

Equality and Human Rights Commission
Briefing paper 4

Equality groups' perceptions and experience of crime

Analysis of the British Crime
Survey 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10

Sue Botcherby, Fiona Glen, Paul Iganski,
Karen Jochelson and Spyridoula Lagou

Equality and Human Rights Commission
University of Lancaster

Equality groups' perceptions and experience of crime

**Analysis of the British Crime Survey
2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10**

Research Briefing Paper 4

**Sue Botcherby, Fiona Glen, Paul Iganski, Karen Jochelson
and Spyridoula Lagou**

**Equality and Human Rights Commission
University of Lancaster**

© Equality and Human Rights Commission 2011

First published Autumn 2011

ISBN number 978 1 84206 416 0

Equality and Human Rights Commission Research

The Equality and Human Rights Commission publishes research carried out for the Commission by commissioned researchers and by the research team.

The views expressed in this briefing paper do not necessarily represent the views of the Commission. The Commission is publishing the paper as a contribution to discussion and debate.

Please contact the research team for further information about other Commission research reports, or visit our website:

Research Team
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Arndale House
The Arndale Centre
Manchester
M4 3AQ

Email: research@equalityhumanrights.com

Website: www.equalityhumanrights.com

You can download a copy of this report as a PDF from our website:
<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/>

If you require this publication in an alternative format, please contact the communications team to discuss your needs at:
communications@equalityhumanrights.com

Introduction

The Equality Act 2010 introduces a new equality duty requiring public authorities to show due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; advance equality and foster good relations across all the protected characteristics. The Act defines harassment as ‘unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic’ which violates a person’s dignity or creates ‘an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment’.¹

This briefing uses British Crime Survey (BCS) data to understand the different equality groups’ expectations about being insulted and their experience of intimidation, threats, violence and crime. It also analyses the experience and reporting of hate crime, that is, crime motivated by the offender’s attitudes to the victim’s age, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or disability compared to other crime not motivated by prejudice. The briefing finds that there is widespread expectation of being insulted or intimidated in public places amongst most minority equality groups. Younger age groups, men, and lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) respondents are more likely to report being a victim of crime, and experiencing threats or deliberate use of violence than older age groups, women and heterosexual respondents. Ethnic minority groups are more likely than White groups to report being a victim of crime, but the Mixed and White groups are most likely to experience violence.

People over sixty, ethnic minority groups and LGB respondents are most likely to report experiencing crime motivated by the offender’s attitude to their identity. Victims of hate crime are more likely to inform police of such incidents than victims of otherwise motivated crimes.

¹ Equality Act 2010, Part 2, Chapter 26.

Methodology

The BCS² is a national survey that measures attitudes and experience of crime in England and Wales. This includes crimes which may not have been reported to the police, or recorded by them. It therefore provides an important complement to police recorded crime statistics. Annually, the BCS collects data from approximately 46,000 people. However, when trying to analyse these data by equality group, the resulting sample size can be too small for a reliable result. Therefore, this paper pools three BCS data sets: 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10 for England and Wales. This provides a dataset of 137,907 cases (see Tables 1 and 2).

To understand each equality group's perceptions and experiences of crime, we analysed the responses of individuals to the following BCS questions:

- their worry about being insulted or pestered in a public place;
- their expectation of being harassed or intimidated in a public place;
- their reported experience of crime;
- whether they had been threatened that their property would be damaged or that force or violence would be used against them;
- their experience of deliberate force or violence being used against them;
- whether crimes were believed to be motivated by the offender's attitudes towards the victim's protected characteristics (hate crime);
- their emotional reaction to the incidents;
- whether the incidents of hate crime and other crime were reported to the police; and
- the preventative measures taken by victims after crime incidents.

All the tables reflect whether differences are statistically significant at least $p < 0.05$. Throughout our analysis, we use a reference category to compare groups. For example, the responses of respondents who declare a 'limiting' or 'non-limiting disability/illness' are compared against the reference category of 'no disability/illness'. For significance testing, the following reference groups are used:

Age: 30-59 year olds

Gender: Male

Ethnic group: White

Religion: Christian

² The data from the British Crime Survey are material from Crown copyright records made available through the Home Office and the UK Data Archive and used by permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office and the Queen's Printer for Scotland. Those who carried out the original collection and analysis of the data bear no responsibility for the further analysis reported in this briefing.

Sexual orientation: Heterosexual

Disability: No disability/illness

When numbers for any category (cell) of analysis fall below 30, they are either not included in tables or combined with other cells into larger categories. For example, where cell sizes for different religious groups are too small for analysis, the analysis focuses on the largest groups, namely Christian and Muslim; where cell sizes for gay, lesbian and bisexual men and women are too small, the groups are aggregated into a single LGB group; and victims of hate crime are pooled together as a single category and compared to victims of other crime for some of the analysis.

Key findings

Worry about being insulted or pestered in a public place

The BCS asks ‘How worried are you about being insulted or pestered by anybody, while in the street or any other public place?’ (see Table 3).

Younger people were more likely to worry about being insulted or pestered while in the street than older people. Women were significantly more likely than men (35 per cent compared to 23 per cent) to report that they were either fairly/very worried about being insulted or pestered. Ethnic minority groups were more likely to worry with 47 per cent of Asian/Asian British and 43 per cent of Black/Black British people worried about being insulted and pestered compared to 28 per cent of White respondents. Muslim and Hindu respondents reported similarly high levels of worry with 45 per cent and 48 per cent reporting being fairly or very likely to worry compared to 27 per cent of Christians. LGB people (41 per cent) also reported high levels of worry, compared to 30 per cent of heterosexual respondents. Those with a limiting disability were fairly or very likely to worry about being insulted or pestered (32 per cent), as were 30 per cent of people with a non-limiting illness or disability.

Expect to be harassed or intimidated in a public place

The BCS asks ‘How likely do you think you are to be harassed or intimidated in the street or any other public place in the next year?’ (see Table 4).

Of all ages, 16-29 year olds (33 per cent) were more likely to expect harassment or intimidation in a public place in the next year than people aged over 60 (12 per cent). All ethnic minority groups were more likely to expect such treatment compared to the White group (20 per cent), with the Mixed (37 per cent) and Asian British (33 per cent) groups recording the highest levels. The Muslim (34 per cent) and Hindu (29 per cent) groups were also more likely than the Christian group (23 per cent) to think they were ‘very/fairly likely’ to be harassed or intimidated. The LGB group (36 per cent) was more likely to expect such treatment than the heterosexual group (24 per cent).

Reported experience of crime

The BCS asks respondents about their reported experiences of crime in the last twelve months.

Those in the younger age groups were more likely to report being a victim of crime in the last 12 months (see Table 5) compared to those in the older age groups. Men were more likely than women to report being a victim of crime (male - 23 per cent; female 21 per cent). Those in the Mixed (31 per cent) and Asian/Asian British (24 per

cent) reported the highest experience of crime. Those who reported that they have no religion (28 per cent) recorded the highest experience of crime, followed by Muslim respondents (25 per cent). LGB people (36 per cent) were much more likely to report crime victimisation than heterosexual respondents (27 per cent). Respondents with a disability as a group were slightly less likely than those without a disability to report being a victim of crime. However, for each age group, disabled people are more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced crime³. The difference from the age-group-specific data is due to the 'disaggregation effect', reflecting different distributions of disabled and non-disabled people across the age ranges, combined with the different experiences of victimisation by age groups.

Experience threats to have property damaged, or force or violence used against them

The BCS asks respondents: 'Has anyone threatened to damage things of yours or threatened to use force or violence on you in any way that actually frightened you?' (see Table 6).

Six per cent of 16-29 year olds reported being threatened in the preceding twelve months, compared to four per cent of 30-59 year olds and one per cent of those aged 60 or over. Women were significantly less likely than men to experience such threats. There were no apparent differences when comparing ethnic groups, or religious groups, except those with 'no religion', who were significantly more likely to have been threatened. Eleven per cent of the LGB group experienced threats compared to four per cent of the heterosexual group. There was little apparent difference in experiencing threats between respondents with a disability and those without. However, for each age group, disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to have experienced threats to have their property damaged or to have force or violence used against them.⁴

Experience of deliberate use of force/violence

The BCS asks respondents about their experiences of deliberate force or violence being used against them in the previous twelve months.

The 16-29 year old group were over three times as likely to report being a victim of deliberate use of violence or force in the last year compared to the 30-59 age group

³ Nocon, A., Iganski, P. and Lagou, S. (2011) *Disabled people's experiences and concerns about crime*. Equality and Human Rights Commission Briefing Paper 3. http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/disabilityfi/briefing_paper_3_new.pdf

⁴ Nocon, A., Iganski, P. and Lagou, S. (2011) *Disabled people's experiences and concerns about crime*. Equality and Human Rights Commission Briefing Paper 3. http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/disabilityfi/briefing_paper_3_new.pdf

(see Table 7). Men experienced higher levels of deliberate violence than women. When ethnic group is considered, the Mixed group (4 per cent) experienced the highest level of deliberate force/violence, followed by those in the White group. People with 'no religion' were more likely to experience force/violence than the Christian group. LGB people (7 per cent) reported over twice the levels experienced by the heterosexual group (3 per cent).

Crime that is related to people's identity

The BCS asks respondents about their experiences of crime in the last year. Each respondent can report up to six incidents.⁵ For each incident they report, they are asked whether they think the incident was motivated by the offender's attitude towards their sexual orientation, gender, age, disability, religion or belief, or whether it was racially motivated (see Table 8). This definition is similar to that used by the police when coding crimes as hate crimes

In six per cent of incidents reported by people aged 60 and over, respondents believed that the incident was motivated by the offender's attitudes towards their age compared to three per cent for 16-29 year olds, and one per cent for 30-59 year olds. In 15 per cent of incidents reported by the Asian/Asian British group, respondents believed that the incident was racially motivated, followed by 11 per cent of Chinese/Other and 10 per cent of Black/Black British. In 12 per cent of incidents reported by the LGB group, respondents believed that the incident was motivated by the offender's attitude towards their sexual orientation compared to one per cent of the heterosexual group. In four per cent of incidents reported by disabled people respondents believed that the incident was motivated by the offender's attitudes towards their disability.

Emotional reactions

For each of the first three incidents victims experienced, if they reported more than one incident, the BCS asks 'Many people have emotional reactions after incidents in

⁵ Each respondent can complete up to six victim forms and each victim form covers an incident or a series of incidents. A series of incidents is defined as 'the same thing, done under the same circumstances and probably by the same people'. Most incidents reported are one-off, single occurrences, but in a minority of cases respondents may have been victimised a number of times in succession. In these cases respondents are asked whether they consider these incidents to be a 'series'; that is 'the same thing, done under the same circumstances and probably by the same people'. Where incidents are determined to be in a series, the number of incidents is recorded, but with only one victim form being completed based on the most recent incident. BCS estimates only include the first five incidents in this 'series' of victimisations in the count of crime. Overall, each adult respondent can have a maximum of 30 incidents included in the count of crime; a maximum of six victim forms with a maximum of five incidents on each victim form.

which they are victims of crime. Did you personally have any of these reactions after the incident?’

While the differences are small, higher proportions of victims in incidents believed to be motivated by offenders’ attitudes towards their identity reported having an emotional reaction, compared with victims in incidents believed to have been motivated by other reasons, and the difference holds when controlling for crime type (see Table 9). When respondents were asked about the extent of their emotional reaction they experienced, the difference in the proportions reporting “very much” was wider still between victims in incidents of identity crime and otherwise motivated incidents, and again this holds when controlling for crime type (Table 10).

Reporting to police

For each incident they report (up to six), respondents are asked ‘Did the police come to know about the matter?’ (Table 11). The police were more likely to come to know about hate crime incidents than otherwise motivated incidents. However, 57 per cent of hate crime incidents were not reported to the police.

For each of the first three incidents victims experienced, if they reported more than one incident, they were asked to say why the crime was not reported to the police, with respondents offered the opportunity to select one or more responses. Table 12 shows the responses that were selected most often. Victims of hate crime incidents were less likely than victims of otherwise motivated crime (29 per cent compared to 34 per cent of incidents) to suggest that the ‘Police could have done nothing’ and less likely to say that the matter was ‘Too trivial/not worth reporting’ (22 per cent compared to 28 per cent of incidents). However, victims in incidents of hate crime were more likely to suggest that the ‘Police would not have bothered/not have been interested’ (26 per cent compared with 22 per cent). Victims in incidents of hate crime were almost three times more likely than victims of incidents of otherwise motivated crime (six per cent compared with two per cent) to suggest that the ‘Fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse’.

Preventive measures taken by victims after crime incidents

Those who are victims of crime are asked for each of the first three incidents they experienced if they have reported more than one incident, to name actions taken by themselves or their household to try to prevent it happening again.

Table 13 shows the preventive measures taken by victims after incidents. Columns are separated into measures taken by those who reported being a victim of a hate crime (i.e. those who say they experienced crime motivated by the offender’s view of their equality identity) and those who believed the crime was motivated by other reasons (we call this an otherwise motivated crime). Victims in incidents of hate

crime are over three times more likely to avoid walking in or going to certain places than victims in incidents of otherwise motivated crimes. Victims of hate crime are more likely to inform the police as a preventive measure, than victims of otherwise motivated crimes.

Appendix A

Table 1: BCS achieved sample size and response rates

Comparing the BCS cycles	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
Achieved sample size	46,983	46,286	44,638
Response rate	76%	76%	76%
Sampling frame*	PAF	PAF	PAF
Type of sample	Over sampled in less populous PFAs (minimum=1000)		

Notes: *PAF - Small Users Postcode Address File.

Source: British Crime Survey User Guide 2009/10 Crime Surveys Home Office Statistics, Home Office, page 17.

Table 2: BCS sample size and percentage of respondents recorded as victims of crime, England and Wales

	Number of respondents	N (weighted)	% ⁶ victims of crime	victims (weighted)
England				
2007/08	42,731	39,993,162	22.3	8,922,358
2008/09	42,144	41,099,769	23.7	9,722,311
2009/10	40,807	41,396,076	21.7	8,975,963
Total	125,682	122,489,007	22.5	27,620,632
Wales				
2007/08	4,252	2,384,491	18.6	443,324
2008/09	4,142	2,405,174	18.2	438,669
2009/10	3,831	2,414,005	18.0	434,320
Total	12,225	7,203,670	18.3	1,316,313

Notes: Variables used: gor1 (gor recoded to 1=England & 2=Wales) and bcsvictim

⁶ Percentages calculated from weighted estimates (N).

Table 3: Worry about being insulted or pestered by anybody while in the street or other public place

Characteristic	Very/fairly worried		Total
	n (unweighted)	Row % (weighted)	n (unweighted)
Age			
16-29	3,491	*34.1	10,395
30-59[Ref. category]	10,177	30.1	34,992
60+	5,397	*23.8	24,078
Gender			
Female	12,360	*35.3	37,962
Male[Ref. category]	6,737	23.0	31,609
Ethnic group			
White[Ref. category]	17,008	27.6	64,731
Mixed	159	*38.8	424
Asian or Asian British	1,044	*46.5	2,217
Black or Black British	557	*43.3	1,330
Chinese or Other	319	*39.6	836
Religion			
Christian [Ref. category]	14,594	28.6	53,965
Muslim	648	*45.4	1,416
Hindu	309	*47.9	635
No religion	3,048	*26.4	12,124
Sexual orientation			
Heterosexual or straight [Ref. category]	9,864	30.1	34,075
Lesbian, gay, bisexual	291	*40.9	752
Disability			
No disability/illness [Ref. category]	13,230	28.7	49,656
Non-limiting disability/illness	1,664	*30.1	6,006
Limiting disability/illness	4,164	*32.0	13,773

Notes: Variables used: agegrp, sex, ethgrp2, relig2, sxclassrecoded, ill, winsultrecoded [Data exclude 'don't know' and 'refused' codes]
*p at least <0.05

Table 4: Expect to be harassed or intimidated by anybody in the street or public place in the next year

Characteristic	Very/Fairly likely		Total
	N (unweighted)	Row % (weighted)	n (unweighted)
Age			
16-29	1,003	*32.9	3,227
30-59[Ref. category]	2,135	20.6	11,161
60+	883	*11.5	7,851
Gender			
Female	2,210	20.8	12,255
Male[Ref. category]	1,815	21.1	10,020
Ethnic group			
White[Ref. category]	3,573	19.7	20,712
Mixed	43	*36.8	125
Asian or Asian British	216	*33.2	719
Black or Black British	136	*29.4	478
Chinese or Other	55	*25.5	226
Religion			
Christian [Ref. category]	2,882	19.3	17,233
Muslim	151	*33.6	490
Hindu	55	*28.9	205
No religion	835	*23.1	3,964
Sexual orientation			
Heterosexual or straight [Ref. category]	2,524	23.7	11,829
Lesbian, gay, bisexual	71	*36.1	242
Disability			
No disability/illness [Ref. category]	2,905	21.3	16,137
Non-limiting disability/illness	311	*19.3	1,776
Limiting disability/illness	806	20.1	4,340

Notes: Variables used: agegrp, sex, ethgrp2, relig2, sxclassrecoded, ill, lharrecoded [Data exclude 'don't know' and 'refused' codes]
*p at least <0.05

Table 5: Reported experience of crime in the past 12 months by identity characteristic

Characteristic	Yes Row % (weighted)	Total n (unweighted)
Age		
16-29	*32.2	20,366
30-59 [Ref. category]	23.8	69,007
60+	*11.0	48,317
Gender		
Female	*21.3	75,623
Male [Ref. category]	23.3	62,284
Ethnic group		
White [Ref. category]	22.2	128,028
Mixed	*30.9	872
Asian or Asian British	*23.7	4,505
Black or Black British	22.1	2,760
Chinese or Other	21.7	1,642
Religion		
Christian [Ref. category]	20.7	106,510
Muslim	*25.1	2,946
Hindu	21.0	1,287
No religion	*27.9	24,365
Sexual orientation		
Heterosexual or straight [Ref. category]	26.7	69,881
Lesbian, gay, bisexual	*35.6	1482
Disability		
No disability/illness [Ref. category]	22.9	98,839
Non-limiting disability/illness	*21.5	11,646
Limiting disability/illness	*19.9	27,137

Notes: Variables used: agegrp, sex, ethgrp2, relig2, sxclassrecoded, ill, bcsvictim [Data exclude 'don't know' and 'refused' codes]
 *p at least <0.05
 The All column includes all respondents within the 3 year sample that identified with the particular characteristic.

Table 6: Experience of threats to damage property, or use force or violence

Characteristic	Yes		Total n (unweighted)
	n (unweighted)	Row % (weighted)	
Age			
16-29	1, 264	*6.0	20,363
30-59 [Ref. category]	2,724	3.7	68,999
60+	552	*1.1	48,313
Gender			
Female	2,430	*3.3	75,612
Male [Ref. category]	2,114	3.8	62,280
Ethnic group			
White [Ref. category]	4,195	3.5	128,015
Mixed	41	4.8	872
Asian or Asian British	152	3.5	4,504
Black or Black British	100	3.1	2,759
Chinese or Other	54	3.7	1,642
Religion			
Christian [Ref. category]	3,151	3.2	106,499
Muslim	102	3.4	2,946
Hindu	37	3.0	1,287
No religion	1,120	*4.7	24,364
Sexual orientation			
Heterosexual or straight [Ref. category]	3,046	4.3	69,875
Lesbian, gay, bisexual	140	*10.8	1,482
Disability			
No disability/illness [Ref. category]	3,200	3.5	98,833
Non-limiting disability/illness	376	3.7	11,645
Limiting disability/illness	949	3.6	27,132

Notes: Variables used: agegrp, sex, ethgrp2, relig2, sxclassrecoded, ill, threviol [Data exclude 'don't know' and 'refused' codes], *p at least <0.05

Table 7: Experience of deliberate use of force/violence

Characteristic	Yes		Total n (unweighted)
	n (unweighted)	Row% (weighted)	
Age			
16-29	1,368	*6.5	20,363
30-59 [Ref. category]	1,563	2.0	69,001
60+	156	*0.3	48,316
Gender			
Female	1,257	*1.7	75,617
Male [Ref. category]	1,832	3.5	62,280
Ethnic group			
White [Ref. category]	2,881	2.7	128,022
Mixed	41	*4.1	872
Asian or Asian British	78	*1.5	4,504
Black or Black British	51	*1.7	2,757
Chinese or Other	33	*1.9	1,642
Religion			
Christian [Ref. category]	1,945	2.1	106,505
Muslim	61	1.9	2,946
Hindu	18	*1.3	1,287
No religion	973	*4.4	24,364
Sexual orientation			
Heterosexual or straight [Ref. category]	2,161	3.3	69,876
Lesbian, gay, bisexual	105	*6.7	1,481
Disability			
No disability/illness [Ref. category]	2,308	2.7	98,833
Non-limiting disability/illness	179	*1.8	11,646
Limiting disability/illness	587	*2.2	27,136

Notes: Variables used: agegrp, sex, ethgrp2, relig2, sxclassrecoded, ill, delibvio [Data exclude 'don't know' and 'refused' codes], *p at least <0.05 .

Table 8: Experience of identity motivated crime

	Yes		Total
	n (unweighted)	Row% (weighted)	n (unweighted)
Age motivated			
16-29	172	*3.1	9,807
30-59 [Ref. category]	144	0.9	22,685
60+	293	*6.4	6,129
Gender motivated			
Female	141	*3.9	6,183
Male [Ref. category]	19	0.3	5,438
Ethnic group motivated			
White [Ref. category]	234	1.2	37,543
Asian or Asian British	131	*14.6	1,449
Black or Black British	74	*10.0	825
Chinese or Other	44	*10.9	477
Religion motivated			
Christian [Ref. category]	58	0.4	26,921
Muslim	43	*7.7	1,028
Sexual orientation motivated			
Heterosexual or straight [Ref. category]	133	0.7	25,690
Lesbian, gay, bisexual	73	*12.0	840
Disability motivated			
No disability/illness [Ref. category]	46	0.2	28,124
Limiting disability/illness	216	*3.8	6,996

Notes: Variables used: Racemot, *hatemotage/hatemotnone, *hatemotgen/hatemotnone, *hatemotrelig/hatemotnone, *hatemotdis/hatemotnone, *hatemotsexor/hatemotnone, agegrp, sex, ethgrp2, relig2, sxclassrecoded, ill
'hatemotage', 'hatemotgen', 'hatemotrelig', 'hatemotdis', and 'hatemotsexor' are variables derived from a multiple response question and include only those incidents where respondents have answered 'yes' to the particular motivation. They therefore exclude multiple types of hate crime victimisation. 'hatemotnone' is derived from the same question and includes only those incidents where respondents have answered 'none of these'.

*p at least <0.05

Incidents of crime included in the analysis include only incidents that occurred in England and Wales, and exclude the following categories in the OFFENCE variable:

Duplicates, 'Invalid victim form', 'Possible' codes, 'Out of scope', 'Attempted criminal damage/but no damage', 'Obscene and nuisance telephone calls', 'Theft of milk bottles'. They also exclude those incidents recorded as 'Invalid' in the VFVALID variable.

Table 9: Respondents reporting an emotional reaction following incidents by offence type: identity crime compared with otherwise motivated crime

	Identity crime		Otherwise motivated crime	
	n (unwghtd)	% (weighted)	n (unwghtd)	% (weighted)
Assault/attempted assault	373	*95.8	2,962	85.9
Robbery/theft from person	199	90.6	1,690	90.3
Burglary/attempted burglary/theft from dwelling	128	*94.2	4,117	87.7
Vehicle and other theft	154	*92.3	12,575	84.3
Criminal damage	298	*93.6	9,297	89.5
Threats	375	*92.0	2,584	88.7
All	1,527	*93.2	33,225	87.1

Notes: Variables used:
 Emotreac; Howaff1, hatemotsexor, racemot, hatemotage, hatemotrelig, hatemotdis, hatemotgen recoded as 'ic', and Offence recoded as:
 1.00 'Assault/attempted assault' includes the following offence codes: 11, 12, 13, 21, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35.
 2.00 'Robbery/theft from person' includes the following offence codes: 41, 42, 43, 44, 45.
 3.00 'Burglary/attempted burglary/theft from dwelling' includes the following offence codes: 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58.
 4.00 'Vehicle and other theft' includes the following offence codes: 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71, 72, 73.
 5.00 'Criminal damage' includes the following offence codes: 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86.
 6.00 'Threats' includes the following offence codes: 91, 92, 93, 94.
 *p at least <0.05

Table 10: Respondents reporting 'being affected' 'very much' by incidents by offence type: identity crime compared with otherwise motivated crime

	Identity crime		Otherwise motivated crime	
	n (unwghtd)	% (weighted)	n (unwghtd)	% (weighted)
Assault/attempted assault	141	*35.8	873	25.5
Robbery/theft from person	61	29.4	378	21.6
Burglary/attempted burglary/theft from dwelling	56	*43.6	1,114	28.0
Vehicle and other theft	38	21.3	1,946	15.8
Criminal damage	115	*42.8	1,622	18.6
Threats	112	*35.4	610	22.7
All	523	*35.4	6,543	20.5

Notes: Variables used:
 Howaff1, hatemotsexor, racemot, hatemotage, hatemotrelig, hatemotdis, hatemotgen recoded as 'ic', and Offence recoded as:
 1.00 'Assault/attempted assault' includes the following offence codes: 11, 12, 13, 21, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35.
 2.00 'Robbery/theft from person' includes the following offence codes: 41, 42, 43, 44, 45.
 3.00 'Burglary/attempted burglary/theft from dwelling' includes the following offence codes: 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58.
 4.00 'Vehicle and other theft' includes the following offence codes: 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71, 72, 73.
 5.00 'Criminal damage' includes the following offence codes: 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86.
 6.00 'Threats' includes the following offence codes: 91, 92, 93, 94.
 *p at least <0.05

Table 11: Whether police came to know about the crime

	Yes		No		Refused		Don't know		Total
	n (unwghtd)	Row % (wgtd)	n (unwghtd)	Row % (wgtd)	n (unwghtd)	Row % (wgtd)	n (unwghtd)	Row % (wgtd)	n (unwghtd)
Identity motivated crime	761	*42.4	922	*57.6	0		2	0.0	1,685
Otherwise motivated crime [Ref. category]	15,692	37.8	23,720	61.8	3	0.0	178	0.4	39,593
Total	16,453	38.1	24,642	61.5	3	0.0	180	0.4	41,278

Notes: Variables used: ic [identity crime: 1=identity motivated & 0=all other motivated incidents], copsknow, *p at least <0.05
 Incidents of crime included in the analysis include only incidents that occurred in England and Wales, and exclude the following categories in the OFFENCE variable: Duplicates, 'Invalid victim form', 'Possible' codes, 'Out of scope', 'Attempted criminal damage/but no damage', 'Obscene and nuisance telephone calls', 'Theft of milk bottles'. They also exclude those incidents recorded as 'Invalid' in the VFVALID variable.

Table 12: Reasons why the police did not come to know about the matter

	Identity incidents		Otherwise motivated incidents [Reference category]		Total	
	n	Column %	n	Column %	n	Column %
	(unwghtd)	(wghtd)	(unwghtd)	(wghtd)	(unwghtd)	(wghtd)
Private/personal/family matter	59	*5.5	1,365	7.3	1,424	7.2
Dealt with matter myself/ourselves	114	*14.0	2045	10.2	2,159	10.4
Reported to other authorities (e.g. superiors, company security staff)	52	6.8	786	5.2	838	5.3
Fear of reprisal by offenders/make matters worse	54	*5.9	372	2.1	426	2.3
Police could have done nothing	266	*29.1	8,334	33.8	8,600	33.5
Police would not have bothered/not have been interested	191	*25.8	5,267	21.8	5,458	22.0
Inconvenient/too much trouble	43	*3.5	1,166	5.1	1,209	5.0
Too trivial/not worth reporting	194	*22.1	6,848	28.1	7,042	27.7
Common event/just one of those things/just something that happens	30	*4.8	437	2.3	467	2.5
Other	51	*5.1	605	3.1	656	3.2
Total [includes 'don't know']	892		22,767		23,659	

Notes: Variables used: ycopno2a- ycopno2u and ic [identity crime: 1=identity motivated & 0=all other motivated incidents]
Column percentages are greater than 100% as ycopno is multiple response variable
*p at least <0.05
Incidents of crime included in the analysis include only incidents that occurred in England and Wales, and exclude the following categories in the OFFENCE variable:
Duplicates, 'Invalid victim form', 'Possible' codes, 'Out of scope', 'Attempted criminal damage/but no damage', 'Obscene and nuisance telephone calls', 'Theft of milk bottles'.
They also exclude those incidents recorded as 'Invalid' in the VFVALID variable.

Table 13: Preventative measures taken after incidents

Preventive measures	Identity incidents		Otherwise motivated incidents [Reference category]	
	n (unwghtd)	Column % (wghtd)	n (unwghtd)	Column % (wghtd)
Improved home security	129	*5.1	3,956	8.4
Avoid walking in/going to certain places	178	*11.9	823	3.5
Avoid parking in certain places	47	*2.8	2,197	4.8
Moved house/flat	50	2.5	541	1.9
Try to be more alert	256	*13.0	3,158	9.4
Make sure valuables are always secure	86	*3.6	4,254	9.5
Make sure valuables are always secure when going out	55	*2.5	1,470	4.2
Have informed the police	40	*3.2	347	1.5
Total [includes 'don't know', 'refused', 'none of these']	1,633		38,074	

Notes: Variables used: recoded:trypre2a-trypre2r & trypre3a-trypre3t and ic [identity crime: 1=identity motivated & 0=all other motivated incidents]
Column per centages are greater than 100% as trypre is multiple response variable
*p at least <0.05
Incidents of crime included in the analysis include only incidents that occurred in England and Wales, and exclude the following categories in the OFFENCE variable:
Duplicates, 'Invalid victim form', 'Possible' codes, 'Out of scope', 'Attempted criminal damage/but no damage', 'Obscene and nuisance telephone calls', 'Theft of milk bottles'. They also exclude those incidents recorded as 'Invalid' in the VFVALID variable.

Contacts

England

Equality and Human Rights Commission Helpline
FREEPOST RRLG-GHUX-CTR
Arndale House, The Arndale Centre, Manchester M4 3AQ
Main number: 0845 604 6610
Textphone: 0845 604 6620
Fax: 0845 604 6630

Scotland

Equality and Human Rights Commission Helpline
FREEPOST RSAB-YJEJ-EXUJ
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, Glasgow G2 8DU
Main number: 0845 604 5510
Textphone: 0845 604 5520
Fax: 0845 604 5530

Wales

Equality and Human Rights Commission Helpline
FREEPOST RRLR-UEYB-UYZL
3rd Floor, 3 Callaghan Square, Cardiff CF10 5BT
Main number: 0845 604 8810
Textphone: 0845 604 8820
Fax: 0845 604 8830

Helpline opening times:

Monday to Friday 8am–6pm.

Calls from BT landlines are charged at local rates, but calls from mobiles and other providers may vary.

Calls may be monitored for training and quality purposes.

Interpreting service available through Language Line, when you call our helplines.

If you require this publication in an alternative format and/or language please contact the relevant helpline to discuss your needs. All publications are also available to download and order in a variety of formats from our website.

www.equalityhumanrights.com

www.equalityhumanrights.com