Systems not Words? Some organisational response to hate crimes

Jim McManus emphasises the need for a 'whole system' response to hate crime.

Possibly the most common organisational response to hate crimes is to initiate awareness training with police and other agency staff. There is no doubt that, if done well, training can be extremely valuable at an individual level (Peel, 2001). However, if change is to be achieved, there is a need to ensure that responses are embedded across an organisation.

This is apparent if we take a victim rather than an agency perspective. The danger in this though is that those of us who have once been victims of hate crime become 'experts' and adapt services around our personal perception of needs, rather than what will be suitable for a range of victims. What might suit my needs as a gay man, or as a Catholic caught on the wrong side of a 12 July March in Glasgow, may not suit those of anyone else.

For many victims of hate, prejudice is something encountered on a daily basis. The psychological burden of a hate crime – whether physical or non-physical – interacts with this experience of complex and ubiquitous inequity.

Some organisations have chosen to deal with this by setting up specific anti-victimisation units, with a small number of staff dealing with a range of hate crimes. There are clear benefits in such an approach, not least ensuring that victims receive a response which is highly skilled and highly sensitised to their needs. The disadvantage is that too often a 'one size fits all' approach is developed. Apart from the fact that most of these units rely on short-term or special funding, joining hate crimes together makes for ease of administration. As a consequence, victimisation units can turn into 'sink units' where race hate, religious hate, sexuality, transgender and gender hate are lumped together, and end up being marginalised by the rest of the agency. The cultural, political and psychological implications of this for victims and for those working with them is often underestimated.

While the national policy framework remains as disjointed as ever, across the country a range of organisational responses are developing in addition to the traditional equal opportunities model.

The Best Value Approach is developing in several regions. In Exeter, the city council joined the police and the county council in conducting a best value review of domestic violence which provides a model that could be adopted elsewhere. In the London borough of Merton, Nacro conducted a best value review of racial and domestic violence arrangements, including interviewing victims. This approach, with strong support from the council and other agencies, was able to consider everything from victim experience of agency response to funding and commissioning of projects to challenge racism across the borough. The best value approach, if used properly, can give victims an opportunity to challenge and improve practice. Allowing time for in-depth interviews with victims, families and agency staff can tease out aspects of good practice, while psychological evidence can be used to develop a best practice benchmark.

An example of this is the *Homophobic Violence Toolkit*, commissioned by the Home Office which I wrote with Dr Ian Rivers, Reader in Psychology at York St. John. The toolkit includes a specimen methodology for a best value review, questionnaires for victims, a set of standards for dealing with victims based on best psychological evidence, and skills standards and a training package for staff. In our trials this 'clinical level' guideline approach has underpinned awareness training and policy to help agencies achieve performance targets set as a result of a best value review. (*The Homophobic Violence Toolkit* is as yet unpublished, although it was completed eighteen months ago, in April 2001. We have since conducted field pilots. In the meantime 392 requests for the toolkit have been logged, but this resource remains unavailable to the agencies who might want to use it.)

The Business Excellence Approach is another organisational response which is showing increasing use in the

Table 1 Business Excellence and Crime and Disorder Performance Management Frameworks compared : some means of helping CDRPs understand EFQM (McManus 2002).

Element of EFQM	Element of Crime and Disorder Performance Management Framework
• Processes • Leadership Policy and Strategy • People • Partnership and Resources • People Results	• Assemble partnership, assess its strengths and weaknesses, develop partnership review process. • Wide and shallow audit and wide-ranging consultation covering whole local authority in order to identify emerging priorities.
• People Results • Customer Results • Society Results • Key Performance Results	**Narrow and deep audit of priority themes and area to include:** • Detailed analysis of emerging priorities • Detailed audit of existing provision that examines its delivery, its outcomes, its cost-effectiveness and the views of users and the community (based on Section 17). • Detailed consultation with victims, offenders and affected communities (both resident and business)
• Partnerships and Resources • Processes • Key Performance Results	• Develop and publish crime and disorder strategy including SMART targets and action plan

commercial and public sectors (McManus 2002). It is based on the European Foundation for Quality Model (EFQM), which the Government is strongly promoting, and to this end the Cabinet Office has a range of support services for public sector agencies. (A self-assessment toolkit on EFQM for voluntary agencies is available to download from *www.ncvo.org.uk.*) The British Quality Foundation produces toolkits for public sector agencies on how to use EFQM and there is a Criminal Justice and Community Safety Networking Group which meets regularly to share experience on how this model can be used.

The main benefit of EFQM is that it requires analysis and response across an entire system, against a range of performance tools that have been tried and tested by thousands of public and commercial sector agencies across Europe and elsewhere. Nacro for example has used EFQM as an internal quality audit and improvement tool, and recently completed two studies where EFQM was used in reviewing organisational responses to hate crimes. Nacro have also produced a self-assessment toolkit on hate crimes linked to EFQM standards, which is contained in the body of the as yet unpublished *Homophobic Violence Toolkit.* As Table 1 shows, the EFQM model integrates well with the Crime and Disorder Performance Management Framework.

EFQM can be applied universally, and training is available to implement it. In one London borough Nacro used EFQM to analyse responses to hate crimes, and one of the populations we were asked to consider was disabled people. Table 2 shows

how EFQM helped us elucidate responses to the weaknesses we uncovered.

The existing work on policy frameworks, standards, training and awareness raising is essential, but it clearly needs to be complemented by the use of organisational improvement tools. Prejudice is something which permeates much of human nature, and many of our institutions. Yet, crime driven by hate does not only feed from overt prejudice, but also from our failure to respond across a system and do everything that can be done to eradicate it. Until the political will exists to adopt a whole system approach, attempts to eradicate hate crime will not be effective.

■

Jim McManus is Assistant Head of Crime & Social Policy, Crime Reduction Directorate, Nacro, and a member of the Equal Treatment Advisory Committee of the Judicial Studies Board.

References:
McManus, J. (2001), *Strangers or Friends?* London: Nacro.
McManus, J. (2002), 'Building Excellence, Reducing Crime?' in Cairncross, J. (ed) *Continuous Improvement in the Criminal Justice System,* London: British Quality Foundation.
Peel, E. (2001) 'Using Stereotypes in Homophobia Training.' *Lesbian and Gay Psychology Review.* March 2001. British Psychological Society Lesbian & Gay Psychology Section.

Table 2: **A London CDRP's findings in relation to Hate Crime (including crime against disabled people).**

Service Area	Location	Offenders	Victims
People Processes	• Providing training to staff from agencies to routinely survey and monitor hotspot locations • Security adaptations and improved access	• Developing an offender treatment outcome standard with competencies and training for staff in dealing with offenders	• Developing a competence standard for how staff deal with victims • Providing training to underpin this
Partnerships and Resources	• Joint protocol on police, neighbourhood warden and CCTV provision in hotspots • Joint funding of victim suites in local hospital • The need to have dedicated reporting and response functions	• Creation of a joint offending behaviour programme between local voluntary agency, magistrates' court and probation	• Creation of a pooled budget for reporting systems • Pooled funding of local race, lesbian and gay and domestic violence programmes to address victimization together
Processes	• A need to ensure that victimization which happens outdoors is handled sensitively • The process for repairs of disabled access facilities in public buildings makes disabled people feel more at risk	• Review of the way in which offenders are dealt with to prevent repeat victimization during bail or pending trial	• A throughcare standard for victims which deals with psychological, physical and emotional recovery and minimizing the risk of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder • Keeping the victim informed during the criminal justice process
Policy and Strategy	• A need to review policy on streetlighting in hotspots of racial and homophobic attacks • Development of a situational crime reduction strategy combining hate crime, night-time economy crime and criminal damage in town centre areas	• A need to develop a shared policy between agencies on dealing with offenders • Lack of an effective information sharing protocol	• Lack of any policy on victims shared between agencies • Lack of an effective information sharing protocol