliant on the additional resource that was provided by the project, as dedicated staffing had a key role in supporting change through negotiation, problem solving and staff development. Change takes time, and the expertise and leadership of the project were needed to create a standard for recording and reporting, as well as to implement this standard. Any longevity of the project is entirely dependant on securing funding to lead the collection, recording and analysis process. The goodwill of LGBT organisations themselves cannot be relied upon, as simply they do not have to capacity to collect/collate data alone.

4.7 Recommendations

4.7.1 Galop should:

• Continue to collate and interpret shared data.
• Disseminate statistics from non-police reports to statutory organisations that collate figures on homophobic and transphobic hate crime.
• Work with partners to produce new guidelines on standardising recording and reporting methods.
• Provide training and support materials to assist volunteers and staff working in the LGBT voluntary sector to gather data on homophobic/transphobic hate crime.
• Work with organisations that are unable to record information about incidents to encourage them to signpost victims to Galop and the MPS.

4.7.2 LGBT organisations:

• Current project partners should continue collecting and sharing data.
• Third party reporting initiatives across London should work with Galop to develop standardised reporting forms, and should share data with Galop for dissemination across London.
• Should build links with statutory services in education, health and housing to encourage more reporting and ensure that victims of homophobia/transphobia receive help and protection.
• LGBT Forums should disseminate information on homophobic/transphobic incidents reported to local organisations.

4.7.3 Central Government, London Government and London criminal justice partners:

• Should take account of the number of non-police reports when reporting on figures on homophobic/transphobic hate crime.
• Provide Galop and other LGBT partners with the funding and resources necessary to build and maintain an ongoing database of non-police reports.
• Work with Galop and other LGBT partners to standardise collection and reporting methods across London, and ensure that this standard is met in any new or existing reporting initiatives.
5. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
This chapter presents the statistical findings of the data collected by the three LGBT organisations, and where possible, comparable data from the MPS. The data is presented thematically and highlights patterns and key points that emerge from the data set. Each chart includes a base figure which refers to the total number of valid cases used to calculate the statistics in that chart.

5.1 Overview

A total of 738 cases were entered into the Filling in the Blanks dataset and included in the final analysis. The charts below illustrate the sources of the data.

Figure 1

Total proportion of cases collected included in the final analysis (April 05 to January 08)

Base = 738

- Galop: 70%
- Stonewall Housing: 19%
- LLGS: 11%

Figure 2

Total proportion of cases collected from all three voluntary organisations in one year (February 07 to January 08)

Base = 411

- Galop: 48%
- Stonewall Housing: 33%
- LLGS: 19%

The first chart shows the total number of cases included in the final analysis. The percentage of cases from Galop is much higher because of the addition of historical data from Galop included in the final analysis. The second chart above shows the percentage of cases gathered from each of the three LGBT organisations for one year.

5.1.1 Comparative data from the MPS

Where it was possible to do so, MPS data was taken from calendar years 2001 to 2006 to compare with data gathered by the Filling in the Blanks project. A total of 8661 incidents were analysed, all reported to the MPS between 2001 and 2006.
5.2 Victims of homophobic and transphobic incidents

5.2.1 Gender, gender identity and sexuality

**Figure 3**

Gender identity of victims recorded by LGBT organisations and MPS

**Figure 4**

Sexuality of victims of homophobic/transphobic incidents (LGBT organisations)

The charts above illustrate that gay and bisexual men constitute the largest percentage of victims of homophobic/transphobic incidents recorded by LGBT voluntary organisations and the MPS. Lesbians and bisexual women are far less likely to contact either LGBT organisations or the MPS.

**Differences in experience by gender**

Surveys of LGBT hate crime show differences in women's reporting of homophobia compared to men (Dick, 2008; Moran et al, 2004). However, the disproportionate number of reports from men compared to women in these surveys is not as large as the Filling in the Blanks dataset. A number of studies (Berrill, 1992; Moran et al, 2004) have highlighted the different experiences of female and male victims of hate crime. Data from LGBT organisations also suggests some differences in the type of incidents reported by women and men, though there are fewer incidents reported by women to compare.
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- A larger percentage of women contacted LGBT organisations about verbal abuse/threats whereas a larger percentage of men contacted LGBT organisations about physical violence.\(^{22}\)
- One in ten female victims contacted an LGBT organisation about a sexual assault or abuse compared to one in twenty male victims.
- One in ten males contacted LGBT organisations after experiencing specific problems with the police, with the majority of cases concerning cottaging and cruising.
- Two thirds of women contacted LGBT organisations about incidents experienced in/near to their home compared to over half of men.\(^{23}\)
- Men were more likely than women to contact LGBT organisations about incidents taking place in public settings, such as the street (21% compared to 16%).
- Around one in ten of men contacted an LGBT organisation about an incident that took place in a public sex environment.

\(^{22}\) The British Crime Survey [2006/7] also found that young men in particular, are more likely to be victims of violent crime compared to women.\(^{22}\)

\(^{23}\) This finding was revealed by cross-tabulating different categories of data not presented in the chart above. Cross tabulations have been included throughout Chapter five to reveal patterns beyond those illustrated in the figures.
People whose gender identity was different to the one they were assigned with at birth did not necessarily identify as trans. Therefore clients contacting Galop were asked whether they had the same gender identity as they were assigned with at birth. Galop then defined those victims with a different gender identity as trans, for the purposes of equalities monitoring. The MPS did not collect data on trans or gender identity, so it was not possible to compare the experiences of trans people who contacted the police.

The higher number of reports from male to female trans victims compared to female to male may indicate that trans women experience more incidents than trans men. This might be due to greater visibility of trans women that resulted in more attacks. However, it might be that trans men are less likely to contact organisations about transphobic or homophobic incidents. Whittle et al's survey [2007] found little difference in the percentage of trans men and women who experienced transphobic incidents, despite the belief that trans women are more likely to be victim of attacks. Many trans people identified as LGB and were sometimes the victim of homophobic hate crime.\textsuperscript{24}

Hate crimes perpetrated against LGBT people are often of a transphobic nature. Attacks on LGBT people sometimes happen because perpetrators’ perception of the victim as not embodying a stereotypical female or male (hetero-normative) identity. For example, a gay or trans man might be attacked for being ‘effeminate’ or a lesbian for being ‘butch’.

Differences in experiences by gender identity

Although the number of cases that were reported by trans people was relatively small, there were some different experiences that should be highlighted.

**Figure 9**

*Incidents experienced by trans and non-trans victims LGBT*

**THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:**

- Trans people were twice as likely to contact LGBT organisations about verbal abuse or threats compared to non-trans people, though trans people were less likely to report incidents involving violence compared to non-trans people.
- Trans people were more likely to contact LGBT organisations about repeated harassment. Nearly three-quarters of trans victims experienced repeated transphobic/homophobic harassment compared to over half of non-trans victims.

**5.2.2 Age**

**Figure 10**

*Age of victims of homophobic/transphobic incidents*
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Adults between 21 and 50 are most likely to contact LGBT organisations or the MPS and account for over three-quarters of all cases recorded.
- There were significantly fewer cases from younger and older people. The under 21s and the over 50s each represented around one in ten cases.
- LGBT people under 21 who first contacted LGBT organisations to get help were half as likely to have reported to the police compared to the over 20s.

**Figure 11**

![Age of victims of homophobic/transphobic incidents by LGBT organisation](chart)

**THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:**

- Stonewall Housing had a much younger client group, with almost one in four victims first contacting them being under 21 compared to one in twenty reporting to Galop’s and just over one in ten to LLGS.
- Over one in ten victims first contacting Galop were over 50, compared to one in twenty reporting to LLGS and less than one in twenty to Stonewall Housing.
- The largest proportion of older victims who contacted Galop sought help with homophobic incidents and legal advice.

**Differences in experiences by age**

There are a number of possible factors why more LGBT people between 21 and 50 contact organisations following an incident. For example, LGBT people in these age groups are more likely to be ‘out’ and identify as LGBT. They may therefore be more visible and vulnerable to attack from neighbours if, for example, they share accommodation with a partner or other LGBT people.

The larger proportion of younger people contacting Stonewall Housing for assistance may be explained by the fact that Stonewall Housing provides housing specifically for young homeless LGBT people needing help after experiencing hate crime or domestic abuse where they were currently living.

Galop’s previous study into young LGBT people’s experience of homophobia (Galop, 1998) suggests that they are less likely to tell anyone about their experiences. Young people often do not know...
about LGBT services and even when they do, they may judge the consequences of reporting to be too risky. For example, young people may not want to report perpetrators who are members of their family/household. Research by Stonewall (Hunt et al, 2007) found that schools are more likely to treat homophobic and transphobic incidents experienced by young LGBT people as bullying rather than as hate crime and often do not report such incidents experienced at school. Research conducted by Childline (NSPCC, 2006) also indicated that significant numbers of young people were contacting its telephone helpline to get help with homophobia/transphobia experienced at home and school.

Middle aged and older LGBT people (those over 50) have different needs or experiences compared to younger LGBT people (Heaphy, 2003). Filling in the Blanks found some differences in the experiences of hate crime of older LGBT people. For example, older clients identified as being bisexual or heterosexual and may have feared being ‘outed’ and appeared more susceptible incidents such as blackmail (seven percent compared to two percent of the under 50s).

Some older LGBT people may also lack confidence and knowledge about where/how to report an incident because they are isolated from the LGBT community. Older LGBT people may also have previously suffered traumatic experiences dealing with the police at a time when homosexuality was illegal and LGBT people were widely stigmatised. This might explain why they are reluctant to contact the police or other organisations. Filling in the Blanks also examines victims’ satisfaction with the police (see below) and found that older LGBT people contacting LGBT organisations who also reported to the police were twice as likely to say they were dissatisfied with their response. However, as there was only a small number of older victims contacting both LGBT organisations and the MPS it is important not to assume that they experienced less hate crime than younger LGBT people.

5.2.3 Ethnicity

Figure 12

![Ethnicity of victims – LGBT organisations and MPS data](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>LGBT Organisation</th>
<th>MPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed heritage/other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LGBT base = 601

25 Of the 55 people within these age categories a larger percentage identified as bisexual [11% compared to 6% of the overall total number] and heterosexual [7% compared to 3%].
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- The ethnic identity of victims of homophobic/transphobic hate crime contacting LGBT organisations and the MPS is comparable to the ethnic population of London according to the 2001 Census. However, LGBT victims identifying as Asian appear to be underrepresented.\(^{26}\)
- Over three-quarters of all incidents reported by BME people reported took place in/near their home compared to just over half of all white victims.
- Three-quarters of BME victims also reported repeated attacks compared to just over half of white victims.

Differences in experiences by ethnicity

These figures might also suggest that BME LGBT people were more likely to report sustained abuse rather than one-off incidents. It might also suggest that BME LGBT have less confidence in approaching the police or LGBT voluntary organisations (Galop, 2001).

BME people suffer disproportionately worse housing conditions and higher levels of homelessness (GLA, 2008) and are therefore more likely to seek housing advice. The higher percentage of repeat incidents experienced in/near home reflects the number of BME clients contacting Stonewall Housing for housing advice. Over half of incidents recorded by Stonewall Housing were from BME/mixed clients compared to around two-fifths of incidents reported to Galop and LLGS. It is important not to over emphasise any differences because of the relatively small number of cases from BME/other ethnic groups in the Filling in the Blanks dataset and the disproportionate number who contacted Stonewall Housing.

5.2.4 Disability and health

Did the victim have a disability or health problem? (LGBT organisations)

---

\(^{26}\) The 2001 Census identifies London’s population as the following: 71% White, 12% Asian, 11% Black, 3% Mixed, 1% Chinese, and 1.5% other.
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Over a third of clients with a disability experienced mental health issues or had developed feelings of anxiety or depression as a direct result of an incident.
- One in five disclosed they were living with HIV/AIDS and had experienced hate crime because of their sexuality or HIV/AIDS status.
- LGBT people living with a disability experience high levels of repeat incidents in/near their homes (65% compared to 57% of those without a disability).

Differences in experiences by disability

The estimates of the proportion of disabled people in London range from 10% to 17%. Figure 13 indicate a higher percentage of LGBT people living with a disability or health problem are contacting LGBT organisations about incidents.

The high percentage of LGBT victims with a disability or health problem contacting LGBT organisations suggests that they are particularly vulnerable to homophobic/transphobic attack and might be further stigmatised because of their disability.
5.3 Nature of incidents

5.3.1 Overview

Nature of incidents recorded by LGBT organisations and the MPS

Each LGBT organisation and the MPS had their own definitions/categories for recording type of incident or alleged offence and the categories above are not necessarily the ones used by each organisation. These categories were changed to enable a comparison between data collected from LGBT organisations and the MPS. There are broad similarities between incidents reported to MPS and LGBT voluntary organisations, as illustrated in the graph above.

Threats and harassment are the most common incidents recorded by the MPS and LGBT organisations, though violence against the person accounted between a quarter and nearly a third of incidents. There were some differences between the MPS and LGBT organisations. For example, victims of sexual violence or abuse appeared more likely to contact LGBT organisations than the police. However, this difference may be because sexual violence is not necessarily recorded as a hate crime by the MPS. Similarly, LGBT organisations recorded incidents that involved problems with the police or criminal justice system.

The data from LGBT organisations reveals that half of all violent incidents were repeat incidents happening in or near the victim’s home. This challenges the common perception of violent hate crime as one-off incidents perpetrated by strangers.

Verbal and written abuse/threats recorded by LGBT organisations

THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Nearly one in three incidents recorded by LGBT organisations involved verbal abuse or threats.
- One in twenty cases involved written abuse or threats, including letters, notes, graffiti and messages sent via electronic media such as texts and emails.
- Nearly two in three incidents of verbal and written abuse or threats were repeat incidents.
- Over three in five incidents of verbal abuse took place in or near to victims’ homes. Nearly two in five incidents took place in public settings, with almost two thirds of these public incidents taking place on the street.
- Two fifths of recorded incidents took place during the day and three fifths of incidents took
place in the evening or at night.

- Over half of victims of verbal/written abuse who contacted an LGBT organisation were reporting the incident for the first time. Just over a quarter of incidents recorded by LGBT organisations had already been reported to the police.

Violence reported to LGBT organisations

THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Over a quarter of incidents involved actual or attempted physical assault as the primary motive. Violence or attempted violence was also a feature of over a tenth of additional incidents, where the primary motive was robbery or sexual assault.
- Over half of violent incidents were part of repeat attacks and happened in or near to victims’ homes.
- Physical attacks that took place in public/semi public locations were most likely to take place on the street or public sex environments.
- Incidents involving violence appeared more likely to take place during the evening or late at night. However, over one in ten incidents involving violence took place during the day time.
- Over a third of victims of violence who contacted an LGBT organisation were reporting the incident for the first time. Half of all victims had already reported the incident to the police but had subsequently gone on to contact an LGBT organisation. This was either because they needed other sorts of help/advice, such as housing, or they were dissatisfied with the police response after reporting to them.

Violence reported directly to the MPS

The MPS recorded specific categories of violence against the person that show the level of seriousness of attacks against LGBT people.

KEY POINTS:

- Half of the violent incidents involved the offence of actual bodily harm.
- More than one in three involved common assault.
- Just over one in twenty involved grievous bodily harm.
- Just over one in twenty involved the offence category ‘other violence’.
- Less than one in a hundred (0.7%) involved murder.

5.3.2 Domestic Abuse

Around one in five of the total number of incidents reported to LGBT organisations involved domestic abuse or violence, where the perpetrator was a current/ex-partner or living in the same household as the victim.

There was an overlap between domestic abuse and hate crime because victims may have experienced domestic abuse or violence motivated by homophobia or transphobia. For example, victims often
approached LGBT organisations for help with homophobic/transphobic abuse from members of the same household or family. Similarly, a victim may have been experiencing domestic abuse from a partner, which included an element of homophobic/transphobic abuse. Clients contacted LGBT organisations for a variety of reasons, including assistance with housing, advice on reporting and dealing with the police or criminal justice system.

**Figure 16**

![Pie chart showing types of domestic abuse involving partner or ex-partner reported to LGBT organisations]

**Type of domestic abuse involving partner or ex-partner reported to LGBT organisations**

**THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:**

- Around two in five victims first contacted an LGBT organisation about the domestic abuse and just over two in five first contacted the police.
- More than nine out of ten cases of domestic abuse/violence from current or ex-partners took place in or near to the victims’ home.
- Over three in five of victims of domestic abuse were male and just under two fifths were female.
- Over three in four abusers were male, with fewer than one in five female.

**Figure 17**

![Pie chart showing types of domestic abuse involving perpetrators from the same household as the victim (LGBT organisations)]

**Type of domestic abuse involving perpetrators from the same household as the victim (LGBT organisations)**

**THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:**

- Nearly three fifths of victims of domestic violence contacting an LGBT organisation were reporting the incident for the first time, with most (four fifths) first reporting to Stonewall Housing to get help/advice.
- Victims who were from the same household/family as the perpetrator were half as likely
to have contacted the police about the incident as victims who did not live in the same household/family.

- Only three percent of victims of domestic abuse from members of the same household or family made a third party report.
- Almost two out of three of victims were male, just under a third were female.
- Nearly half of all abusers were male, with less than one in five female.

5.3.3 Sexual assault and abuse

**Figure 18**

THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Two out of three victims who contacted LGBT organisations had not contacted the police.
- Three out of five victims who first contacted an LGBT organisation were reporting the incident for the first time.
- Less than one in five sexual assaults reported to LGBT organisations resulted in a third party report, since most victims only wanted advice and support.
- Over half of sexual assaults/abuse occurred in or near to the victim’s home, nearly a quarter occurred in the street/public location and nearly a fifth of incidents occurred in an LGBT venue.
- Two out of three victims were male; nearly one in three was female.
- One in four victims was under 21 years old.
- Nearly nine out of ten perpetrators were male.
- Almost two in three victims knew or were familiar with the perpetrator. One in four was a partner/ex-partner of the victim and nearly one in four came from the same household as the victim.
5.3.4 Theft/robbery, damage to property and blackmail

Figure 19

The statistics reveal that:

- LGBT people are sometimes deliberately targeted by perpetrators committing theft or robbery. For example, one in three robberies took place at a public sex environment or in/near an LGBT venue. Similarly, attempts were made to blackmail victims, who were not out to family, friends, or colleagues.
- Thefts, robbery, and damage to property were often one part of a homophobic/transphobic attack and 15% of all cases recorded by LGBT organisations involved either damage to property, theft, robbery, or blackmail.
- Over four in five incidents involving damage to property took place in/near to victims’ homes.

5.3.5. Other incidents reported to LGBT voluntary organisations

Incidents that did not fit the main incident categories in sufficient numbers were recorded as ‘other’. Examples included making allegations about the victims, anti-social behaviour, and refusal of goods or services, that had been partly or fully motivated by homophobia/transphobia. Just over one in twenty of these cases involved incidents where the victim did not give sufficient details and were therefore recorded as ‘unspecified harassment’.

These cases were relevant for inclusion because they were sometimes involved issues where civil, criminal and employment law overlapped. These were also incidents that might not normally be reported to the police or where the police had been unable or unwilling to intervene. For example, over half of victims contacting LGBT organisations about these incidents were reporting them for the first time. Over three fifths of these victims had no contact with the police, and another fifth said they were dissatisfied with the police after reporting to them.

27 For further detail.

28 For further detail.
Incidents arising from issues with the police and criminal justice system

Incidents arising from contact with the police were only included in the dataset when the client specifically contacted the LGBT organisation with a problem involving the police. These calls accounted for around one in ten of total cases dealt with by Galop because of the specialist services it offered. Victims who contacted LGBT organisations were also asked a separate question about contact with the police that will be discussed later in this report.

- Three in five incidents involving the police were from clients who had been warned, cautioned or charged by the police. Most incidents concerned disputes following allegations of a sexual offence taking place, often in a public toilet or occasionally in other cruising areas such as parks.29 Some clients disputed the allegations and/or claimed that they had been verbally abused or threatened with arrest by an officer.
- Around one in ten of calls about sexual offences were from men who were worried about an alleged sexual offence appearing on a Criminal Records Bureau check. These included men who had been convicted for gross indecency in the past, despite this offence being removed following the Sexual Offences Act 2004.
- A number of these clients had been cautioned or arrested by the police following cases of domestic violence or incidents. As these clients sometimes faced charges, they usually wanted legal advice or to get help about dealing with the police.
- Nearly two in five calls were about incidents involving the police outside London.

5.4 How often, where and when incidents occurred

5.4.1 Frequency of incidents

Figure 20

Was the incident recorded by the LGBT organisation single or repeat?

Single incident was used to describe a one-off event and repeat incident to capture cases of on-going harassment, where the victim had been subject to attack by the same perpetrators more than once.30

29 Under the terms of the Sexual Offences Act 2004 it is illegal to engage or procure sex in a public toilet. There is no specific legislation covering cruising grounds. The MPS follows ACPO guidelines, though different police boroughs approach policing of public sex environments differently.

30 The study did not use harassment because the word can be interpreted differently. For example, in some cases victims described being harassed by "harrassing" or using a PSE site.
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Over four fifths of repeat incidents occurred in or nearby the home of the victim.
- Conversely, three quarters of single incidents occurred in public/semi-public settings.

5.4.2 Location of incidents

Figure 21

Media perceptions of homophobic/transphobic hate crime have often focused on attacks that occur late at night, outside LGBT bars or clubs. However, this study found that homophobic/transphobic incidents were as equally likely to be take place in or near to victims’ homes as they were in public locations.

THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Nearly three in five incidents recorded by LGBT organisations took place in/near the victim’s home compared to less than two in five recorded by the MPS.
- Half of all incidents recorded by MPS took place in public or semi-public areas, such as the street, shops or public transport, compared to one in five incidents recorded by LGBT organisations.
- Nearly one in ten incidents recorded by LGBT organisations took place in public sex environments (PSE’s). A significant number of these cases were men who had problems with the police or others following allegations of sexual offences. However, there were a number of incidents that involved assault or robbery in PSE’s that had not been reported to the police because victims or witnesses were reluctant to disclose that they were cottaging or cruising.
- Just over one in twenty incidents took place in the workplace. Only one in a hundred cases took place in schools or colleges.
- Three in five incidents involving verbal abuse recorded by LGBT organisations took place in/near the home compared to less than two in five taking place in public areas.
- Nearly half of violent incidents recorded by LGBT organisations took place in the street or other public/semi public areas, including one in five taking place in/outside LGBT venues or PSEs.
There appears to be a difference in the type of incident that victims are more likely to report to MPS and LGBT organisations the respectively. The statistics above reveal that victims are more likely to contact the police about incidents in public settings rather than in their own homes. This may be due to victims’ perception about the kinds of incidents that the police may or may not intervene in. Victims may also feel that it is more ‘risky’ to involve the police in incidents in/near home because they fear reprisals from perpetrators. Conversely, much larger proportions of victims who have experienced incidents in or near their home make contact with LGBT organisations, which may be because they are looking for help and support rather than wanting police intervention.

The figures reveal a very low number of reports relating to incidents in schools and colleges. Given what is known about homophobic and transphobic bullying in schools (see Chapter one), this is likely to be a significant under-estimate of the number of incidents taking place in or around schools.

The figures relating to location of verbal abuse reported to LGBT organisations indicate a higher proportion being reported in or near the home. Although this may indicate that levels of verbal abuse in public areas are lower than levels in/near the home, it is also relevant that verbal abuse in or near the home was often repeat harassment, as opposed to verbal abuse in more public areas (which were more often single incidents). This may mean that victims are more likely to want help with repeat abuse in the home. It may also be that victims of one-off verbal abuse by a stranger in public may feel that there is little to gain from reporting.

The higher level of violent incidents reported to LGBT organisations taking place in public areas may mean that victims were more likely to these incidents because they may consider them more serious and/or wanted to warn the LGBT community in case of further attacks.

Figure 22

Base = 510

The borough of the incident took place in (LGBT organisations)
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Just over one in five incidents reported to LGBT organisations took place outside London.
- Most inner London boroughs had higher numbers of incidents. Ten percent of incidents reported in London occurred in Westminster, with eight other boroughs having between a four percent and nine percent share of the total number of incidents for London.
- Significantly fewer reports were made from the outer London boroughs, with most accounting for two percent or less of the total number of incidents reported.
- More victims of reported LGBT hate crime lived in inner London boroughs.
- Homophobic/transphobic incidents appear to mainly take place in the same borough in which the victim lived.

The higher number of reports from inner London boroughs with more visible LGBT communities may suggest these are homophobic/transphobic crime ‘hot spots’. Evidence to support this remains largely speculative because there is no available data on London’s LGBT population within each borough. The figures reveal that more victims who reported to LGBT organisations lived in inner London boroughs, and that this is also where most incidents took place. This pattern is expected given the high percentage of incidents that took place in/near to victims’ homes. There may be other factors that account for different levels of reporting within London. For example, resources aimed at encouraging reporting were more likely to reach LGBT people in inner London areas because of the higher number of venues and community organisations. LGBT people in outer London areas may be more isolated from these communities. Galop and Stonewall Housing also had several frequent clients in inner London boroughs that reported a series of separate incidents over the course of the data collection period.

Most London boroughs had a higher percentage of repeat incidents compared to single incidents. These figures suggest that issues such as neighbourhood harassment need to be targeted in many London boroughs. Only a few boroughs had a higher ratio of single incidents compared to repeat. For example, in Westminster 57% of incidents that took place were single incidents compared to 41% repeat incidents, which was probably due to the high number of entertainment venues in the borough.
5.4.3 Date and time of incidents

Information about the time and date of incidents was not always consistently available. Third party reports were more likely to have the date and/or time of the incident because the victim/witness had been asked to provide them, but LGBT organisations tended not to collect such information when reporting the incident was not the main reason for the call. Repeat incidents occurred over a longer period of time and were therefore recorded as happening at various times. Additionally, it is possible that in some cases incidents were recorded as happening at various times when more precise information was not available or the victim/witness was not prompted for more specific information.

Figure 24

The month in which incidents occurred was analysed in two consecutive calendar years, January 2006 to December 2007, to see if greater or fewer numbers of incidents occurred in any given month. A third of cases had no information about the month of the year. Almost two out five of cases took place over various months because they were repeated incidents and unspecific dates had been given (not shown on the graph above).

Homophobic or transphobic attacks occur throughout the year, although there were some small differences between the number of incidents being recorded in some months compared to others, for example more incidents were recorded in May and June. It would be difficult to account for small fluctuations between the months. Internal factors that influence the ability of LGBT organisations to collect data, such as fluctuations in funding or staffing of helplines may be as likely to affect figures as external factors.

31 For example, nearly all cases dealt with by Stonewall Housing were recorded as repeat incidents occurring at various times.
The statistics reveal that:

- Over half of all incidents recorded by LGBT organisations were repeat incidents occurring over several days, weeks or months.
- Data from both LGBT organisations and the MPS suggest that incidents occurred evenly across the week with even little variation between each day, though slightly more incidents occurred on a Saturday.
- Single incidents appeared much more likely to take place during the weekend: For example, a quarter of all single incidents reported to LGBT organisations took place on a Saturday.

Three in five incidents recorded by LGBT organisations were repeat incidents that took place over various times, when it was not possible to record the time of each separate incident. Therefore, the data recorded by LGBT organisations shown in the figure 26 represents single incidents.
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Homophobic/transphobic incidents took place throughout the day, rather than only at night.
- LGBT organisations recorded more incidents that took place late at night, with nearly one in three taking place between 21.01 and 00.00 hours. More incidents were recorded by the MPS during the early hours, particularly between 00.01 and 3.00.
- There was some relationship between time and location of incident. Unsurprisingly, nine out of ten incidents taking place at LGBT venues happened during the evening or late at night/early hours. Three in five incidents in/near home took place during the evening or late at night when both victim and perpetrator were likely to be at home. However, incidents that occurred in the street were equally as likely to happen in the afternoon or evening.

5.5 Perpetrators of homophobia/transphobia

Most studies on homophobic or transphobic attacks focus on collecting information about the victims of homophobia/transphobia. There may be good reasons for the lack of information about perpetrators. Although third party reports sometimes include descriptions of perpetrators to help a police investigation, voluntary LGBT organisations are more likely to focus on obtaining information about the victim so as to provide assistance or for monitoring purposes. Victims or witnesses may also be unwilling or unable to identify perpetrators for fear of reprisals or other negative consequences. Victims might also not be asked any questions about the perpetrator or give very general descriptions of offenders, such as groups of youths or neighbours. Nevertheless it is possible to obtain some anonymous demographic detail about the perpetrators to build a profile of those responsible for carrying out homophobic/transphobic hate crime.

5.5.1 Relationship between victim and perpetrator

**Figure 27**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known to the victim</th>
<th>Familiar to victim</th>
<th>Unknown to the victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBT organisations</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT base = 619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship between victim and perpetrator

THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- The victim either knew or was familiar with the perpetrator of the homophobic/transphobic incident in around two out of three cases recorded by LGBT organisations or the MPS.
- Around three in four perpetrators of single incidents were strangers to the victim.
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Excluding strangers who could not be identified the largest proportion of perpetrators were neighbours or people who lived near to the victim, such as groups of youths in the same street or area.
- LGBT organisations recorded a higher percentage of cases where the perpetrator was identified as being part of the same family/household as the victim or was a partner or ex-partner.
- LGBT people also encountered perpetrators of homophobic/transphobic incidents while going about their daily lives, from people providing or receiving goods and services and work/school colleagues.
- Over one in twenty victims contacting LGBT organisations identified a police officer as the perpetrator of an incident. Three in four of these cases were people who had been warned, cautioned or arrested by the police.
- Just under a third of perpetrators were strangers/unknown to the victim incidents, a similar figure to incidents reported to LGBT organisations.
- Nearly half of all perpetrators were neighbours or living locally to the victim.
- Only a small number of perpetrators in cases reported to the MPS were members of the same

5.5.2 Sizes of groups of perpetrators

Number of perpetrators (LGBT organisations)
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Over half of all incidents recorded by LGBT organisations involved only one perpetrator. One in four incidents involved groups of people, often youths living in the local neighbourhood.

5.5.3 Demographics of perpetrators

**Figure 30**

**Age of perpetrators (LGBT and MPS)**

Around one in five of incidents recorded by LGBT organisations had information about the age of the perpetrators\(^\text{32}\). In many cases the age of the perpetrator was an estimate, though MPS data had specific data on suspects who were charged as well as accused.\(^\text{33}\)

**THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:**

- Between half and three fifths of all perpetrators were under 30 years old.
- Young people aged 16 to 20 were suspects for almost one in four of all incidents, though they were less likely to be charged.
- MPS data on suspects under 16 years shows that only half are ever charged.
- It may also be that young people are perpetrators in many more incidents but these go unreported because they occur in schools and colleges.

---

32 An additional 14% of incidents also had estimated ages of groups of perpetrators, such as groups of under 18s.

33 ‘Accused’\(\square\)

penalty notice for disorder.
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Data from both the MPS and LGBT organisations show similar percentages of male and female perpetrators, with women far less likely to be perpetrators of homophobic/transphobic incidents.
- Data from LGBT organisations suggested that male victims were much more likely to be attacked by male perpetrators - over four out of five incidents perpetrated against males were carried out by other males and less than one in ten perpetrated by females.
- Just under half of incidents perpetrated against female victims were carried out by males, and one in three was perpetrated by females.
- Three out of four incidents involving violence were perpetrated by males, compared to just over one in ten by females.

Ethnic appearance or identity of perpetrators

The recorded ethnic identity of the perpetrator often relied on the description given by the victim to either the MPS or an LGBT organisation.

Perpetrators of homophobic/transphobic incidents where identified from a range of ethnic backgrounds. The majority of perpetrators (including suspects and accused) were white in ethnic appearance, though...
the percentage of perpetrators identified as black appears higher in proportion to London’s black population as a whole. It is worth noting however that this overrepresentation reflects a similar trend outlined in the House of Commons, Home Affairs Committee, which reported that a range of criminal justice system factors play an important role in promoting overrepresentation (Home Affairs Committee, 2007).

It should also be noted that four out of five BME victims identified the perpetrator as BME. This figure might be accounted for because three out of four BME victims who contacted LGBT organisations (particularly Stonewall Housing) sought help with incidents perpetrated by members of the same family household.

### 5.5.4 Motivation for incidents

*Figure 33*

The study examined the motivation behind homophobic/transphobic incidents by recording either the victim’s/witness’ viewpoint or by interpreting information recorded in case notes. Motivation was examined to identify possible triggers for incidents and to further explore what sorts of incidents were being reported.

The majority of incidents (around three in five) reported to LGBT organisations were solely motivated by homophobia or transphobia, where the victim was targeted simply because of their sexuality or gender identity.

Specific triggers leading to incidents included the disclosure of sexual or trans identity and negative reactions to the appearance or conduct of LGBT people (such as holding hands or kissing). Factors such as cultural beliefs/attitudes of the perpetrator are somewhat harder to identify but were occasionally cited as a trigger for a homophobic/transphobic attack. Where homophobia is an aggravating feature of a related offence, this normally refers to incidents that are initially been triggered by another incident, such as a dispute with a neighbour which then lead to homophobic/transphobic abuse.
5.6 Reporting homophobic/transphobic incidents

5.6.1 Who reports?

Figure 34

Was the person contacting an LGBT organisation a victim or witness?

Most clients contacting LGBT voluntary organisations about a homophobic/transphobic incident were victims. It appears that few witnesses come forward to report incidents unless directly involved.

A small number (three percent) of contacts were made by a third party on behalf of a victim of an incident. The client had not actually witnessed an incident, but wanted to get help or advice. For example a parent whose child had been bullied because they (or the parent) were LGBT.

5.6.2 Where victims go for help

Figure 35

Who did the victim/witness first contact about an incident? (LGBT organisations)
5.6.3 Why victims approach LGBT organisations

**Figure 36**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help/advice following an incident</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing advice</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advice</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report an incident</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with an incident already reported</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base = 728

Why did clients contact LGBT voluntary organisations?

A crucial role of LGBT voluntary organisations was providing advice and assistance to victims of hate crime, rather than to take third party reports. Victims contacted these organisations because of the specialist advice and support they provided. The majority of clients who contacted an LGBT organisation wanted help and advice following a homophobic/transphobic incident. However, a small number of clients wanted specific housing or legal advice while other clients were unsure what help they needed when first making contact.34

THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Around a quarter of victims specifically wanted to report a homophobic or transphobic incident to the LGBT organisation, though they did not necessarily want to involve the police. Some clients wanted to tell an LGBT organisation about an incident and not all of these calls therefore resulted third party reports being made.
- Some clients wanted help with an incident that had already been reported to the police. These clients were often dissatisfied with the response from the police and other statutory bodies after initially reporting the incident to them.

---

34 Two peers can conduct a criminal records check or taking out an injunction against a perpetrator.
• There were differences between each LGBT organisations:
  o One in three clients to Galop wanted to report an incident and one in four wanted to get help after having already reported to the police.
  o LLGS and Stonewall Housing had very small numbers of clients who initially wanted to report an incident, less than one in twenty clients.

5.6.4 Victims’ experiences of the police

Figure 37

Contact with the police (LGBT organisations)

Over half of clients contacted an LGBT organisation for the first time having had no previous contact with the police. However, a significant number of victims of incidents had already contacted the police about an incident but had subsequently contacted LGBT organisations looking for help.

THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

• Nearly a quarter of all victims who contacted LGBT organisations were dissatisfied with the police.
• Out of the clients who had already had contact with the police about an incident, over half (52%) appeared dissatisfied with their response.
• An additional twentieth of clients had been warned, cautioned or arrested by the police for a sexual offence such as cottaging. It was highly likely that in most cases, these clients were also likely to be dissatisfied with the police.
• Over one in ten victims had reported to the police but had no further contact with them so it was therefore not clear if they were satisfied or dissatisfied.
THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- Nearly seven in ten unsatisfied clients were dissatisfied at the lack of response or follow-up from the police after an incident had been reported – feeling that the police had not taken sufficient action following a homophobic/transphobic incident.
- One in ten of these unsatisfied clients were dissatisfied because they believed the police had been unsympathetic or displayed a homophobic/transphobic attitude when they tried to get help with an incident.
- One in five unsatisfied clients were dissatisfied after having been warned, cautioned or arrested by the police.
- Dissatisfaction with the police may also depend on the type of homophobic/transphobic incident experienced by the victim, for example one in four victims of repeated attacks were dissatisfied with the police compared to one in five victims of single incidents.
- Just over one in three victims who reported violent incidents to the police were dissatisfied compared to just under one in five who had experience verbal abuse.

LGBT organisations are likely to have been contacted by those victims who were most dissatisfied with the police after first reporting an incident to them. Therefore the level of dissatisfaction with the police may appear to be greater because the figures only take into account those victims who had subsequently approached LGBT organisations rather than those who only reported to the police. The higher percentage of dissatisfaction from victims of violence was may be because they had higher expectations about the response from the police.

Victims may have also been dissatisfied with other organisations they had reported an incident to. For example, three percent of victims were dissatisfied with other statutory/voluntary organisations after contacting them about an incident. This percentage is likely to be much higher had information about levels of dissatisfaction had been recorded about every organisation the victim had contacted.
Figure 39 above illustrates a range of reasons given by victims for not wanting to contact the police. Victims contacting LGBT organisations sometimes considered reporting but appeared to weigh up the risks of reporting against the possible benefits. These included fear of reprisals from the perpetrator or other negative consequences, such as fearing they would become the subject of a police investigation. Other clients worried about the negative response from the police, feeling that the police would not take the incident seriously or believing that there was little the police could do. Other reasons included embarrassment or wanting to put the incident behind them.

5.7 Outcome of cases

5.7.1 Cases reported to LGBT organisations

Outcome refers to the response/help given to a client who contacted an LGBT organisation about an incident. A number of the more complex incidents had more than one outcome and therefore it was difficult to summarise the outcome of an incident. The project sought to record the initial or primary response to the client who contacted the organisation about an incident. One significant outcome of cases was the nearly one fifth of clients who made a third party report.

Third Party Reporting

THE STATISTICS REVEAL THAT:

- More than one in four victims/witnesses reporting to a third party did not report directly to the police because they felt the incident was not serious enough to be worth reporting as there was nothing the police could or would do.
- Nearly one in four victims/witnesses wanted to make a report to an LGBT organisation only and did not want information passed on to the police.
- There were differences between each LGBT organisations:
  - One in three clients to Galop wanted to report an incident and one in four wanted to get help after having already reported to the police.

---

35 These figures exclude those who had reported to the police, or those who had been warned, cautioned or arrested by the police.

36 Neighbours.
The term *third party report* is used to describe a report taken from a victim or witness of an (homophobic/transphobic) incident by a non-police organisation, such as a voluntary or community organisation. The organisation taking the report then passes it on to the police without the victim having to contact the police directly. Organisations such as Galop also provide *assisted third party services* whereby a case worker helps the victim/witness to make a report but also offers further assistance with the incident.\(^{37}\) In order for the police to log a full report, the victim/witness needs to provide their name and address. However, some organisations also take *anonymous third party reports*, whereby a report is forwarded to the police without these details to provide intelligence. Galop was the only one of the three LGBT organisations to provide a full third party reporting service, though Stonewall Housing and LLGS both had an agreement to signpost/refer victims to Galop if they wanted to make a report.

The percentage of third party reports taken by Galop may not represent the overall number of reports being made to the police after assistance from LGBT organisations. For example, clients from outside Greater London were often referred to local police or other organisations in their area who took a report. In addition, Galop signposted a number of victims directly on to LGBT police liaison officers when they wanted to report directly to the police.

Incidents that became third party reports also appeared to differ from the overall profile of incidents in the data set:

- Nearly three in five third party reports concerned verbal abuse/threats, and violence was involved in nearly one in four.
- Over two in three third party reports were single incidents, whilst one in three were repeat incidents.
- Two in five third party reports were of incidents that occurred in public settings and one in four took place in LGBT venues or public sex environments. Victims/witnesses might specifically have wanted to report these sorts of incidents to an LGBT organisation because they felt the LGBT community needed to be made aware of possible hate crime hotspots. In addition, they might have felt more comfortable reporting through a third party rather than directly to the police, particularly if the incident took place in a public sex environment.
- Only one in four third party reports were of incidents that took place in/near the victim’s home. This may have been because the victim had already reported cases of on-going harassment, or because they were reluctant to involve the police because they worried about the consequences.

LGBT voluntary organisations were rarely given feedback once a third party report had been forwarded to local police. The lack of information sometimes made it difficult to determine whether or not the report had led to any further action being taken, such as an investigation or charges being brought against the perpetrator.

---

\(^{37}\) For example, liaison with the police on the victim’s behalf, or legal advice.
A high percentage of cases concerning issues with the police and criminal justice system originated from outside London and around one in four clients were therefore referred to other organisations, such as local LGBT groups. Others who needed legal representation were referred to LGBT-friendly solicitors. Clients were also referred to LGBT police liaison officers if it was felt they could provide assistance, although liaison officers could not help with formal complaints against the police. A small number of cases led to a police complaint being initiated by the client through the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC).

Other Outcomes

A large percentage of people contacting LGBT voluntary organisations were initially looking for either immediate advice about an incident, however some required detailed, ongoing advice. Clients may also be signposted or referred on to another organisation. For example, those needing specific assistance from another organisation were provided with a local contact if they were calling from outside of London.

Many victims who contacted LGBT voluntary organisations were seeking help with incidents already reported to the police. One in ten victims who contacted Galop were signposted to LGBT Police Liaison Officers if they required assistance from the police. Victims subsequently went on to make a report to the police or receive help from a liaison officer with an incident already reported. In many respects Galop and LGBT police liaison officers acted as intermediaries in incidents where victims had been dissatisfied after first reporting to the police.

Despite the high number of calls regarding dissatisfaction with the police, only two percent of cases led to a complaint being made about the MPS through the Independent Police Complaints Commission.

5.8 Conclusions

The analysis of the data collected by the LGBT organisations and the MPS reveals a number of key patterns. The figures reveal some of the ways in which different sections of the LGBT communities...
experience homophobic and transphobic hate crime. These differences mean that it is important for those responsible for hate crime initiatives to ensure that they target different sections of the community, and do not treat LGBT people as a homogenous whole.

There are a number of similar patterns discernable in the cases reported to the MPS and LGBT organisations; however there are also some important differences which highlight areas where people are less likely to seek help from the police instead approaching LGBT organisations for support and alternative outcomes. It is clear that LGBT organisations play a vital role in providing alternative routes for reporting experiences, and getting appropriate advice and support, and that without these services some victims would simply not report at all.

The data reveals that gay and bisexual men were most likely to report hate incidents, to both LGBT organisations and the MPS. A higher proportion of men reported violence, and a higher proportion of women reported sexual assault. Higher proportions of trans people reported verbal abuse and repeat harassment. Both younger (18 and under) and older (over 50) LGBT people appear less likely to contact either LGBT organisations or the MPS about incidents. BME LGBT victims of homophobic or transphobic incidents appear more likely to be the victim of an incident in or near their home; this occurred in three quarters of incidents, compared to half of incidents targeted at white victims. A significant percentage of victims contacting LGBT organisations were living with a disability. Those with mental health issues might be particularly vulnerable, and this underlines the importance of inclusive mental health and counselling services for LGBT people.

In general verbal abuse and threats were the most commonly reported type of hate crime, followed by physical violence. There was also a range of other incidents which were also homophobic or transphobic in nature, including sexual violence, domestic abuse and damage to property.

Despite perceptions about the nature of hate crime, victims were as likely to contact LGBT organisations about incidents that occur in or near to their homes as they were about incidents taking place in the street or near LGBT venues. Incidents also occurred in a wide range of locations, however there is likely to be particular under-reporting from certain settings such as PSEs and schools. The MPS appear to be more likely to be contacted by victims who were attacked in public areas but less likely to be contacted about incidents occurring in/near the home. It appears that victims are more likely therefore to approach an LGBT organisation to report domestic abuse or ongoing harassment.

More incidents were recorded as taking place in inner London boroughs compared to outer London boroughs and incidents occurred at all times of the day/week/month, not just at night or during the weekend.

Victims contacting organisations about an incident appeared more likely to know the perpetrators(s) than for the perpetrator to be a stranger, which is likely to be because the majority of attacks took place in or near the home.

Perpetrators of incidents are most likely to be young men. Given the significant majority of perpetrators who fit this category this is a group that could be targeted in any initiatives seeking to prevent hate crime.

Around half of all callers to LGBT organisations did not report their experiences to the police, because of lack of confidence in the police, or because they feared the consequences of reporting to them, such as reprisals. Significant proportions of victims however, make contact with LGBT organisations after already reporting to the police or other statutory services, because they want further help or advice. A large number of these victims did not want to make a formal third party report to the police,
but were seeking other sorts of outcomes. In addition, a large percentage of victims contacting LGBT organisations are dissatisfied with the response of the police after having reported an incident. One in ten felt the police response had been negative/unhelpful or homophobic/transphobic. The large percentage of victims expressing dissatisfaction with the police response, as well as the numbers choosing to contact LGBT organisations for additional support and advice, suggest that the emphasis on reporting alone may not be appropriate. As discussed in the findings and conclusions of the mapping exercise, many people ‘tell’ someone about their experiences, rather than directly wanting to report. These people are often seeking outcomes that the police cannot offer, such as emotional support or legal advice. It is vital both that these more supportive reporting services continue to exist, but also that the experience of reporting directly to the MPS is improved, particularly in ensuring communication with both victims and organisations which pass on reports.

5.9 Recommendations

5.9.1 Victims

Further work needs to be done in reaching specific groups, both in crime prevention and in reporting services and related advertising. All agencies working with LGBT victims of crime need to recognise and respond to these differences as well as the cross-sectional discrimination many LGBT victims experience. This might include:

- Different strategies to target men and women, and trans people, to encourage reporting due to their different experiences.
- Strategies for reporting should recognise the specific obstacles faced by both older and younger LGBT people, recognising that the need may be for alternative outcomes such as housing, rather than just reporting.
- A focus on BME people who experience particular problems with housing, following repeat incidents of homophobic or transphobic incidents.
- LGBT voluntary organisations providing hate crime services should build links with organisations that support people with disabilities and those with health problems. This could include building expertise in supporting LGBT people with mental health issues.

5.9.2 Incidents

Whilst attacks by strangers in public continue to be an important focus of hate crime initiatives, it is also important to recognise that significant proportions of incidents occur in or near the home, and that a focus on these types of incidents is also necessary. This might include:

- A strategic response within housing services to homophobic and transphobic harassment, including a recognition of the risk of escalation when no or ineffective intervention is made.
- An explicit agreement between third party reporting services and the MPS regarding the level of response a victim of verbal abuse can expect, which can be communicated to the victim.
- A continued attempt by both voluntary and statutory organisations to promote greater understanding of the nature and extent of domestic abuse experienced by LGBT people, including the recognition that domestic abuse can also involve hate crime.
- Central Government, London Government and London criminal justice partners should work together to provide appropriate refuge space for gay and bisexual men, and trans people fleeing domestic abuse.
5.9.3 How often, where and when incidents occur

The data challenged some of the commonly held perceptions about when and where homophobic and transphobic crime can occur. Services need to consider the following:

- Establishing a system for hotspot mapping based on data from both LGBT voluntary sector groups and the MPS. This mapping should be disseminated widely via LGBT forums and other methods, to ensure that organisations can focus their resources appropriately.
- LGBT voluntary organisations should be provided with funding from central government to assist victims approaching them from outside the London area.
- Targeting interventions at homophobic/transphobic hotspots such as public transport hubs and public sex environments, with the MPS working in partnership with LGBT organisations.
- Using publicity to challenge the myth that attacks only happen in the evenings.
- Where possible, LGBT voluntary organisations should keep a clear record of the time and dates of incidents reported to them to identify any patterns or hotspots.

5.9.4 Perpetrators

The research highlighted the value of collecting information on perpetrators. Building on this information by continuing to analyse information on perpetrators would allow the development of programmes to prevent homophobic and transphobic hate crime. To assist with this aim:

- Where possible, LGBT organisations should consistently collect data on perpetrators to identify patterns.
- The MPS and LGBT voluntary sector organisations should develop interventions that target perpetrators of homophobic/transphobic hate crime, focusing on particular areas such as the home, local neighbourhoods and schools.
- Initiatives focused on homophobic and transphobic hate crime could consider interventions targeted at potential perpetrators, for example, by challenging the cultural values and prejudices of young men (the largest perpetrator group).

5.9.5 Outcomes

Victims of homophobic and transphobic hate crime seek a variety of outcomes which can only be achieved by an effective partnership between the MPS and LGBT voluntary sector organisations. Ensuring that both types of service deliver the outcomes that victims need would involve:

- Ensuring that LGBT third party reporting initiatives are funded to provide comprehensive assistance to victims rather than being used simply as a tool to increase the numbers of reports.
- Research by the MPS into why the levels of dissatisfaction exist following reports of incidents, and a strategic response to improving satisfaction levels. This may include minimum standards on reporting back on progress with a case, and a single point of contact to report out of date or inaccurate information in the public domain.
- Central Government, London Government and London criminal justice partners working together to provide appropriate resources to LGBT organisations to develop and maintain services for victims of hate crime who need help and support following homophobic/ transphobic incidents. This service should be consistent throughout London.
- Where possible, LGBT organisations recording anonymous data on homophobic and transphobic incidents where a victim does not want to make a formal report.
6. APPENDICES
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Appendix 2 - Glossary

Glossary of Abbreviations/Acronyms/Terms

ACPO – Association of Chief Police Officers

Anonymous Reporting – a victim/witness may want to report a homophobic/transphobic incident but wish to remain completely anonymous. They may/may not give personal details to the organisation taking a report but this would not be passed on to the police or others unless permission was given. Information may still be sent to the police but with no personal/contact details of the witness/victim.

Assisted Reporting – unlike other forms of third party reporting, assisted reporting will often [but not always] involve the organisation making an initial report but also advocating on behalf of the victim.

BME – black and minority ethnic – a term that refers to non-white ethnic/minority groups.

CDRP – Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. A statutory partnership tasked with strategic responsibility for combating crime in a local authority area. These partnerships are made up of the police, local council and other partners.

Cottage – a toilet which is a meeting place for men to have sex with men.

CPS – Crown Prosecution Service

CSU – Community Safety Unit – Each London borough has a CSU to investigate all hate crime and domestic violence. Officers working at CSU are specially trained in community relations.

Diversity and Citizen Focus Directorate – a central division of the MPS with responsibility for strategic issues concerning diversity. The LGBT Strand desk sits within this directorate.

Galop – not an acronym

Hate Crime – a crime committed against a person or people because of a particular group they belong to. Hate crimes include physical or verbal attack and harassment.

Homophobia – a fear or dislike directed towards lesbian, gay or bisexual people or their perceived lifestyle, culture or characteristics.

Liaison Reporting – Galop offers to act as a liaison between the victim/witness and the police if they want to report an incident but do not want the police to have their personal contact details.

LGBT – lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender

LGBT Police Liaison Officers – all London boroughs have one [or more] LGBT police liaison officers. The role of the officer[s] in each borough can vary and usually depends on which department of the police they are part of, such as the Community Safety Unit or Safer Neighbourhoods Team. However, LGBT liaison officers share a common goal of building links between the LGBT community and the police. They provide reassurance to LGBT people who are victims/witnesses to hate crime. Only a small number of boroughs have full time dedicated liaison officers, a few have part time officers. Other boroughs have named LGBT officers but they are not necessarily assigned dedicated hours to their role.
LLGS – London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard

MPS – Metropolitan Police Service

**Non-police reporting** – an umbrella term for all types of third part reporting.

**Outed** – when someone’s sexuality or gender identity is revealed by someone else, often without their permission. An LGBT person can also ‘out’ themselves, by revealing their sexuality or gender identity.

**PSE** – public sex environment. This term refers to an outside area, such as a park, heath, etc that is a meeting place for men to have sex with men, sometimes referred as a cruising ground.

**Safer Neighbours Team** – a section based in each local police borough responsible for day to day street policing. Many LGBT Liaison Officers are members of the Safer neighbourhood Team.

**Self-reporting** – a victim/witness may want to report an incident, usually through the internet, or a paper based form, without speaking directly to the organisation they are submitting the report to. They may/may not provide personal contact details.

**SH** – Stonewall Housing

**Third Party Reporting** – a report of an [homophobic/transphobic] incident made on behalf of a victim of witness, through another organisation such as community group or advice line. This organisation will make a report on the victim/witness behalf and forward it to the police in order for it to become a third party.

**Trans** – a person who was assigned one gender at birth but who identifies elsewhere on the gender spectrum for some, part or all of the time. Trans is an umbrella term which includes transsexual, transvestite and transgender people, amongst others.

**Transphobia** – a fear or dislike directed towards trans people or their perceived lifestyle, culture or characteristics.
Appendix 3 - Organisations contacted as part of the mapping exercise

In some cases contact was made with more than one individual in an organisation.

**London boroughs** websites examined or telephone contact made [see contact list]:

- Barking and Dagenham: local authority contact.
- Victim Support telephone/email contact
- Barnet: LGBT Network Group and website, telephone contact
- Bexley: Metro Centre, local authority website
- Brent: Diversity Team website
- Bromley: LGBT forum launch, local authority website
- Camden: LGBT Forum and website, telephone/email/personal contact.
- City of London: website
- Croydon: Aurora and local authority website, telephone contact
- Enfield: LGBT forum, local authority website, telephone/email contact.
- Ealing: Gay Men’s Health Project, local authority website
- Greenwich: Metro Centre, local authority website
- Hackney: Local Authority website, Victim Support
- Hammersmith & Fulham: local authority website, telephone contact but no response
- Haringey: local authority website, telephone/email contact
- Hounslow: local authority telephone contact and website.
- Harrow: local authority telephone contact, website and documents sent. Telephone contact with CSU
- Havering: local authority website contact
- Hillingdon: LGBT forum telephone contact; local authority contact
- Islington: Local authority contact/meeting/email/telephone
- Kensington & Chelsea: face to face contact with LGBT Advisory Group, local authority website

- Kingston Upon Thames: Local authority website, telephone/email contact with CSU.
- Lambeth: Local authority contact, email, website, LGBT forum
- Lewisham: Local authority website. Email, but not response
- Merton: Local authority website, Citizens Advice

- Bureau HIV/AIDS advice project
- Newham: Local authority website
- Redbridge: Local authority website, LGBT forum, email contact
- Richmond: Local authority website
- Southwark: LGBT community officer, website, email/telephone
- Sutton: Local authority website, CAB website has links
- Tower Hamlets: Local authority website, email contacts, LGBT forum
- Waltham Forest: Local authority website
- Wandsworth: Local authority website
- Westminster: Community Safety Team, interview, email and personal contact.

**LGBT Voluntary Groups:**

- Galop
- Metro Centre
- Stonewall Housing
- Stonewall Group
- East London out Project
- London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard
- London Friend
- Polari
- Outrage
- Black Gay Men’s Advisory Group
- NAZ Project
- Albert Kennedy Trust
- PACE
- Lesbian & Gay Christian Alliance
- Bede House Association Southwark
- Broken Rainbow
- Imaan
- UK Black Out
- LGBT Consortium
- LGBT Labour
- LGBT NUS
- UNISON
AMICUS  
Amnesty International  
Lesbian & Gay Immigration Group

Trans-living International  
Press For Change  
Mermaids  
F2M London  
Gender Trust  
Beaumont Society [NR]  
Transpol [NR]  
Trans-health

LGBT YOUTH GROUPS  
Beau Belles  
London Lighthouse [South] High NRG youth group  
Wise Thoughts

Southwark Anti Homophobia Forum – Dax  
Ashworth  
Lambeth LGBT forum  
Camden LGBT forum  
Redbridge LGBT forum  
Tower Hamlets LGBT forum  
Kensington & Chelsea LGBT Advisory Group  
Aurora Croydon  
Barnet LGBT forum  
Wandsworth LGBT forum  
LAGA [Waltham Forest]  
Islington LGBT forum

Guys and St Thomas’ NHS Trust  
Islington PCT  
Camden PCT  
Sexual Health services  
Healthcare Commission  
Kings PCT [sexual Health Clinic]

Child Line  
Banardos Young women & young men’s Project  
Refugee Council  
DfES LGBT staff group  
NUS LGBT Network

Westminster  
Kairos in Soho  
SW5 Project

CLASH [Central London Action on Sexual Health]  
Westminster PCT  
Soho Clinic  
Harrow Road Community forum  
St Mary’s Paddington Working Men’s Project  
St Anne’s Church Soho  
Soho Masses  
Westminster Domestic Violence Forum  
Westminster Street Wardens  
Westminster LGBT voluntary network

Sexual health  
Terrance Higgins Trust – various, including outreach team, information department, youth workers  
West London Gay Men’s Health Project  
Positive East  
GMFA

Victim Support:  
National Office - London  
Southwark  
Westminster  
Hackney  
Camden  
Greenwich  
Barking & Dagenham  
Morden CAB – HIV/AIDS Advice Project

Metropolitan Police Service:  
LGBT police liaison officers:  
Westminster  
Kensington & Chelsea  
Lambeth  
Southwark  
Islington  
Tower Hamlets  
British Transport Police Reassurance Police Officer  
The Crown Prosecution Service  
LGBT Strand Lead Diversity Team:  
Carl Wonfor [MPS Diversity]  
Susan Patterson [MPS Diversity]  
Dee Caryl [MPS Diversity Directorate]
Appendix 4 - Questions used for mapping exercise

Name of organisation:
Contact:
Date:

1. Does your organisation receive calls relating to transphobic/homophobic hate crime?

2. What system you have to monitor/collect information/reports on hate crimes?

3. Do you keep records/data on these contacts, for example basic statistical or demographic information?

4. Is there anyone in the organisation who takes responsibility for hate crime reporting?

5. Do you pass this information on to any other organisation?
Appendix 5

Galop Incident Report Form

1. Initial Record of Attendance & Advice

Date incident reported to Galop:
Local contact/borough

Name of the client:
[state anonymous if details not given]

Clients contact details:

Name of Caseworker:

Reference Number:

2. Please record details of the enquiry

3. About the victim

Borough/area where victim lives:

Gender identity
[ ] Male [ ] Female [ ] Other

Is the victim’s gender identity the same as the gender they were assigned with at birth?
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Date of Birth

Religion

Sexuality
[ ] Gay [ ] Lesbian [ ] Bisexual [ ] Heterosexual [ ] Other

Disability
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Health Problem
[ ] Yes [ ] No

If ‘yes’ please state disability and/or health problem

Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>Asian or Aisan British</td>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>White &amp; Black African</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other mixed background</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Other Black Background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other background [specify]:

Employment

- Employed F/T
- Employed P/T
- Unemployed
- F/T Education
- Retired

Where did you hear about Galop?

4. About the incident

Was the client a:

- Victim
- Witness
- Third party

Was this incident a:

- Single
- Repeated [Harassment]

What did the incident specifically involve? [tick as many as are appropriate]:

- Verbal abuse [name calling/shouting out]
- Verbal threat [specific threat made]
- Physical assault [actual incident of violence]
- Attempted physical assault
- Sexual assault
- Rape
- Sexual abuse
- Robbery
- Blackmail
- Damage to property/vehicle
- Written abuse [e.g. letter/email/text]
- Graffiti
- unspecified domestic violence
- Problem with the police [eg caution]
- Victim arrested/cautioned by the police

Other [specify]:

Were there any injuries?

- Yes
- No

If "Yes", please give details:

Was there any loss or damage to property or money?

- Yes
- No

If so please give details, including its value:
5. Location and time of the Incident

In which London borough or area did the incident take place?

Where specifically did the incident take place?
[e.g. name of street/area or venue/pse, or state if it was in/outside victim’s home]

When did the attack take place?

Time of day [approximate if unknown] A/DK/M/NA

☑ Various times [if repeat incident]

State the date the incident began:
Day __________________________
Month _________________________
Date __________________________ A/DK/M/NA

☑ Various times [if repeat incident try to get details]

6. About the person/people who carried out the incident

How many offenders were there?

Did the victim know the offender[s]?

☑ Unknown/stranger ☑ Known to me ☑ Know them by sight/familiar to me

If known or familiar, can the victim say how they know the offender, e.g. neighbour/ex-partner etc: A/DK/M/NA

If willing, can the victim give names and, if possible, addresses of these people?

Can the victim give a description of the perpetrators?

Gender: ☑ Male ☑ Female ☑ Mixed Group A/DK/M/NA

Approximate age[s]: __________________________

Ethnic appearance: __________________________ A/DK/M/NA

Can they give the approximate height/build and/or any distinguishing marks or features about the perpetrator[s]:

Was a vehicle used?
[e.g. name of street/area or venue/pse, or state if it was in/outside victim’s home]
7. Reporting the incident elsewhere

Has the victim reported this incident to anyone else?
[Tick more than one if necessary]

☐ No  ☐ Police  ☐ Council or housing service

☐ Partner/friend/family member  [please specify]

☐ Other  [please specify organisation or individual]

☐ A/DK/M/NA

If they had reported it to the Police did they get a crime reference number?
[please record]

If they had reported the incident to the Police how did they feel about their response, e.g: was it flagged as a homophobic crime, were the police helpful?

☐ A/DK/M/NA

If the victim decided NOT to report it to the Police, could they say why they had decided not to:

☐ A/DK/M/NA

8. What happens now?

If the victim wants the police to investigate the incident, the police will need to speak to them. Please complete the following:

☐ The victim would like to be contacted by a Galop caseworker, but they do not want their contact details passed onto any other agencies

☐ The victim wants the police to investigate and wants their contact details to be given to the police

☐ The victim wishes to remain anonymous and do not want the police or Galop to contact them

If the victim would like to be contacted by a Galop caseworker, or if they want the police to investigate the incident, please provide their contact details below [they may just want to give their name and telephone contact details]:

Clients name:

Address:  Home telephone:  ☐

Mobile:  ☐

Email:

If there are any restrictions the victim would like us to observe when we contact them?

Is it safe:

☐ To phone back on this number  ☐ To leave phone messages

☐ To contact at certain times (please write details)

If the victim has a disability which they would like us to be aware of when we contact them, please tell us here: