

Williams, M. L. and Tregidga, J. 2014. Hate crime victimisation in Wales: psychological and physical impacts across seven hate crime victim-types. *British Journal of Criminology*, 54 (5): 946-967. (10.1093/bjc/azu043)

BRIT. J. CRIMINOL

HATE CRIME VICTIMISATION IN WALES

Psychological and Physical Impacts Across Seven Hate Crime Victim-Types

MATTHEW L WILLIAMS* and JASMIN TREGIDGA

This paper presents findings from the All Wales Hate Crime Project. Most hate crime research has focused on discrete victim types in isolation. For the first time, internationally, this paper examines the psychological and physical impacts of hate crime across seven victim types drawing on quantitative and qualitative data. It contributes to the hate crime debate in two significant ways: (1) it provides the first look at the problem in Wales and (2) it provides the first multi-victim-type analysis of hate crime, showing that impacts are not homogenous across victim groups. The paper provides empirical credibility to the impacts felt by hate crime victims on the margins who have routinely struggled to gain support.

Keywords: hate crime, Wales, impact factors, bias crime, risk assessment

Introduction

The past few decades have seen hate crime experience an ascending position in policy agendas, particularly in Europe, the United States and Australasia (see Garland and Chakraborti 2012, Iganski 2008, FRA 2010, Perry 2001, Moran and Sharpe 2004). Most recently in England and Wales this is evident in the creation of national hate crime policies, including the UK Government's Hate Crime Action Plan 2012, and the Welsh Government's Hate Crime Framework for Action 2014. Internationally, the majority of hate crime research that focuses on the impacts of victimisation is limited to discrete hate crime victim-types in isolation. Only a small body of work has examined the differences in the impacts of hate crime *between* victims with *different identities*, and this is limited to comparisons of two or three victim types (e.g. Stacey 2010 compares homophobic to racist hate crime). This research deficit means scholars, practitioners and policy makers are left to infer from existing studies on well-researched victim types, the impacts of hate crimes on under-researched victim types. There is therefore a pressing need for research evidence that will assist in moving away from this unfavourable position of comparing apples with oranges, and that allows us to gain a better understanding of who suffers the impacts of hate most. In this paper we provide such evidence from the All Wales Hate Crime Project, the largest and most comprehensive academic study of hate crime in the UK to date. Drawing from extensive quantitative and qualitative data we show for the first time how the impacts of hate crimes are experienced across seven different victim-types: disability; race/ethnicity; religion/belief; sexual orientation; transgender status/gender identity; age; and gender; the first five of which are currently considered protected characteristics in law pertaining to England and Wales.

This paper contributes to the hate crime debate in two discrete but significant ways: i) as the Crime Survey for England and Wales cannot be reliably extrapolated to smaller constituent regions in isolation when studying hate crime (Office for National Statistics 2012) it provides the first look at problem in Wales; and ii) it provides the first multi-victim-type analysis of hate crime, showing that psychological and physical impacts of crimes and incidents are not homogenous across seven victim types. The paper concludes with some reflections on researching hate crime victimisation through a mixed-methods design.

Context

Conceptualizing Hate Crime: Definitions and Legislation in England and Wales

The definition and concept of hate crime is contested amongst criminologists (Chakraborti and Garland 2009). Much social science scholarship retains an identity-focussed gaze on hate crime victimisation despite the lived experiences of ‘communities’ or ‘groups’ that are diverse and heterogeneously interactive (Chakraborti and Garland 2012). Garland (2012) and Garland and Hodkinson (2014) assesses the usefulness of theories of hate crime that promote hierarchical notions of group dominance and subordination when attempting to identify which groups ought to be included under the hate crime ‘umbrella’. Utilising the examples of the victimisation of disabled people, the elderly, the homeless and those from alternative subcultures to demonstrate such issues, they suggests the concepts of community, risk, harm and vulnerability are fundamental to understanding the nature of the abuse and the victimisation that victim groups suffer. For this reason, hate crime scholarship ought to be organised around the concepts of vulnerability and ‘difference’, rather than identity and group membership alone, so as not to dilute the values of the hate crime movement (Chakraborti and Garland 2012). Garland (2012) argues an alternate approach would be to shift analytical focus away from collective terminology and towards understanding the risk of targeted victimisation that individuals face, in particularly for those victims of hate crime at the margins of the debate (e.g. disabled, elderly and homeless victims). However, Mason (2014) argues that victims of hate crime on the margins can struggle to engender compassionate emotion for their plight, and hence fail to convince others that they are undeserved targets of harm that is sufficiently serious to warrant collective concern. Such hate crime victims are branded as ‘illegitimate’ due to insufficient empirical credibility and their subsequent unheard claims of vulnerability, their extra-marginal position or ambiguous moral status. To break this process Bowling (1999) promotes a dynamic appreciation of social relationships between the actors involved in hate crime acts. As opposed to seeing such acts as distinct ‘events’, a process driven approach allows for the continuum of victimisation to be studied (e.g. from incident to crime and from single event to multiple repeat events), the addition of historical context, and the role of the police and the media in defining ‘ideal’ victims. Similarly, Walklate (2011) has identified the need for subjective accounts of experiential victimisation to understand the processes of interaction that results in becoming ‘the victim’: embracing the identity and taking up the career.

Defining, legislating and prosecuting hate crime is also problematic due to the inherent complexity of identities and their intersections. The debate on intersectionality in hate crime scholarship, while nascent, has begun to unpack how various identities interact and are read by victims and perpetrators. For example, a limited literature reporting on the intersectional nature of homophobic and transphobic (e.g. Beyond Barriers, 2003) and Islamophobic and

genderphobic (Chakraborti and Zempi 2012) victimisation has begun to emerge in the UK. Similarly, European research has examined intersectionality and homophobic victimisation, and the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA 2010) has carried out considerable work in the area of hate speech and discrimination against LGBT communities in the EU Member States with a specific focus on the intersection between sexual orientation and gender identity. Furthermore, there are a number of US and Canadian based studies that examine the same (e.g. Namaste 2000, Jauk 2013). Further afield, there are a number of qualitative studies emanating from Australia that have explored the intersectional nature of hate crimes through an examination of the role of gender conformity/identity in the violent victimisation of LGBT people (Tomsen and Mason, 2001, Moran and Sharpe, 2004). Notwithstanding these scholarly attempts to understand and define hate crime there remains ambiguity. But as Chakraborti and Garland (2009: 150) argue, the academy could carry on producing alternative definitions of hate crime, but in the final analysis “official classifications are shaped by the interpretation of the victim and the criminal justice system, and not academia”.

The Home Office identifies five protected characteristics in relation to hate crime (see introduction) and adopts the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) victim centred, and some might argue tautological definition: *Any hate incident, which constitutes a criminal offence, perceived by the victim or any other person, as being motivated by prejudice or hate* (we return to the problems associated with this definition in the following paragraph). At present, a patchwork of legislation covers the five protected characteristics and associated hate crimes. Racially and religiously aggravated crimes are specified under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, incitement laws were introduced under the Public Order Act 1986, and an increase in sentences for aggravation related to disability, sexual orientation and transgender identity were introduced under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (see Williams and Tregidga 2013 for more detail). Sub-criminal *incidents* are also specified and in the majority of cases are identified as acts of low level, persistent disorder. Often, these acts are not criminal in nature but can be reported to the police.

The All Wales Hate Crime Research project adopted the ACPO definition of hate crimes and incidents to facilitate comparison with the Crime Survey for England and Wales. However, in line with rehearsed arguments, we acknowledge that the use of the terms hate crime and incident, are problematic. In particular our data revealed that, in some cases, respondents felt that the term ‘hate’ did not resonate with their experiences. Many felt the term was too extreme and narrow and failed to fit with their rationalisations of offender motives that included misunderstandings of identity characteristics, attempts to reinforce masculinity, and alcohol consumption. Furthermore, the use of the term ‘crime’ emerged as confusing for respondents as they were unsure whether their experiences constituted acts serious enough to be classified as crimes that warranted reporting to the police. Confusion was compounded by the disjuncture between the victim-centred definition based on perception and the evidence-driven criminal justice process where there must be proof beyond reasonable doubt that a hate crime was motivated by hostility. Given these issues we were mindful to carefully word all questions relating to experiences of hate crimes and incidents (see Methods).

Wales and the Devolved Welsh Government

In this paper we do not claim that our findings are nomothetic, but rather represent Wales, a particular indigenous geo-historical context that to date has received little academic attention in isolation in relation to the study of hate crime victimisation. According to the Census the usually resident population of Wales was 3.1 million in 2011. Available statistics on the various protected characteristics show for the same period, 4 percent of Welsh residents were BME, 18 percent were aged 65 or over, 23 percent of were living with a disability or long term health problem, and 58 percent were Christian, compared to 3 percent ‘other’ religious denomination (Muslim, Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist or Jewish). The Integrated Household Survey 2011/2012 identified that 1.7 percent of Welsh residents identified as Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual (although 2.5 percent stated they did not know/refused to answer the question/failed to give a response).

As Edwards and Hughes (2009: 77) note, ‘it is also often assumed that the term ‘England’ subsumes Wales and there has been a tradition for the ‘and Wales’ part of the descriptor to be ignored’. However, it is salient to take into consideration a number of pertinent geo-political issues when examining the nature and impact of hate crime in Wales. The Government of Wales Act 1998, 2006 created a National Assembly for Wales and the Welsh Government, transferring a wide range of powers to the devolved administration. However, responsibility and budget for policing and criminal justice is not devolved. In the context of hate crime, Wales is subject to the legislation outlined above, but an additional response to hate crime issues has been taken forward as part of the Community Cohesion Programme of the Welsh Government which commenced in 2009. This has resulted in positive developments, including attempts to tackle negative social attitudes held towards minority communities and to increase community engagement and cohesion across Wales. Furthermore, the Welsh Government, criminal justice agencies, local authorities and voluntary sector organisations have worked together to help take forward work across Wales to improve the operational and strategic response to hate crime. Much of this work, coupled with extensive Welsh-specific research into the nature and impact of hate crime victimisation (Williams and Tregidga 2013) and hate crime perpetration (Roberts et al. 2013) culminated in the Welsh Government’s Tackling Hate Crimes and Incidents: A Framework for Action in 2014.

In addition to the political context, there are a number of geo-historical characteristics that have the potential to shape the nature and impact of hate crime victimisation, and in turn, challenge hate crime policy development and application in Wales. Community tensions that are particular to Wales, as compared to England, Scotland and Northern Ireland, are difficult to extrapolate from national datasets (see following section). Pinning down the provenance of such tensions in Wales that may be brought about by variances in space, place and economy and the like is a complex task, and one that is yet to be fully undertaken. However, some work has examined community cohesion in Wales specifically that assists in understanding the possible genesis of tensions that may lead to hate crime perpetration. Cooper and Innes (2009) found that near three quarters of the Welsh population perceived a lack of respect and consideration as a problem in their area, with men, the young, those born in Wales and those in social housing more likely to feel this way. The latter economic factor emerged as highly significant, and reflects the poorer economic conditions in Wales

compared to the rest of the UK. This is important in understanding hate crime in this context, especially towards ethnic minorities and immigrants (see Gadd 2009).

There are densely populated, multi-cultural regions in the South East of Wales (proximate to the cities of Swansea and Cardiff) that are at contrast with large areas to the North and West that are characterised by a highly dispersed demography, particularly in the rural and valleys locations. The All Wales Hate Crime Project highlighted how these regional factors shape hate crime experience. Within the more rural areas minorities expressed through interviews heightened feelings of exclusion, vulnerability and fear in relation to hate victimisation, citing how ‘different’ was often perceived as ‘dangerous’ in these isolated communities. Language and Welsh nationality also emerged as a particular factor, with native Welsh speakers expressing experiences that differed from non-Welsh speakers (Williams and Tregidga 2013). As previously stated, the results reported later represent a particular indigenous geo-historical context and should not be considered nomothetic. However, it is pertinent to recognise that the factors reported above are not exclusive to Wales when compared to the other constituent regions of the UK.

Prevalence of Hate Crime in England and Wales

There is an established literature in relation to the nature and prevalence of hate crime victimization in England and Wales. It is most developed in the context of race (Phillips and Bowling 2012) and religious hatred, most recently in relation to Islamophobia (Chakraborti and Zempi 2012, Taras 2012). There is also a growing body of work on homophobic hate crime (Beyond Barriers 2003, Williams and Robinson 2004, 2007, Robinson and Williams 2003). To a lesser extent work has also been conducted on elder abuse (Milne et al. 2012), disability hate crime (Grundy 2011), cyber hate (Burnap et al. 2014) and hate in occupational settings (Jones and Williams 2013).

The available police data shows that 43,927 hate crimes were recorded in England and Wales in 2012/2013 (around 1 percent of all recorded crime), with race hate crimes accounting for 82 percent of this total, followed by homophobic hate crimes (10 percent), disability hate crimes (4 percent), religious hate crime (4 percent) and transphobic hate crimes (1 percent) (Home Office 2013). In 2011/12 there were 1,809 hate crimes recorded in Wales, and the distribution across the protected characteristic groups revealed a broadly similar pattern to the national picture: race hate crimes (76 percent), homophobic hate crime (13 percent), disability hate crimes (8 percent) and religious hate crimes (3 percent).

An analysis of the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) 2011/12 and 2012/13¹ estimated that around three percent of crime overall was hate motivated (an estimated 278,000 incidents a year)². Victims of race hate crimes accounted for the majority of this total (154,000 incidents per year), followed by religious hate crimes (70,000), disability hate crimes (62,000) and homophobic hate crimes (39,000) (Home Office 2013). While data specific to Wales can be extrapolated from the CSEW, the sampling strategy adopted by the Home Office and the Office for National Statistics means that the number of respondents

¹Data from the two survey years were combined to provide more robust estimates of hate crime.

²The CSEW asks questions relating to seven hate crime victim-types: race/ethnicity; religion/belief; sexuality/sexual orientation; age; sex and gender identity/transgender status. Questions on gender identity/transgender status were added to the BCS in 2011/12.

reporting hate crimes/incidents is too small to conduct a robust analysis on an area by area basis, even after combining several sweeps of the survey. The Home Office and Office for National Statistics state that the CSEW is designed to provide estimates for England and Wales as one unit of analysis. The national statistician's review of crime statistics concluded "given the sample size of the survey it cannot be used to produce robust estimates on an annual basis for those crimes that are experienced by relatively small proportions of the population or outside the current scope of coverage" (Office for National Statistics 2011:11). It is pertinent to note that The All Wales Hate Crime Survey was funded due to this restriction in existing national datasets.

Impacts of Hate Crime

The existing literature on the impacts of hate crimes focus predominantly on the personal effects of direct victimisation and demonstrate the substantial impacts of hate crime victimisation on the psychological and physical wellbeing of individuals. In the US, Levin and McDevitt (1993) have shown how hate crimes are characterised by injury, hospitalisation, multiple offenders, serial attacks and repeat perpetration. Herek et al. (1997) reported hate crime survivors expressed higher levels of depression, anxiety, anger and post-traumatic stress. Recently, there have been several attempts to compare and contrast the impacts of hate crimes with non-hate crimes in the UK. At the level of personal impacts, it is argued that hate crimes are more deleterious than non-hate crimes (Smith et al. 2012, Botcherby et al. 2011, Iganski 2008). Smith et al. (2012) via their analysis of the BCS (2009/10 & 2010/11) show that, compared to non-hate crime victims, victims of hate crime were statistically significantly more likely to say they were emotionally affected by the incident (86 percent compared to 92 percent), and more likely to be 'very much' affected (17 percent compared to 38 percent).

There are a number of empirical studies that identify a link between suicidal ideation and hate crime victimisation. For example, House et al. (2011) investigated interpersonal violence, victimisation and discriminatory events as possible predictors of suicidal and non-suicidal self-injury in a Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) sample. The authors found that experiences of interpersonal trauma and sexual discrimination were associated with increased likelihoods of engaging in suicidal and non-suicidal self-injury and that those at greatest risk were experiencing high levels of both interpersonal trauma and sexual discrimination. Similarly, a study by Maguen and Shipherd (2010) indicated that experiencing transgender-related violence resulted in 18 percent of their gender minority sample attempting suicide with transgender men reporting the highest rate (41 percent) followed by transgender women (20 percent). Suicidal thoughts were also common in a study by Nemoto et al. (2011) where around 75 percent of white participants in their transgender sample reported such thoughts and 64 percent of these reported suicide attempts. Furthermore, around 50 percent of participants reported being physically assaulted and 38 percent being raped or sexually assaulted before the age of 18, while white and African American participants reported transphobia experiences more frequently than others.

Also relevant to this paper is the literature on the intangible emotional costs of crime more generally. Brand and Price (2000) identified that the psychological impacts for victims of crime can be considerable, particularly for violent crimes. Victims of violent crimes might have received physical injuries; they might feel shocked, insecure, wary and vulnerable for many weeks or months after the crime occurred. Property crimes have also been identified

as resulting in significant emotional impacts (Maguire 1980). In addition to psychological impacts, research has indicated violent crime is associated with retaliation, increased levels of hostility and a desire for revenge post-victimization (Wilkinson 2001, Orth and Montada 2006). Evidence suggests this is particularly the case with victims of race hate crimes (Cardozo et al. 2003). The models reported in this paper include different types of hate crimes/incidents (acquisitive, violent, property, threats and incidents) to identify if differences exist in relation to associations with psychological impacts and physical reactions to hate crimes.

Hypotheses

H₁: Particular hate crime victim types will emerge as significantly more likely to suffer psychological impacts as a result of their victimisation.

H₂: Particular hate crime victim types will emerge as significantly more likely to have physical reactions as a result of their victimisation.

These first two hypotheses are based on the existing evidence that suggests hate crimes have negative psychological and physical impacts upon victims and that experiences across hate crime victim types are not homogeneous (Wilkinson 2001, Cardozo et al. 2003, Stacey 2010, Botcherby et al. 2011).

H₃: Violent hate crime will be significantly associated with suffering both psychological and physical impacts, over and above non-violent hate crime.

The third hypothesis is based on existing research that identifies the impacts from violent crime often exceed the impacts from other types of crimes in relation to both psychological and physical impacts (Wilkinson 2001, Orth and Montada 2006, Smith et al. 2012, Brand and Price 2000).

Methods

Data Collection

This paper reports on quantitative and qualitative data collected for the Big Lottery funded All Wales Hate Crime Research Project. The research implemented a mixed methodological approach to data generation. A national hate crime victimisation survey was administered by IpsosMORI in 2012 and interviews with victims were conducted by a university based researcher in 2012/13. The victimisation survey, dubbed by Miers (1989) as the exemplar of positivist victimology, is a widely used and adequate tool for capturing data about hate crimes that occur in public and in private. However, these instruments are limited in capturing all types of victim and experience. As Walklate (2012:174) states, 'Within positivist victimology, the victim is either given by the criminal law, or given by the self-evident nature of their suffering'. However, victims of hate crimes and incidents can often neutralise and hence mute their suffering due to the endemic and sustained nature of their experience (Garland and Chakraborti 2012, Iganski, 2008). It might be said that some of these victims have built up a *resilience* to hate incidents – even though exposed to adversity they are able to cope with that adversity and neutralise its effects (Walklate 2011). To ameliorate this limitation semi-structured interviews were conducted with victims.

In total, 1810 respondents completed the survey and over 60 victims across seven equality strands participated in face-to-face, telephone or focus group interviews. The study implemented a quota sampling strategy due to the issues associated with probability samples and recruitment of minority respondents. Each of the seven victim types were identified as quotas to ensure equitable coverage in terms of survey and interview responses. Access to hard to reach minority groups was facilitated by the steering group that consisted of voluntary organisations representing each of the victim types, Victim Support, the four Welsh Police Services, Probation Service, Crown Prosecution Service, Equality and Human Rights Commission, Welsh Government and the Home Office. Survey packs were disseminated throughout Wales via the mailing list of each organisation, via local and national events (e.g. Mardi Gras, LGBT History Month, Multicultural Mela, Black History Month, Learning Disability Week) and online. The interview data served to enhance the survey findings by providing detailed, narrative accounts of the nature and impact of hate crime victimisation across the seven victim types. The analytic strategy applied to the qualitative data was inductive and open. Coding focused on identifying key themes of interest and relationships with statistical findings.

Given the nature of the research topic we made efforts to establish informed consent in both the survey and interviews. The research aims and objectives were clearly expressed and all respondents were informed that the data produced would be anonymised and would remain confidential. The research was monitored by the steering group and guidance was sought on ethical practice in complex cases. Support was routinely offered to respondents in the form of follow-up advice and counselling.

Dependent Variables

The survey included multiple items that measured respondents' perceptions of the impacts they suffered from hate victimization. These were derived from the CSEW 2012/13 and from victim cognitive testing interviews. Factor Analysis was used as a data reduction method to identify the underlying components of these items (inter-correlations of a set of variables). Two components were extracted: Psychological Impacts and Physical Reactions (see Table 1)³. Both components were included in separate Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models as dependent variables.

Predictor Variables

Predictor variables were entered into the models and are broken down into categories (including control variables): i) *Victim variables*: Six survey items provided details on the nature of hate crime victimisation across the various victim-types: gender, age, race, religion, disability, sexual orientation and transgender identity; ii) *Crime variables*: CSEW crime classifications were included in the survey. For ease of interpretation the classifications were recoded into five categories: acquisitive crime, violent crime, property crime, threats and hate incidents⁴.

³ The Kaiser-Meyer-Okin value was .895, exceeding the recommended value of .6 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

⁴ Acquisitive includes burglary, robbery, theft of and from motor vehicle and theft of bike; violence includes physical and sexual assault; property includes criminal damage; threats includes threats to life, family, friends, well-being or property and hate incidents includes being pestered, ridiculed or treated with intolerance.

TABLE 1 *Factor loadings with Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measures of sampling adequacy*

Item	Rotated Factor Loadings	
	Component 1: Psychological Impact	Component 2: Physical Reactions
Made me lose confidence	.735	
Made me depressed	.726	
Made it difficult to sleep	.719	
Made me anxious	.711	
Made me fearful	.690	
Made me cry	.663	
Made me feel stressed	.644	
Made me feel isolated	.623	
Made me feel suicidal	.589	
Made me feel shocked	.588	
Made me verbally retaliate		.865
Made me physically retaliate		.775
Made me hostile towards others		.563

$\chi^2 (78) = 2126.07, p < 0.00$; Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (overall) = 0.895.

Survey items also solicited information on the location of the crime/incident and if the victim was alone; iii) *Perpetrator variables*: Three survey items that generated data on the nature of perpetration were included in the models. The first identified if the perpetrator was a stranger or known to the victim, the second identified if the nature of perpetration was repeat targeted, and the third identified the number of perpetrators; iv) *Criminal Justice variables*: Variables relating to crime reporting (police and third party) and police crime commissioner area were included in the models.

Results

Descriptive statistics

Table 2 provides a description of the victim sample of the survey. Of the 1,810 respondents, 562 identified as victims of hate crimes and/or incidents in Wales. As non-probability sampling was employed to boost the number of victims in the sample this proportion cannot be interpreted as a measure of prevalence. All hate crime victim-types were well represented in the sample. The majority of victims indicated they suffered hate incidents, followed by hate motivated threats, violent, acquisitive and property crime. The majority of incidents were recorded as taking place away from the home while the victim was in company. The majority of respondents were victimised by a stranger, with a minority indicating they were repeatedly targeted by the same perpetrator. Most respondents in the sample were victimised by one or two perpetrators. Near one half of victims reported the crime/incident to the police. Comparisons of these descriptive statistics with the CSEW indicate roughly similar estimates (Smith et al. 2012, Williams and Tregidga 2013).

TABLE 2 *Descriptive Statistics, N=562*

Independent Variables	Coding	M	SD
<i>Control variables</i>			
In a relationship	1=Yes	.39	.49
Child carer	1=Yes	.24	.43
Practicing religion	1=Yes	.26	.44
English speaker	1=Yes	.95	.23
Welsh speaker	1=Yes	.15	.36
Unemployed	1=Yes	.09	.28
Sense of belonging ¹	Scale (range 1 to 4)	2.6	1.0
Council renter	1=Yes	.09	.29
HA renter	1=Yes	.10	.30
Private renter	1=Yes	.25	.43
Owned	1=Yes	.54	.50
<i>Victim variables</i>			
Hate Victim: Gender	1=Yes	.14	.35
Hate Victim: Age	1=Yes	.12	.32
Hate Victim: Race	1=Yes	.25	.43
Hate Victim: Religion	1=Yes	.11	.31
Hate Victim: Disability	1=Yes	.14	.35
Hate Victim: SO	1=Yes	.34	.48
Hate Victim: Trans	1=Yes	.04	.20
<i>Crime variables</i>			
Acquisitive Crime	1=Yes	.24	.43
Violent Crime	1=Yes	.27	.44
Property Crime	1=Yes	.23	.42
Threats	1=Yes	.32	.47
Hate Incidents	1=Yes	.63	.48
Location of incident ²	1=Public	.64	.48
Victim alone	1=Yes	.40	.49
<i>Perpetrator variables</i>			
Perpetrator stranger	1=Yes	.57	.50
Repeat perpetrator	1=Yes	.34	.47
One perpetrator	1=Yes	.30	.46
Two perpetrators	1=Yes	.25	.43
Three perpetrators or more	1=Yes	.45	.50
<i>Criminal Justice variables</i>			
Report to police	1=Yes	.44	.50
Report to third party	1=Yes	.23	.42
South Wales Police	1=Yes	.54	.50
North Wales Police	1=Yes	.20	.40
Dyfed Powys Police	1=Yes	.16	.37
Gwent Police	1=Yes	.10	.30

¹Question: How strongly do you feel you belong to your local area? Response options: 1 'Not at all very strongly' through to 4 'Very strongly'. ²0=Home or Directly outside home.

Quantitative Findings

Psychological and Physical Impacts

OLS regression was performed on the Psychological and Physical impacts quantitative measures. Results from correlational analyses, and tolerance statistics and variance inflation factors showed there were no problems with multi-collinearity among the predictor

variables. Statistics indicated a robust fit to the data in both models. Tables 3 and 4 represent the results from the regression analysis. For each type of impact five separate models were run to estimate which *set of predictors* explained the most variance in the dependent. In other words, which of the victim, crime, perpetrator, or criminal justice variable sets were most accountable for each of the impact types.

The full Psychological Impacts and Physical Reactions models identified several statistically significant associations. With regard to the *victim variables*, those reporting experiencing transgender, and to a lesser extent disability related hate crimes, were significantly more likely to experience both psychological impacts and physical reactions, indicating these victims suffer the impacts of hate crimes greatest compared to other victim-types. Those reporting suffering gender related hate crimes were more likely to suffer psychological, impacts only, while victims of race hate crime were more likely to physically react only. These associations represent *the first evidence* to suggest psychological and physical impacts of hate crimes are not homogeneous across the seven victim types. The stark extent of the significant findings in relation to transgender victims in both models provides the first UK based quantitative evidence that these individuals are exceptionally vulnerable to the impacts of hate crime. This supports qualitative findings relating to Australia (Moran and Sharpe 2004) the US (Jauk 2013) and Canada (Namaste 2000).

Crime variables also emerged as significant in both full models. Compared to all other types of crime, victims of violence were significantly more likely to suffer both psychological impacts and physical reactions. Victims of hate related threats and those victimised near their home emerged as significantly more likely to suffer psychological impacts only, while victims of acquisitive crimes were most likely to suffer physical reactions only. The psychological associations resonate with previous work that evidences non-hate related threats, violence and domestic crimes can create greater impacts on victims (Maguire 1980, Brand and Price 2000), while the physical reactions associations are intuitive given the nature of the crimes (see Discussion).

In relation to *perpetrator variables*, victims of repeat hate perpetration were significantly more likely to suffer both psychological impacts and physical reactions, as were those who were victimised by more than one perpetrator. The psychological associations chime with Levin and McDevitt's (1993) argument that hate crimes have a greater impact upon victims than non-hate crime, partially due to their often sustained and repetitive nature and the presence of multiple perpetrators.

Within the set of *criminal justice variables*, reporting to the police and/or third parties also emerged as significant. Those reporting showed higher levels of psychological impact but lower physical reactions. The psychological finding may resonate with research suggesting reporting hate crimes can result in secondary victimisation (Chakraborti and Garland 2009) or it may be due to the fact that suffering greater impacts may increase the likelihood of reporting. In relation to the physical reactions finding it is intuitive to assume victims who used violence against their perpetrators may not report to avoid possible self indictment (Herek et al. 1997).

Several *control variables* emerged as significant in both models. Of particular interest were the positive associations between economic (unemployment and housing association renters) and social exclusion (negative sense of belonging) measures and both psychological and

TABLE 3 *OLS regression models predicting psychological impacts of hate victimization*

Predictor variables	Victim model	Crime model	Perpetrator model	Criminal justice model	Full model
Constant	-0.31	-0.15	-0.23	-0.21	-0.81
In a relationship	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.14*
Child carer	0.17	-0.01	0.03	-0.03	-0.05
Practicing religion	-0.07*	-0.02	-0.05	-0.13	-0.16*
English speaker	0.23	0.27	0.18	0.23	0.27*
Welsh speaker	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.23*	0.11
Unemployed	0.42**	0.42**	0.39**	0.45**	0.28*
Sense of belonging	-0.17**	-0.17**	-0.17**	-0.18**	-0.15**
Council renter	0.27*	0.01	0.28*	0.26*	0.12
Housing association renter	0.59**	0.36**	0.57**	0.41**	0.37**
Private renter (<i>ref: owned</i>)	0.11	0.02	0.16*	0.15	0.16*
Hate victim: gender	0.25*				0.24*
Hate victim: age	0.26*				0.18
Hate victim: race	0.16				0.09
Hate victim: religion	0.17				0.06
Hate victim: disability	0.70**				0.51**
Hate victim: sexual orientation	0.26**				0.05
Hate victim: trans	0.73**				0.80**
Acquisitive crime		0.07			0.08
Violent crime		0.34**			0.22**
Property crime		0.13			0.01
Threats		0.34**			0.29**
Hate incidents		0.07*			0.02
Location of incident		-0.27**			-0.18*
Victim alone		0.21**			0.12
Perpetrator stranger			-0.06		-0.01
Repeat perpetrator			0.63**		0.36**
One perpetrator			0.15		0.18
>Three perpetrators (<i>ref: two perpetrators</i>)			0.20*		0.20**
Report to police				0.31**	0.19*
Report to third party				0.62**	0.34**
South Wales Police				0.10	-0.01
North Wales Police				-0.01	0.09
Dyfed Powys Police (<i>ref: Gwent Police</i>)				0.05	0.03
Model fit					
Sig	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Adjusted R^2	0.18	0.24	0.18	0.19	0.40
N	534	515	503	515	476

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

TABLE 4 *OLS regression models predicting physical reactions to hate victimization*

Predictor variables	Victim model	Crime model	Perpetrator model	Criminal justice model	Full model
Constant	-0.63	-0.51	-0.32	-0.29	-0.66
In a relationship	0.01	-0.06	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03
Child carer	0.13	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.07
Practicing religion	-0.26**	-0.18*	-0.18*	-0.23**	-0.22*
English speaker	0.31	0.37*	0.23	0.24	0.29
Welsh speaker	0.25*	0.23*	0.27*	0.30**	0.23*
Unemployed	0.40**	0.37**	0.32*	0.45**	0.31**
Sense of belonging	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03	-0.06	-0.03
Council renter	0.02	-0.19	-0.02	-0.01	-0.25
Housing association renter	0.16	0.02	0.17	0.03	0.02
Private renter (<i>ref: owned</i>)	0.19*	0.08	0.22*	0.15*	0.12
Hate victim: gender	-0.01				-0.16
Hate victim: age	0.33**				0.24
Hate victim: race	0.25**				0.19*
Hate victim: religion	0.23				-0.07
Hate victim: disability	0.36**				0.22*
Hate victim: sexual orientation	0.29**				0.16
Hate victim: trans	0.57**				0.53**
Acquisitive crime		0.21**			0.22**
Violent crime		0.19*			0.18*
Property crime		-0.04			0.02
Threats		0.18*			0.15
Hate incidents		0.10**			0.07
Location of incident		-0.12			-0.17
Victim alone		0.00			-0.07
Perpetrator stranger			0.05		0.08
Repeat perpetrator			0.47**		0.32**
One perpetrator			-0.31**		-0.29**
>Three perpetrators (<i>ref: two perpetrators</i>)			-0.08		-0.11
Report to police				-0.08	-0.26**
Report to third party				0.26**	0.03
South Wales Police				0.24*	0.34**
North Wales Police				-0.09	0.05
Dyfed Powys Police (<i>ref: Gwent Police</i>)				-0.04	0.14
Model fit					
Sig	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Adjusted R^2	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.05	0.17
N	534	515	503	515	476

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

physical impacts. Given that a greater number of people in Wales as compared to England were unemployed and on housing benefit at the time of the survey, and that in general experience of poverty and social exclusion is greater in Wales than in England (New Policy Institute 2014, Cooper and Innes 2009) these significant findings may suggest that victims in Wales are at risk of suffering greater impacts from victimisation as compared to more affluent regions of the UK.

Sub-model analysis revealed that the crime variables set explained the most variance in both psychological and physical impacts. This suggests that the type of hate crime experienced accounts most for the impact felt. However it is important to note that the other variable sets explained a similar amount of variance, and therefore it is not possible to say with certainty that one set of indicators should be given priority over others.

Qualitative Findings

In this section of the paper we present qualitative evidence from hate victim interviews. Due to the space restrictions associated with presenting mixed-methods research we focus on those respondents that emerged as most impacted in the statistical analysis: victims of transgender and disability hate crime⁵. The interviews with these victims corroborate the statistical findings in relation to psychological impacts. The main effects highlighted by participants included depression; suspicion of others and the local community; lack of confidence; and feelings of shame, embarrassment, isolation and vulnerability.

However, most striking was the near ubiquitous mention of suicidal ideation amongst victims of transgender hate crime. The following extracts highlight the insidious nature of this impact, evidencing how thoughts of suicide often evolve into pragmatic considerations in the face of repeat targeted hate perpetration:

I have phoned the Samaritans in the last six months two or three times...I'm not suicidal by emotion; I've sat down and been through the emotional bit. I've got to the place now where suicide is a lifestyle option. I now know that if it gets to point X, if A outweighs B then it's something which...it's a pragmatic.

Victim of transgender hate crime, South Wales

I know from experience what a risk of serious harm is to a trans person, because I know the impact that minor, accumulative offences have. The impact increases the risk of serious harm to a trans person because it reduces confidence and increases risk of suicide. One hundred incidents can have more impact than one physical assault. I would prefer someone to beat seven bells out of me and I can spend a couple of days in hospital than actually go through the daily rubbish which I've been through.

Victim of transgender hate crime, South Wales

While discussion of this most extreme impact occurred predominantly in interviews with transgender victims, it also emerged in some discussions with victims of disability hate crime:

I've been in work sometimes and been really upset. And you feel like jumping off a cliff or hanging yourself or something because no one is helping you.

⁵ We report on interview data with other victim types in a forthcoming qualitative paper.

Victim of disability hate crime, Gwent

These admissions of arguably the most debilitating psychological impact of hate crime corroborate the headline statistical finding that these types of victims are likely to feel the impacts of hate most. When discussing impacts, transgender and disabled participants frequently referenced some of the control variables highlighted as significant factors in the statistical analysis. In particular, the majority made reference to social exclusion:

I was part of the allotment organisation...but I stopped getting involved with the community. I don't feel confident to sit on a stall in the community garden. I even camouflaged my room with blinds and all on the windows, because I was scared to [sic] being attacked. I create my own prison, it's like an open prison I created myself, I have my flat, but I don't feel free. And that affect me [sic], my life, because when I went this year to London, the doctor says to me he not going further with my process [gender transition] if I'm just stuck in my flat.

Victim of transgender hate crime, South Wales

Can't I just expect to go to a pub, and have a drink like everybody else? It sounds trivial but it bloody isn't, it makes me feel like ending my life sometimes.

Victim of disability hate crime, North Wales

*Since moving to the Conway area I have had abuse on a daily basis, so much so I only leave my house to go to work and to the shops. I find something as simple as going to the shops terrifying. In the past I have experienced name calling such as 'queer faggot,' 'gay c*nt' and so on. I have been punched in the face, had bricks in my window, three people turn up at my house with baseball bats and had a gun pointed at my head. I have never reported any of it to the police. I have locks on my front and back doors which are always locked when I am in. I never answer the door after dark, nor the telephone. I have on some occasions considered suicide. I have considered moving of course, but my debts have me trapped. My age is 34...what a life.*

Victim of transgender hate crime, North Wales

Other accounts referenced similar isolation and/or exclusion from their local community, or the absence of a strong support network – either formal or informal. In many cases victims of transphobic abuse believed their experiences and subsequent feelings of desperation were often compounded by the inability to confide in friends or family (who are often unaware of the victim's gender identity). In many cases of disability hate crime, victims revealed feelings of isolation and often the physical inability to access formal support agencies. The findings in relation to transgender victims mirror similar US (House et al. 2011, Maguen and Shipherd 2010, Nemoto et al. 2011, Juak 2013), Canadian (Namaste 2000) and Australian (Moran and Sharpe 2004) research, indicating the particular vulnerability of these victims extends to the UK.

Discussion

The findings largely supported the first two hypotheses that postulated significant differences would exist between hate victim types in relation to experiences of psychological impacts and physical reactions. Our quantitative and qualitative data provided overwhelming evidence that victims of transgender hate crimes were significantly more likely

to suffer psychological impacts and react physically compared to all other victim-types. This is the first mixed methods evidence in the UK to show these victims suffer the impacts of hate most, lending support to the growing international evidence base on transgender hate crime (Namaste 2000, Moran and Sharpe 2004, Jauk 2013). Similar, although less significant results were also reported in relation to victims of disability hate crime (both measures), race hate crime (only physical retaliation) and gender hate crime (only psychological impacts). A closer examination of our data revealed that both transgender and disabled hate crime victims reported the highest levels of repeat victimisation (50 percent & 48 percent respectively). In addition, over a third of victims of transgender and disability hate crimes (38 percent & 37 percent respectively) stated that violent crimes were the most serious they had experienced, the second and third highest amongst all hate victim types in the survey, after sexual orientation. Furthermore, holding all other factors constant, victims of transphobic hate crime were more likely to suffer thoughts of suicide by a factor of ten compared to other hate crime victim-types (Williams and Tregidga 2013). This pattern reflects the findings of Maguen and Shipherd (2010) and Nemoto et al. (2011), and in particular, the presence of additional, aggravating factors such as social isolation and the absence of a strong support network supports the work of House et al. (2011). Our interview data corroborated this pattern and revealed that psychological impacts were not experienced in isolation. Rather, in line with existing research, it was evident that hate crime impacts interacted with pre-existing personal or social factors (e.g. absence of a strong support network or social exclusion), producing deleterious effects that remained 'active' beyond the confines of the hate crime and the immediate aftermath (Namaste 2000, Moran and Sharpe 2004, Jauk 2013).

It is important to also delve further into the association of race hate crimes and physical reactions and gender based hate crimes and psychological impacts. The former relationship is consistent with existing research that identifies victims of race hate crimes have a propensity to physically react (Wilkinson 2001, Cardozo et al. 2003). In relation to the latter, we accept that respondents who did not identify with any of the other protected characteristic identities selected gender hate crime as an option in the survey to denote their belief that they were victimised based on hostility towards their sex. However, a closer examination of the data revealed that over half of those selecting this option were either gay or bisexual women (37 percent), transgender (12 percent) or gay men (5 percent). We accept that these respondents perceived their gender was targeted, and not their sexual orientation or transgender status. However, the complexities brought about by the intersections of these identities and how they are read by victims and perpetrators has been identified in non-UK research by Namaste (2000), Moran and Sharpe (2004), and Jauk (2013). Moran and Sharpe (2004: 395) show 'the multiple and simultaneous operation of many different social and cultural divisions at work in the context of transgender identity'. Based on these findings and ours we stress that future qualitative research should consider ways of distinguishing between the measurements of gender, sexual orientation and transgender based hate crimes to further interrogate their intersectional nature in the UK geo-historical context. This specific issue is examined in greater detail in a forthcoming, qualitative-informed paper that builds empirically upon recent scholarly argument that aspects of hate crime discourse should move away from a focus on group identity towards notions of targeted, individual victimisation (Garland and Chakraborti 2012).

The final hypothesis was partially supported by the analysis. Victims of violent hate crimes were significantly more likely to suffer both psychological impacts and physical reactions. This finding is commensurate with analysis of the BCS and CSEW in relation to the national picture of hate and non-hate violent crime victims and psychological impacts (Smith 2012, Brand and Price 2000). The association with a physical reaction also mirrors research that evidences violent crime victims who suffer with post-traumatic stress are more likely to retaliate, and experience increased levels of hostility and a desire for revenge (Wilkinson 2001, Orth and Montada 2006). Counter to our final hypothesis, victims of hate related threats were significantly likely to suffer psychological impacts, above violent hate crime victims. The association of psychological impacts and threats is intuitive, and it has been evidenced in relation to non-hate related property crime (Maguire 1980). However, its dominance over violent hate crime in the model is counter-intuitive. A closer examination of the data revealed that 48 percent of victims of hate related threats were also victims of repeat-targeted perpetration, a predictor that also emerged as highly significant. Furthermore, 44 percent of these victims indicated they received threats either within or immediately outside their home, again a significant predictor of psychological impacts. These patterns indicate that a large proportion of hate related threats may be related to anti-social behavior and harassment, possibly perpetrated by local residents and neighbours, and more crucially, interpreted and recorded by the police as such (see Garland 2012). Indeed, the interview data supported this supposition with a number of participants highlighting in some cases police reluctance to record an event as a hate crime or incident, instead labelling it as harassment or 'neighbour nuisance', especially in cases of repeat victimisation. The sustained and repeated nature of such threats, coupled with any subsequent inappropriate response by police, would undoubtedly have significant psychological effects on victims, in excess of those experienced by some victims of less common and episodic hate related violence.

Finally, of the types of hate crime, the association between acquisitive crime and physical reactions was strongest in the second model. This relationship is intuitive in relation to criminal acts such as robbery in a public place, but less so in circumstances where perpetrator and victim are less likely to come into contact (such as burglary and car theft). Like Orth and Montada (2006) in such cases we interpret this association as the criminal act inspiring more prospective physical reactions, such as desire for revenge and increased hostility towards suspects. Indeed, it is more likely that victims of acquisitive hate crimes know their perpetrator, mostly so in cases of local repeat-targeted perpetration, allowing these prospective yearnings for a physical response to gain traction (Williams and Tregidga 2013).

The sub-model analysis revealed that, in order of influence, crime, perpetrator, victim and criminal justice factors significantly predicted both psychological impacts and physical reactions following hate crime perpetration. These findings suggest a number of areas of focus for both practitioners and policy-makers. It is evident that efforts to reduce both types of impact via risk assessment are best first targeted at specific hate crime types, namely violent and acquisitive hate crime and hate related threats. Secondly, reduction efforts should be targeted towards repeat-targeted perpetration by local residents and neighbours. Third, particular attention should be paid to ameliorating the negative psychological and physical effects of hate crimes of those most susceptible to suffering them: victims of transgender; disability, gender and race hate crimes.

Finally, criminal justice factors seem to have had the least effect on both impacts, and where significant associations do exist they are unlikely to be causal. However, future research should further explore criminal justice responses to hate crime and how better responses might ameliorate impacts post victimisation (e.g. such as victim support). There is a substantial body of existing work in this area with a predominant focus on hate crime reporting patterns (Sin et al. 2012), police interpretation of victim reports (Garland 2012) and police response to hate crime victims (Moran and Sharpe 2004). The current research stresses the need to identify and respond to risk indicators beyond the immediate circumstances of victimisation, for example, feelings of social exclusion, the absence of a strong support network – either formal or informal, and the geo-political implications of diverse demographic factors such as poverty and rural living. It is argued that these factors should be considered aggravating elements associated with hate crime victimisation and incorporated into a comprehensive and UK-wide risk assessment tool for responding to both isolated and repeat cases of hate crime victimisation.

Here in the discussion we take a slight detour to highlight a complex issue that emerged during the All Wales Hate Crime Project. Hate incidents (defined in our survey as being insulted, pestered or ridiculed in a public place; being ignored and/or treated with impatience, frustration or intolerance because of some aspect of individual identity) did not emerge as significantly predictive of either impact in our full models. Furthermore, victims of incidents were the least likely to report to the police, compared to all other types of hate crime (Williams and Tregidga 2013). At this juncture we want to raise a potential issue in hate crime victimization survey research. Like Miers (1989) and Walklate (2012) we wish to argue that such tools in isolation may be insensitive to capturing the nuance of hate incident experience and associated impacts. This position is largely based on evidence from our qualitative interviews. Almost all of the 60 victims interviewed recalled experiencing hate incidents on a weekly and sometimes daily basis and many revealed the psychological and physical impact of this type of victimisation. However, during these conversations it became apparent that victims, and especially those whose minority identity was visually apparent (i.e. victims of race hate crimes and victims for whom gender presentation was a key factor), had developed a high *resilience* (Walklate 2011) to this low level endemic victimization to the point where they were able to neutralise any negative impact, perceiving these actions by others as ‘mundane’. It is possible that such victims have a higher level of tolerance for this low level victimisation because of the frequency with which they experience it. However, while our respondents may be considered *vulnerable* and ‘ideal victims’ (Christie 1986) socially, culturally and politically, it is clear that some often rejected the labels. Indeed, to adopt either label of vulnerable or victim was considered retrograde to the civil advances made by minority pressure groups over past decades (Williams and Tregidga 2013). It became apparent during our conversations with victims that many felt to ask for or receive help was a sign of weakness and vulnerability, increasing their troubles. However, resistance to such help and subsequent labels was complicated by the political casting of certain hate crime victim-types as objects to be pitied and targeted for enhanced support from criminal justice professionals, eroding the capability of individuals to resolve their own personal troubles (Walklate 2011). Possibly in a grasp for personal control, many respondents avoided reporting their experiences to the police. To complicate matters further, on the rare occasion incidents were reported to police they were often recorded as anti-social behaviour (for example, youth annoyance or neighborhood dispute) and in many of these cases the stated ‘hate’

element was diluted if not absent altogether (Williams and Tregidga 2013). There have been a number of recent, high-profile cases where this type of situation has had tragic consequences. We therefore conclude this discussion, like others within feminist criminology, with a clarion call for researchers of hate crime to adopt intensive as well as extensive, mixed method research designs that retain the capacity to examine and begin to account for a range of associated issues beyond the circumstances of the immediate hate crime act, including personal circumstances, victim perception of motivation (what aspect of their identity do they believe may have contributed to their victimisation) and their subsequent response to the hate experience.

Conclusions

The findings from the All Wales Hate Crime Project provide novel evidence, showing for the first time internationally, that the impacts of hate crimes are not homogeneous across seven hate *victim types*. Neither are all hate *crime types* equal in their subsequent negative impacts upon victims. We evidenced that victims of transgender hate crimes feel the impacts of victimisation most, when compared to the other six victim types. This shows that the pattern seen in the US (House et al. 2011, Maguen and Shipherd 2010, Nemoto et al. 2011, Juak 2013), Canada (Namaste 2000) and Australia (Moran and Sharpe 2004) is replicated within the UK for the first time. The crime, perpetrator, victim and criminal justice sub-model analysis revealed the integral role key significant predictors play as indicators of risk of suffering deleterious psychological and physical impacts, and in turn, the necessity of incorporating such predictors into operational risk assessment tools and regional and national policy frameworks that can be used to respond to hate crimes and help to protect victims from repeat-targeted victimisation. The paper also brings to the fore the methodological challenge of capturing the full gamut of hate crime and incident impacts, especially in the case of transgender victims, and therefore the need to construct mixed method research designs that facilitate the potential to capture the complex and nuanced nature of hate crime impact. While it is clear from our quantitative and qualitative data that transgender victims suffered the impacts of hate most, we must acknowledge that some experiences we as analysts would attribute to these victims may have been recorded under the gender or sexual orientation categories in the survey. Interrogating the subtle and subjective differences between victim statuses is complex. ‘Knowing’ what aspect of ones identity was ‘read’ and targeted is never clear, and these debates are rehearsed in court rooms by barristers defending those accused of hate crime perpetration on a weekly basis. It is therefore no surprise that this difficulty is transferred to the recording of hate crimes, both in policing and in research. In light of our experience we recommend that the question wording in relation to transgender, gender and sexual orientation hate crimes in the CSEW is evaluated, especially since transgender status was included for the first time in 2011/12, and that the recording of these hate crimes by police is reviewed.

The growing body of international research into transgender and disability hate crime victims, of which this paper forms part, may signal a move away from researching the more understood forms of hate and towards a focus on the marginal, at least in academic circles. Like Walklate (2011: 189) we acknowledge that ‘what kind of suffering is recognized, empathized with and responded to...is socially constructed’ and that as a result ‘some suffering is recognized and others go unnoticed’. The policing of hate crimes has become a priority in most constabularies in the UK, as evidenced in its inclusion in many police and

crime commissioner's actions plans. But it is yet unclear how the various resources attached this this priority will be allocated to the different victim-types, and if this allocation will be based on what we can now see are different needs. As Mason (2014:13) argues

‘The ideal victim of hate crime...is one who can lend their good name...to this call for social justice by engendering compassionate thinking for their plight and thereby challenging the sentiments that drive prejudiced and discriminatory perceptions of them in individual, social and institutional domains. The minority groups that have the greatest capacity to do this are those who can convince others that they are the undeserved targets of a kind of harm that is sufficiently serious to warrant collective concern. Groups that struggle to engender such compassion—because there is insufficient *empirical credibility* to their claim of vulnerability, because they are found to be morally blameworthy or because they are too strange or distant to invite concern—will struggle to gain support...’ [emphasis added]

We hope this research goes some way to giving legitimate voice to the victims who suffer the impacts of hate most but who may still sit on the margins.

Funding

This paper is based on the All Wales Hate Crime Project (2010-13), funded by the Big Lottery Fund (RGT/1/010332756, £569,194).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments, to Professor Gordon Hughes for his reflection on earlier drafts of this paper and to Dr. Nicholas Lord for his contribution to the literature review for the All Wales Hate Crime Project.

REFERENCES

- Botcherby, S., Glen, F., Iganski, P., Jochelson, K. and Lagou, S. (2011), *Equality Groups' Perceptions and Experience of Crime: Analysis of the British Crime Survey 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10*, London: EHRC.
- Burnap, P., Williams, M.L., Sloan, L., Rana, O., Housley, W., Edwards, A., Knight, V., Procter, R. and Voss, A. (2014), ‘Tweeting the Terror: Modelling the Social Media Reaction to the Woolwich Terrorist Attack’, *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, Online Advance Access.
- Brand, S. and Price, R. (2000), *The Economic and Social Costs of Crime, Home Office Research Study No. 217*. London: Home Office.
- Beyond Barriers (2003), *First Out...Report of the Findings of the Beyond Barriers Survey of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People in Scotland*. Glasgow: Beyond Barriers.

- Cardozo, B. L., Kaiser, R., Gotway, C. A., and Agani, F. (2003), 'Mental Health, Social Functioning, and Feelings of Hatred and Revenge of Kosovar Albanians One Year After the War in Kosovo', *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 16: 351--360.
- Chakraborti, N. and Garland, J. (2009). *Hate crime: impact, causes and responses*. Sage.
- Chakraborti, N. and Garland, J. (2012), 'Reconceptualizing Hate Crime Victimization Through the Lens of Vulnerability and 'Difference''. *Theoretical Criminology* 16/4: 499--514
- Chakraborti, N., and Zempi, I. (2012), 'The veil Under Attack: Gendered Dimensions of Islamophobic Victimization', *International Review of Victimology*, 18/3: 269--284.
- Christie, N. (1986), 'The Ideal Victim', in E.A. Fattah (ed.) *From Crime Policy to Victim Policy*, 17--30. London: Macmillan.
- Cooper, H. and Innes, M. (2009), *The Causes and Consequences of Community Cohesion in Wales: A Secondary Analysis*. Cardiff: UPSI.
- Edwards, A and Hughes, G. (2009), 'The preventive turn and the promotion of safer communities in England and Wales: Political Inventiveness and Governmental Instabilities', in A. Crawford (Ed.) *Crime Prevention Policies in Comparative Perspective*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- FRA (2010), *Homophobia and Discrimination on Grounds of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in the EU Member States*, Vienna: FRA.
- Gadd, D. (2009), 'Aggravating Racism and Elusive Motivation', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49/6: 755--771.
- Garland, J. (2012), 'Difficulties in Defining Hate Crime Victimization', *International Review of Victimology*, 18/1: 25--37.
- Garland, J. and Chakraborti, N. (2012), 'Divided By a Common Concept? Assessing the Implications of Different Conceptualisations of Hate Crime in the European Union', *European Journal of Criminology*, 9/1: 38--51.
- Garland, J. and Hodkinson, P. (2014), 'F**cking Freak! What the Hell do you Think You Look Like?: Experiences of targeted Victimization Among Goths and Developing Notions of Hate Crime', *British Journal of Criminology*, Advance Online Access.
- Grundy, D. (2011), 'Friend or Fake? Mate Crimes and People with Learning Disabilities', *Journal of Learning Disabilities and Offending Behaviour*, 2/4: 167--169.
- Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., Cogan, J. C., and Glunt, E. K. (1997) 'Hate Crime Victimization Among Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Adults: Prevalence, Psychological Correlates and Methodological Issues', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12/2: 19--215.
- Home Office (2012), *Statistical News Release: Hate Crimes, England and Wales 2011/12*. Home Office.

- House, A.S., Van Horn, E., Coppeans, C. and Stepleman, L.M. (2011), 'Interpersonal Trauma and Discriminatory Events as Predictors of Suicidal and Nonsuicidal Self-Injury in Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Persons', *Traumatology* 17/2: 75--85.
- Iganski, P. (2001) 'Hate Crimes Hurt More', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45/4: 626--38.
- Iganski, P. (2008), *Hate Crime and the City*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Jauk, D. (2013), 'Gender Violence Revisited: Lessons From Violent Victimization of Transgender Identified Individuals', *Sexualities*, 16/7: 80--825.
- Jones, M., and Williams, M. L. (2013) 'Twenty Years On: Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Police Officers' Experiences of Workplace Discrimination in England and Wales', *Policing and Society*, Online Advance Access.
- Levin, J. and McDevitt, J. (1993), *Hate Crime: The Rising Tide of Bigotry and Bloodshed*. New York: Plenum.
- Maguire, M. (1980), 'The Impact of Burglary Upon Victims', *British Journal of Criminology*, 20/3: 261--275.
- Maguen, S. and Shipherd, J.C. (2010), 'Suicide Risk Among Transgender Individuals', *Psychology and Sexuality* 1/1: 34--43.
- Mason, G. (2014), 'The Symbolic Purpose of Hate Crime Law: Ideal Victims and Emotion', *Theoretical Criminology*, 18/1: 7--92.
- Miers, D. (1989), 'Positivist Victimology: A critique, Part 1', *International Review of Victimology*, 1: 1--29.
- Milne, A., Cambridge, P., Beadle-Brown, J., Mansell, J., and Whelton, B. (2012), 'The Characteristics and Management of Elder Abuse: Evidence and Lessons From a UK Case Study', *European Journal of Social Work*, 16/4: 489--505.
- Moran, L. J. and Sharpe, A. N. (2004), 'Violence, Identity and Policing: The Case of Violence against Transgender People', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 4/4: 395--417.
- Namaste, V. K. (2000), *Invisible Lives: The Erasure of Transsexual and Transgendered People*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nemoto, T., Bödeker, B., and Iwamoto, M. (2011), 'Social Support, Exposure to Violence and Transphobia, and Correlates of Depression Among Male-to-Female Transgender Women with a History of Sex Work', *American Journal of Public Health*, 101/10: 1980--1988.
- New Policy Institute (2014), *The Dynamics of Low Income*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
- Office for National Statistics (2011), *National Statistician's Review of Crime Statistics: England and Wales*. ONS.

- Orth, U. and Montata, A. (2006) 'Feelings of Revenge, Retaliation Motive, and Posttraumatic Stress Reactions in Crime Victims', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21/2: 229--243.
- Perry, B. (2001), *In the Name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crimes*. Routledge.
- Phillips, C. and Bowling, B. (2012) 'Ethnicities, Racism, Crime and Criminal Justice' in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, A. L. and Williams, M. L. (2003), *Counted Out: Findings from the Stonewall Cymru LGB Survey*, London: Stonewall.
- Sin, C.H., Sheikh, S., Khanna, M. (2012), 'Police Readiness for Tackling Hate Crime Against People with Learning Disabilities – Areas for Improvement and Examples of Good Practice', *Safer Communities* 11/3: 145--153.
- Smith, K., Lader, D., Hoare, J. and Lau, I. (2012), *Hate Crime, Cyber Security and the Experience of Crime Among Children: Findings from the 2010/11 British Crime Survey*. Home Office.
- Stacey, M. (2010), 'Distinctive Characteristics of Sexual Orientation Bias Crimes', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26/15: 3013-3032.
- Taras, R. (2012). 'Islamophobia Never Stands Still: Race, Religion, and Culture'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36/3: 417--433.
- Tomsen, S. and Mason, G. (2001), 'Engendering Homophobia: Violence, Sexuality and Gender Conformity', *Journal of Sociology*, 37/3: 265--287.
- Walklate, S. (2011), 'Reframing Criminal Victimization: Finding a Place for Vulnerability and Resilience', *Theoretical Criminology*, 15/2: 179--194.
- Walklate, S. (2012), 'Who is the Victim of Crime? Paying Homage to the Work of Richard Quinney', *Crime, Media, Culture*, 8/2, 173--184.
- Wilkinson, D.L. (2001) 'Violent Events and Social Identity: Specifying the Relationship between Respect and Masculinity in Inner-city Youth Violence', *Sociological Studies of Children and Youth* 8: 235--269.
- Williams, M. L. and Robinson, A.L. (2007), *Counted In! The All Wales Survey of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People*, London: Stonewall.
- Williams, M. L. and Robinson, A.L. (2004), 'Problems and Prospects with Policing the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Community in Wales', *Policing and Society*, 14/3: 213--232
- Williams, M. L. and Tregidga, J. (2013), *Time for Justice: All Wales Hate Crime Research Project*. Cardiff: Race Equality First.