

Graduate Diploma Professional Police Practice

LEVEL 6 - 40 Credits

Workbook title: Competency Based Workbook 2 (DHEP)

**(SOUTH WALES POLICE, GWENT POLICE AND
UWTSD)**

Learner name: Robert BUXTON

**Learner's University Registration Number:
2245753**

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMME

Module title: Policing in the Workplace 3 (DHEP) - BMPP6009D

Workbook Guidance

Please read these notes carefully. They provide essential information. The documents you will use in developing your workbook are on the following pages.

What is the workbook for?

The purpose of this workbook is to enable learners to demonstrate and provide evidence of how they meet the learning outcomes set by the College of Policing, for the Graduate Diploma in Professional Policing Practice. You are being asked to outline your experiential learning based upon your theoretical understanding in a range of operational situations.

- Wellbeing and Resilience
- Criminal Justice
- Conducting Investigations
- Decision making and discretion
- Maintaining Professional Standards
- Leadership and Team working
- Policing the roads
- Information and Intelligence

You may wish to use the same incidents as you have outlined in the Occupational Competence Portfolio.

How should the workbook be presented?

Blank electronic copies can be found on Moodle of this workbook. You must submit this document electronically therefore it is important that you save your work regularly and upload the final typed version through Turnitin on Moodle.

Word count policy can be found in chapter 7 of the Academic Quality under section 7.7 (this applies to presenting work above and under the specified word count).

https://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/media/uwtsd-website/content-assets/documents/academic-office/aqh-chapters/chapters---en/Chapter_07_Assessment-Taught_Programmes_Pages_72-79-UPDATED-05-11-2019.pdf

Reflective practice is a core aspect for your workbooks and although there is a variety of useful resources on Moodle, there is one particular book, that is specifically based on reflective practice in policing, here is a link to one chapter from Selina Copley's Reflective Practice for Policing Students:

https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/298870/mod_resource/content/1/Reflective%20Practice%20for%20Policing%20Students%20-%20Selina%20Copley%20Chapter5.pdf

How is the workbook assessed?

Advice and support about the completion of this workbook is available to you. Please contact Kelly Andrews direct using k.andrews@uwtsd.ac.uk with any questions or queries you may have.

Dates of workbook submission can be located within the General information tile within Moodle.

Once submitted your workbook will be assessed and marked independently. You will be provided with individual feedback once the work has been marked.

Confidentiality

It is important that no individual can be identified either directly or indirectly from the information in the workbook. However, you must:

- adhere to guidance in the Candidate Handbook about confidentiality.
- not identify individuals including witnesses, victims, or offenders by name.
- not write information that enables any individual to be identified indirectly through the description you provide. This includes references to names, colleagues, places (including hospitals, schools, town, villages, streets) specific incidents which were high profile and could be identified due to past publicity, other professionals or any other personal information including medical or other conditions.
- take personal responsibility for adhering to confidentiality rules.
- not include any dates of any incidents or anything that specifically identifies an actual incident.

Please be aware that any content that is deemed to be inappropriate, disrespectful, or abusive will not be tolerated. Following review of any content of this nature the information will be shared with the employer of the student responsible.

Should any health and wellbeing concerns be raised because of disclosures made by the student within this workbook, the employer of the student will be informed.

NOTE

Your workbook will be submitted electronically via Turnitin on Moodle. Guidance on this is in the Candidate Handbook.

Remember that the workbook is YOUR responsibility you must not rely on the assessor or anyone else to pick up any confidentiality breaches as this is your work and you must accept full responsibility for confidentiality. Meeting all the confidentiality requirements is particularly important.

Dyslexia and other special circumstances

If you have any condition that you feel may affect your ability to deal with any part of the programme, please see the Candidate Handbook for further guidance. The University has a Student Services Unit that may be able to help but ***it is the learner's individual responsibility to contact them.***

Competency Based Workbook 2 - Learner Workbook

Guidance:

- Your workbook must contain items 1 - 5 below (in the order given).
- You should use the pro-forma to insert your text within each section.
- Note that this module has 2 components with each weighted at 50% of the overall 100% marks total.
- You should upload your completed document as a saved pdf file of this workbook; if this is not possible then a Word Doc file is acceptable. Do not send a scanned file from a photocopier, an apple.dot file, or a Microsoft publisher file as Turnitin will not be able to assess them, despite you being able to upload them.

Contents

Component 1 50%	Area of Professional Practice	Word count
Task 1	Vulnerability and Risk Evidence-based policing	2000
Task 2	CHOOSE ONLY 1 OF THESE 'ADVANCED LEARNING AREA' OPTIONS. IT SHOULD BE ONE THAT HAS BEEN AGREED WITH THE FORCE TO STUDY IN YEAR 2.	All options are 2000 words
Task 2		2000
Option 1	Response Policing	
Option 2	Policing Communities	
Option 3	Road Policing	
Option 4	Information and Intelligence	
Option 5	Conducting Investigations	
	Bibliography	

Task 1

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum: Vulnerability and Risk, Evidence-based policing

You must choose **a policing incident** in which you played a significant role with a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour and reflect on what happened.

Give a brief description of the incident including social and legislative contexts and any relevant cultural, ethnicity and language issues.

Critically evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches (by professionals and the police) in supporting or managing vulnerable people or people at risk of harm.

Explore what works in relation to tackling repeat victimisation and repeat offending. Consider the use of evidence-based policing.

2000 words (+/- 10%: *include your actual word count at the end of each section*)

ANSWER:

Introduction

Anti-social behaviour (ASB) has been a significant focus of academic research, political debate, and public policy across the United Kingdom for several decades. Broadly defined as behaviour that causes harassment, alarm, or distress to others, ASB encompasses a wide range of activities, including vandalism, verbal abuse, substance misuse, noise nuisance, and persistent neighbour disputes. Although often categorised as "low-level crime", the cumulative impact of anti-social behaviour can be substantial, affecting individual wellbeing, undermining community cohesion, and contributing to wider social disorder (Millie, 2009). Consequently, governments and criminal justice agencies have developed a range of legislative and social interventions aimed at addressing both the causes and consequences of ASB.

This essay critically examines anti-social behaviour within its social and legislative contexts. It explores the structural factors that contribute to ASB, analyses the evolution of legislative responses in the UK, and considers the influence of culture, ethnicity, and language on both perceptions and experiences of anti-social behaviour. The discussion then evaluates different approaches to supporting vulnerable individuals and managing those at risk of causing harm. Finally, the essay assesses strategies for reducing repeat victimisation and repeat offending through the examination of relevant UK case studies before concluding with an assessment of what constitutes effective practice in tackling ASB.

Defining Anti-Social Behaviour

One of the challenges in addressing anti-social behaviour is the absence of a universally accepted definition. In the UK, the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 established the legal foundation for responding to ASB by defining it as behaviour that causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm, or distress to individuals outside the offender's household (Home Office, 1998). Subsequent legislation, most notably the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, refined this framework and consolidated various enforcement mechanisms available to police, local authorities, and housing providers (Home Office, 2014).

Anti-social behaviour can take many forms. Burney (2005) identifies key categories including interpersonal conflicts, environmental nuisance, substance-related disorder, and neighbour disputes. While these behaviours may appear relatively minor in isolation, their persistent nature often has a

significant impact on victims and communities. However, some academics argue that the broad nature of the definition risks criminalising socially marginalised groups, including young people, individuals experiencing homelessness, and those with mental health difficulties. Others maintain that effective legal tools are necessary to protect communities from ongoing harm and to maintain public confidence in local authorities and the criminal justice system.

The Social Context of Anti-Social Behaviour

Understanding anti-social behaviour requires consideration of the broader social conditions in which it occurs. Sociological perspectives frequently emphasise the importance of structural inequalities as underlying drivers of ASB. Factors such as poverty, unemployment, educational exclusion, and housing instability can create environments in which anti-social behaviour becomes more prevalent. Social disorganisation theory, developed by Shaw and McKay (1942), suggests that communities experiencing economic deprivation often lack the informal social controls and community cohesion necessary to prevent offending behaviour.

Young people are particularly associated with anti-social behaviour within public discourse. However, this association may reflect their visibility within public spaces rather than their actual involvement in harmful conduct. Media portrayals and political rhetoric have often amplified concerns about youth behaviour, contributing to moral panics that can influence policy responses.

The impact of anti-social behaviour on victims is equally significant. Research demonstrates that victims often experience anxiety, fear, stress, and reduced quality of life. In severe cases, individuals may feel compelled to move from their homes to escape persistent harassment or nuisance.

Vulnerable groups, including older people, individuals with disabilities, and members of minority communities, may experience disproportionate levels of harm due to existing social vulnerabilities and barriers to accessing support services.

Legislative Responses and Policy Development

Since the late 1990s, anti-social behaviour has occupied a central position within UK criminal justice and community safety policy. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 introduced Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs), which became one of the most recognisable tools used to address persistent nuisance and disorder. The Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 expanded available powers and widened the scope of interventions available to local agencies. Subsequent reforms, including the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, further enhanced police powers within community settings.

A significant shift occurred with the introduction of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. This legislation replaced a complex array of previous measures with six principal tools: Civil Injunctions, Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBOs), Community Protection Notices (CPNs), Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs), dispersal powers, and closure powers. The intention was to simplify enforcement processes and improve the effectiveness of responses to ASB.

Despite these developments, legislative approaches have faced substantial criticism. ASBOs, for example, were criticised for transforming relatively minor nuisance behaviour into criminal offences when breaches occurred, thereby contributing to the criminalisation of vulnerable individuals and young people (Solanki et al., 2006). Critics argue that such measures often focused on controlling behaviour rather than addressing its underlying causes. Although the 2014 reforms incorporated restorative elements, such as the Community Remedy, concerns remain that enforcement mechanisms continue to prioritise punishment over support and prevention (Crawford, 2009).

Cultural, Ethnic and Linguistic Considerations

Anti-social behaviour cannot be fully understood without recognising the influence of cultural, ethnic, and linguistic factors. Perceptions of what constitutes acceptable behaviour vary across different communities and social groups. As a result, behaviours interpreted as anti-social by one group may be regarded as culturally normative by another.

Research has highlighted concerns regarding ethnic disparities in the identification and policing of anti-social behaviour. Minority ethnic communities often report experiences of disproportionate surveillance and enforcement, leading to perceptions of over-policing and discrimination (Bowling & Phillips, 2002). Furthermore, individuals from minority backgrounds may be more likely to be viewed as perpetrators rather than victims of ASB, influencing both reporting practices and official responses. Language barriers present additional challenges. Individuals with limited English proficiency may struggle to report incidents, access support services, or engage with mediation processes. This can leave victims isolated and reduce confidence in public agencies. Addressing these issues requires

culturally competent interventions, effective translation services, and meaningful community engagement to ensure that responses are fair, inclusive, and accessible.

Supporting and Managing Vulnerable Individuals

Increasingly, practitioners and policymakers recognise that many individuals involved in anti-social behaviour are themselves vulnerable and require support rather than purely punitive interventions. Vulnerabilities may include mental health difficulties, substance misuse, learning disabilities, homelessness, or experiences of trauma.

A notable example of effective practice is the Manchester Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH). This model brings together police, social services, housing providers, health professionals, and other agencies to coordinate responses to vulnerable individuals involved in or affected by anti-social behaviour. Evaluations suggest that integrated working has reduced repeat incidents and prevented escalation, particularly when combined with diversionary programmes for young people (Manchester City Council, 2018).

From a critical perspective, supportive approaches are often more appropriate than punitive measures when addressing the needs of vulnerable individuals. Johnstone (2013) argues that sanctions such as fines or imprisonment frequently fail to address underlying causes and may exacerbate social exclusion. For example, penalising individuals experiencing homelessness for nuisance-related behaviour does little to resolve issues such as housing insecurity, addiction, or poor mental health.

Tackling Repeat Victimisation

Repeat victimisation remains one of the most significant challenges associated with anti-social behaviour. Victims who experience persistent ASB often suffer cumulative psychological and emotional harm, making effective intervention essential.

The West Yorkshire Victim Support Pilot provides an example of a victim-centred approach. Introduced in 2017, the initiative offered repeat victims dedicated caseworkers who provided personalised support, safety planning, and advocacy with police and housing providers. Evaluations indicated increased victim satisfaction and improved perceptions of safety among participants (Victim Support, 2017).

The success of such schemes highlights the importance of early intervention and coordinated multi-agency responses. However, challenges remain regarding consistency of provision across different regions. Financial constraints and varying local authority priorities can limit the availability of specialist support services, creating disparities in victim experiences (Crawford et al., 2019).

Tackling Repeat Offending

Reducing repeat offending requires a balance between enforcement and rehabilitation. Traditional punitive measures may provide immediate relief for communities but often fail to address the social and personal factors associated with persistent anti-social behaviour.

The Liverpool Community Justice Centre, which operated between 2005 and 2013, sought to address this issue through a problem-solving court model. The initiative combined judicial oversight with access to support services and community engagement. Although evaluations produced mixed findings regarding reductions in reoffending, the model improved public confidence in the justice system and promoted more holistic responses to offending behaviour (Centre for Justice Innovation, 2014).

Similarly, restorative justice initiatives implemented in several Forces across the UK have demonstrated promising outcomes. By facilitating dialogue between offenders and victims, restorative approaches encourage accountability while addressing the impact of behaviour on affected individuals. Research conducted by the Restorative Justice Council in 2016 found that restorative interventions contributed to reduced rates of repeat offending and increased victim satisfaction compared to traditional punitive sanctions.

These examples support McNeill's (2006) argument that effective offender management must address both structural and individual factors contributing to harmful behaviour. While Criminal Behaviour Orders and similar measures can provide immediate protection for communities, long-term reductions in offending are more likely to be achieved through interventions that address underlying needs and promote social inclusion.

What Works in Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour?

Evidence from research, policy evaluations, and practical case studies consistently suggests that supportive, preventative, and collaborative approaches are more effective than reliance on enforcement alone. While enforcement measures can provide immediate protection to communities

experiencing persistent anti-social behaviour, long-term success is generally achieved when interventions address the underlying causes of offending and vulnerability. A key factor in successful practice is multi-agency collaboration. Anti-social behaviour often involves complex social, economic, and personal issues that cannot be resolved by a single organisation. Partnerships between police services, local authorities, housing providers, health services, schools, and voluntary organisations allow for information sharing and coordinated interventions. Models such as the Manchester Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub demonstrate how collaborative working can reduce repeat incidents while providing support to vulnerable individuals. Cultural competence also plays an important role. Effective responses recognise the diversity of communities and avoid assumptions about behaviour based on ethnicity, age, or cultural background. Training practitioners to understand cultural differences and improve communication can reduce misunderstandings and increase confidence in public services among minority groups. Another significant factor is early intervention. Research consistently demonstrates that addressing risk factors during childhood and adolescence can prevent more serious behavioural problems from developing later in life. Youth mentoring schemes, educational support programmes, family interventions, and diversionary activities provide constructive alternatives to offending behaviour and help strengthen community ties. Victim-centred practice is equally important. Historically, responses to anti-social behaviour have focused heavily on managing offenders, sometimes at the expense of victim needs. Effective interventions ensure that victims are listened to, supported, and involved in decision-making processes. Personalised support, advocacy services, and safety planning can significantly improve outcomes for individuals experiencing repeated victimisation. Finally, restorative justice approaches have shown considerable promise in addressing both offending behaviour and victim harm. By encouraging offenders to understand the consequences of their actions and make amends, restorative practices can promote accountability while reducing reliance on punitive sanctions. Evidence suggests that these approaches can increase victim satisfaction and contribute to lower rates of reoffending. Taken together, these findings indicate that anti-social behaviour is most effectively addressed through a balanced combination of enforcement, prevention, rehabilitation, and community engagement. Such an approach recognises that while accountability remains important, sustainable reductions in anti-social behaviour require a broader understanding of the social conditions that contribute to it.

Conclusion

Anti-social behaviour remains a complex and contested issue situated at the intersection of crime, social policy, and community wellbeing. While legislative frameworks provide important mechanisms for protecting communities and responding to harmful behaviour, they risk contributing to over-criminalisation when applied without consideration of wider social contexts. Poverty, exclusion, inequality, and vulnerability are critical factors in understanding both offending behaviour and victimisation.

Furthermore, cultural, ethnic, and linguistic factors shape how anti-social behaviour is perceived, experienced, and addressed, highlighting the need for fair and culturally competent responses. The evidence reviewed in this essay suggests that effective strategies must move beyond enforcement alone. Approaches that combine prevention, support, rehabilitation, restorative justice, and multi-agency collaboration are more likely to reduce repeat victimisation and repeat offending in the long term.

Ultimately, creating safer and more cohesive communities requires a balanced approach that protects victims while addressing the underlying causes of anti-social behaviour. By embedding principles of fairness, inclusivity, and support within policy and practice, agencies can develop more effective and sustainable responses to ASB.

Word Count 2085

Task 2

Choose 1 of these 5 options to answer

(Note for officers who have an interest in becoming a detective and wish to specialise in this role, you **MUST** choose option 5)

1. Response Policing.
2. Policing Communities.
3. Road Policing.
4. Information and Intelligence.
5. Conducting Investigations.

Task 2 Option 1:

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum:

Response Policing

A core part of the policing mission is to prevent crime and disorder. Domestic abuse causes both serious harm and constitutes a considerable proportion of overall crime

You should choose **a domestic abuse incident** that was of a complex nature, in which you played a significant role in providing a response.

Critically assess the challenges associated with a domestic abuse incident that you have attended, and the strategies developed for effective policing in such challenging situations.

2000 words (+/- 10%: include your actual word count at the end of each section)

ANSWER:

Introduction

Domestic abuse (DA) remains one of the most significant challenges facing policing and public protection agencies across the United Kingdom. The Home Office, 2013 defines domestic abuse as any incident or pattern of incidents involving controlling, coercive, threatening, violent, or abusive behaviour between individuals aged sixteen or over who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members, regardless of gender or sexuality. This definition recognises that domestic abuse extends beyond physical violence and encompasses emotional, psychological, financial, and sexual abuse. Increasingly, research and policy acknowledge that domestic abuse is characterised by patterns of power and control rather than isolated incidents of violence.

The complexity of domestic abuse presents considerable challenges for police officers and partner agencies. Victims often experience significant barriers to reporting abuse, including fear, coercion, financial dependence, concern for children, and mistrust of authorities. Furthermore, perpetrators frequently employ tactics that leave little physical evidence, making investigation and prosecution difficult. The hidden nature of abuse means that many victims remain trapped in abusive relationships for prolonged periods before coming to the attention of criminal justice agencies.

This essay critically examines the challenges associated with policing domestic abuse through the analysis of a complex case encountered during operational policing. The incident demonstrates the difficulties associated with coercive control, victim disengagement, repeat victimisation, safeguarding responsibilities, and offender management. The essay then evaluates a range of policing strategies developed to address these challenges, including risk assessment tools, evidence-led prosecutions, Domestic Violence Protection Orders, Clare's Law, Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences, specialist domestic abuse units, and perpetrator intervention programmes. Through critical analysis, the discussion highlights both the strengths and limitations of current approaches and considers what lessons can be learned for future practice.

A Complex Domestic Abuse Incident

The case examined in this essay involved a married couple where the husband had engaged in a prolonged pattern of coercive and controlling behaviour towards his wife. Over an extended period, the offender isolated the victim from friends and family members, restricted her social interactions, and exerted significant control over various aspects of her daily life. Such behaviour reflects the patterns of coercive control identified by (Stark, 2007), whereby perpetrators systematically undermine a victim's autonomy and independence.

The abuse eventually escalated into serious physical violence, resulting in the victim sustaining significant injuries requiring hospital treatment. While receiving medical care, the victim disclosed the history of abuse and controlling behaviour to hospital staff, who subsequently referred the matter to the police. This disclosure represented a critical intervention point, as victims frequently seek medical assistance before engaging directly with law enforcement agencies.

The suspect was arrested following the disclosure. However, despite the seriousness of the allegations, the victim ultimately declined to support criminal proceedings. As a result, charges were initially brought only in relation to the assault offences. These charges were subsequently discontinued due to insufficient evidence once the victim withdrew support and no further corroborative evidence could be obtained.

Although the criminal investigation faced significant evidential challenges, the incident was assessed as high risk through the completion of a DASH (Domestic Abuse, Stalking and Honour-Based Violence) risk assessment and a Public Protection Notification. Consequently, safeguarding measures were implemented, including the issuing of a Domestic Violence Protection Notice (DVPN), which was later upgraded by the court to a Domestic Violence Protection Order (DVPO). Despite these interventions, the offender repeatedly breached the order, highlighting ongoing concerns regarding perpetrator accountability and victim safety.

This case illustrates many of the challenges associated with domestic abuse policing. It demonstrates the impact of coercive control, victim vulnerability, difficulties in obtaining evidence, risks of repeat victimisation, safeguarding considerations relating to children, and the challenges involved in balancing victim autonomy with the responsibility to protect individuals from harm.

Challenges in Policing Complex Domestic Abuse Cases

Victim Reluctance and Withdrawal from Proceedings

One of the most persistent challenges in domestic abuse investigations is victim reluctance to engage with the criminal justice process. Research consistently demonstrates that victims frequently withdraw statements or decline to support prosecutions due to fear of retaliation, emotional attachment to the perpetrator, financial dependence, or concerns regarding child custody arrangements (Hoyle & Sanders, 2000).

In the case discussed, the victim's unwillingness to support prosecution significantly affected the ability of police and prosecutors to pursue charges. This reflects Stark's (2007) argument that coercive control extends beyond physical violence and often creates psychological barriers that prevent victims from seeking justice. Victims may perceive cooperation with authorities as increasing their risk of harm rather than enhancing their safety.

For police officers, this creates a significant dilemma. While respecting victim autonomy remains a fundamental principle, officers also have a duty to prevent harm and protect vulnerable individuals. Balancing these competing considerations requires sensitivity, professional judgement, and effective safeguarding measures.

Coercive Control and Invisible Harm

Historically, domestic abuse policing focused primarily on incidents involving physical violence. However, growing recognition of coercive control has transformed understanding of abuse. The offence of controlling or coercive behaviour introduced under Section 76 of the Serious Crime Act 2015 represented an important shift towards recognising non-physical forms of abuse.

Despite this legislative progress, coercive control remains difficult to identify and prosecute. Unlike physical assaults, coercive behaviour often consists of numerous seemingly minor acts that collectively create a pattern of domination and control. Examples include monitoring communications, restricting access to finances, isolating victims from support networks, and regulating daily activities.

The challenge for police officers lies in evidencing these patterns. Successful investigations often require the collection of text messages, social media records, financial documents, witness statements, and detailed victim accounts. This demands significant investigative resources and specialist knowledge.

Children as Secondary Victims

Children living in households affected by domestic abuse are increasingly recognised as victims in their own right. Research suggests that exposure to domestic abuse can have long-term psychological, emotional, and developmental consequences comparable to direct abuse (Callaghan et al., 2018). Such experiences are often categorised as Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs), which are associated with poorer outcomes in adulthood.

In practice, safeguarding children presents complex challenges. Victims may fear that disclosing abuse could result in social services intervention or even the removal of children from the family home. This concern can discourage reporting and reduce engagement with investigations. Police officers must therefore work closely with social services and other safeguarding partners to ensure that children are protected while maintaining the confidence of non-abusive parents. Failure to achieve this balance can inadvertently discourage future disclosures.

Cultural, Ethnic and Language Barriers

Domestic abuse occurs across all communities; however, victims from minority ethnic backgrounds may face additional obstacles when seeking support. These can include fears of community ostracism, concerns regarding immigration status, language barriers, and risks associated with honour-based abuse (Thiara & Gill, 2010).

Language difficulties may prevent victims from fully understanding legal processes or accessing support services. Cultural expectations surrounding family honour, gender roles, and marriage can also influence decisions about reporting abuse.

For police services, these challenges highlight the importance of culturally competent practice. Officers must avoid assumptions based on ethnicity or culture while ensuring that responses are tailored to the specific needs of individual victims.

Evidence and Prosecution Challenges

Domestic abuse prosecutions have traditionally relied heavily on victim testimony. Consequently, when victims withdraw support, many cases fail to proceed. This has led to increasing emphasis on evidence-led prosecutions, where cases are built using independent evidence such as body-worn video footage, 999 recordings, medical reports, photographs, and witness testimony.

Despite growing awareness of these approaches, implementation remains inconsistent. Officers may lack confidence in identifying evidential opportunities, while resource pressures can limit thorough investigations. As a result, opportunities to prosecute dangerous offenders are sometimes missed.

Repeat Victimisation and Escalation

Domestic abuse is characterised by high levels of repeat victimisation. Research consistently demonstrates that previous abuse is one of the strongest predictors of future abuse. Escalation in severity is also common, with many domestic homicides occurring following a history of repeated incidents.

The repeated breaches of the DVPO in the case discussed illustrate this challenge. Protective orders may provide temporary safeguards, but without effective monitoring and enforcement, perpetrators can continue to pose significant risks.

Strategies for Effective Domestic Abuse Policing

Over the past two decades, policing strategies have evolved significantly in response to growing understanding of domestic abuse.

Risk Assessment and Multi-Agency Safeguarding

The DASH risk assessment tool is widely used to identify high-risk domestic abuse cases. Information obtained through the assessment informs safeguarding decisions and referrals to specialist services. Where cases are assessed as high risk, they are often referred to Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs) or managed through Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs (MASHs). These arrangements bring together police, social services, health professionals, schools, housing providers, and specialist domestic abuse services.

The principal strength of these approaches lies in their ability to share information and coordinate interventions. However, critics argue that risk assessment tools can encourage a "tick-box" approach and may not always capture the complexity of individual cases (Robinson & Clancy, 2020), this has led to the new development of a risk assessment tool called Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment (DARA) which captures the abuse suffered from the survivor more accurately and allows a greater

range of the survivors opinions to be captured and collated to assist partner agencies to better manage and identify risks.

Evidence-Led Prosecutions

Evidence-led prosecutions seek to reduce reliance on victim testimony by utilising alternative sources of evidence. The increased use of body-worn video cameras has significantly enhanced investigative opportunities by capturing victim demeanour, injuries, and spontaneous disclosures.

Research suggests that body-worn video can improve prosecution outcomes and reduce victim attrition. Nevertheless, evidence-led investigations require substantial investment in technology, training, and investigative capacity.

Domestic Violence Protection Notices and Orders

DVPNs and DVPOs were introduced under the Crime and Security Act 2010 to provide immediate protection for victims. These measures allow police and courts to impose temporary restrictions on perpetrators, preventing contact with victims and enabling victims to access support services.

The principal benefit of these orders is the provision of immediate safeguarding. However, concerns remain regarding their relatively short duration and the effectiveness of enforcement. In practice, breaches are not always dealt with robustly, potentially undermining confidence in the protective measures available.

Clare's Law

The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, commonly known as Clare's Law, allows individuals to request information regarding a partner's history of abusive behaviour. Police may also proactively disclose relevant information where necessary to protect potential victims.

While the scheme empowers individuals to make informed decisions, disclosure alone does not guarantee safety. Victims may remain unable or unwilling to leave abusive relationships due to emotional, financial, or practical barriers.

Specialist Domestic Abuse Units and Perpetrator Programmes

Specialist domestic abuse units have improved expertise within policing and enhanced victim engagement. Officers working within these units often possess greater knowledge of coercive control, risk assessment, and safeguarding processes.

Alongside enforcement measures, perpetrator programmes seek to address the attitudes and behaviours that underpin abuse. Although some programmes have shown promising results, evidence regarding long-term effectiveness remains mixed.

Critical Assessment

Current domestic abuse strategies represent significant progress compared to the historically limited responses offered by criminal justice agencies. However, important challenges remain.

Firstly, tensions continue to exist between victim protection and victim autonomy. While safeguarding interventions are essential, there is a risk that victims may feel excluded from decisions affecting their lives. Effective practice requires meaningful victim involvement rather than purely paternalistic interventions.

Secondly, legislative reform alone cannot address the social and economic factors that contribute to victim vulnerability. Housing shortages, financial dependency, and limited access to specialist services continue to prevent many victims from leaving abusive relationships.

Thirdly, resource constraints remain a significant obstacle. HMICFRS inspections have repeatedly identified inconsistencies in police responses, often linked to training deficiencies and staffing pressures. Without adequate investment, even well-designed policies may fail to achieve their intended outcomes.

Finally, more attention must be paid to perpetrator accountability. While victim safety rightly remains a priority, sustainable reductions in domestic abuse require interventions that challenge offender behaviour and reduce reoffending.

Conclusion

Domestic abuse remains one of the most complex and challenging areas of contemporary policing. The case examined in this essay demonstrates how coercive control, victim reluctance, safeguarding responsibilities, repeat victimisation, and offender non-compliance can combine to create significant operational and ethical challenges.

Although policing responses have evolved considerably through the introduction of risk assessment tools, evidence-led prosecutions, Domestic Violence Protection Orders, Clare's Law, MARACs, specialist units, and perpetrator programmes, substantial barriers remain. Effective responses require more than criminal justice intervention alone; they depend upon coordinated multi-agency working, specialist support services, robust safeguarding arrangements, and a commitment to understanding the complex realities faced by victims.

Ultimately, successful domestic abuse policing requires a balance between protection and empowerment. By combining legal powers with victim-centred practice, cultural sensitivity, and long-term investment in support services, police and partner agencies can improve outcomes for victims while holding perpetrators accountable. Only through such a holistic approach can the cycle of abuse be effectively challenged and long-term community safety achieved.

Word count 4251

Task 2 Option 2:

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum:

Policing Communities

Criminal justice faces ever more challenges from society. While official figures show a drop in police recorded crime in the UK the distribution of crime shows a more complex pattern with violent crime showing a rise.

Regarding community policing chose an incident that you have attended that presented a complex issue for the community, and that you played a significant role in providing a response.

Critically evaluate a range of interventions that you have employed to promote community engagement that assisted in resolving the issue.

2000 words (+/- 10%: *include your actual word count at the end of each section*)

Answer:

Task 2 Option 3

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum:

Road Policing

The police are the lead agency for collision investigation and have the primary duty to investigate and establish the circumstances that have led to road deaths and life changing injuries.

Describe a serious collision that you attended and in which you took a significant role (e.g., initial reporting officer, scene manager, lead investigator).

Critically evaluate the evidence base that you dealt with and strategies that could be implemented to reduce the likelihood of it reoccurring.

2000 words (+/- 10%: *include your actual word count at the end of each section*)

Answer:

Task 2 Option 4

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum:

Information and Intelligence

You should choose an investigation that you have been involved in **that was of a complex nature**, in which you played a significant role.

Critically analyse an investigation, that you have led, commenting on the effectiveness of the National Intelligence Model and the importance of the role played by cross border cooperation in relation to your information and intelligence.

Reference how effective information and intelligence was used within your operation, and how you used specialist intelligence roles to support your complex investigation.

2000 words (+/- 10%: *include your actual word count at the end of each section*)

Answer:

Task 2 Option 5

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum:

Conducting Investigations

You should choose an investigation that you have been involved in **that was of a complex nature**, in which you played a significant role.

Critically evaluate the processes employed in a complex investigation you have been involved in, and the fast-track actions that you have utilised.

Evaluate the support you have provided to victims, witnesses, and offenders (where appropriate) during a complex investigation and reference the management of your own personal values and attitudes in relation to this.

2000 words (+/- 10%: *include your actual word count at the end of each section*)

Answer:

Authentication signature:

Please sign to confirm that the work submitted is your own and has not been copied from another:

Signed:

Date:

Bibliography

The bibliography should only include sources referenced within the workbook using the Harvard referencing system. Information about referencing in written assignments and how to avoid plagiarism can be found on Moodle. It is important that you are aware of the importance of ensuring that the work submitted is your original work.

Bowling, B. & Phillips, C. (2002). *Racism, Crime and Justice*. Longman.

Burney, E. (2005). *Making People Behave: Anti-social Behaviour, Politics and Policy*. Routledge.

Callaghan, J.E.M., Alexander, J.H., Fellin, L.C. & Sixsmith, J. (2018). Beyond “witnessing”: Children’s experiences of coercive control in domestic violence and abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(10), 1551–1581.

Centre for Justice Innovation. (2014). *Community Justice in England and Wales: Lessons from the Past, Directions for the Future*.

Crawford, A. (2009). Criminalising Sociability through Anti-Social Behaviour Legislation: Dispersal Powers, Young People and the Police. *Youth Justice*, 9(1), pp. 5–26.

Crawford, A., Lewis, S., & Traynor, P. (2019). *Anti-social Behaviour Strategies: Findings from a Longitudinal Study*. University of Leeds.

Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC). (2011). *Hidden in Plain Sight: Inquiry into Disability-Related Harassment*.

Farrell, G. & Pease, K. (2001). Repeat victimisation. In N. Tilley (ed.), *Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety*. Willan.

Flatley, J., Moley, S., Hoare, J. & Tseloni, A. (2008). *Experience of Anti-Social Behaviour: Findings from the 2007/08 British Crime Survey*. Home Office.

Flint, J. & Nixon, J. (2006). Governing Neighbours: Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and New Forms of Regulating Conduct in the UK. *Urban Studies*, 43(5–6), pp. 939–955.

Harries, R. (2006). *Experiences of Anti-Social Behaviour: Findings from the 2004/05 British Crime Survey*. Home Office.

Hester, M. (2013). Who does what to whom? Gender and domestic violence perpetrators. *European Journal of Criminology*, 10(5), 623–637.

HMICFRS. (2014). *Everyone’s Business: Improving the Police Response to Domestic Abuse*. London: HMICFRS.

HMICFRS. (2017). *A Progress Report on the Police Response to Domestic Abuse*. London: HMICFRS.

Home Office. (2013). *Domestic Violence and Abuse: New Definition*.

Home Office. (1998). *Crime and Disorder Act 1998*. HMSO.

Home Office. (2014). *Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014: Reform of Anti-Social Behaviour Powers*. HMSO.

Hoyle, C. & Sanders, A. (2000). Police response to domestic violence: From victim choice to victim empowerment? *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(1), 14–36.

Johnstone, G. (2013). *Restorative Justice: Ideas, Values, Debates*. Routledge.

Kelly, L. & Westmarland, N. (2016). *Domestic violence perpetrator programmes: Steps towards change*. Project Mirabal Final Report. London: Durham University/London Metropolitan University.

Manchester City Council. (2018). *Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub Annual Report*.

- Matthews, R., Easton, H., Briggs, D., & Pease, K. (2007). *Assessing the Use and Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders*. Policy Press.
- Myhill, A. (2015). *Measuring coercive control: What can we learn from national population surveys? Violence Against Women*
- McNeill, F. (2006). A Desistance Paradigm for Offender Management. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(1), pp. 39–62.
- Millie, A. (2009). *Anti-Social Behaviour*. McGraw Hill/Open University Press.
- Phillips, C. & Bowling, B. (2017). Ethnicities, Racism, Crime and Criminal Justice. In Liebling, A., Maruna, S. & McAra, L. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford University Press.
- Restorative Justice Council. (2016). *Restorative Justice in Practice: Case Studies across England and Wales*.
- Robinson, A.L. (2003). The Cardiff Women's Safety Unit: A multi-agency approach to domestic violence. *Wales Journal of Law and Policy*, 2(2), 195–213.
- Robinson, A.L. (2004). Domestic violence MARACs (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences): A joint initiative to protect victims of domestic violence. Cardiff University Report.
- Robinson, A.L. & Clancy, A. (2020). Risk-led policing of domestic abuse and the DASH risk model. *Policing and Society*, 30(2), 173–188.
- Sampson, R. & Raudenbush, S. (1999). Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighbourhoods. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3), pp. 603–651.
- Shaw, C. & McKay, H. (1942). *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. University of Chicago Press.
- Solanki, A., Bateman, T., Boswell, G., & Hill, E. (2006). *Anti-Social Behaviour Orders: A Culture of Compliance*. Home Office Research Study 235.
- Squires, P. & Stephen, D. (2005). Rethinking ASBOs. *Critical Social Policy*, 25(3), pp. 517–528.
- Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steel, N., Blakeborough, L., & Nicholas, S. (2011). *Supporting high-risk victims of domestic violence: A review of Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACs)*. London: Home Office.
- Thiara, R. & Gill, A. (2010). *Violence against Women in South Asian Communities: Issues for Policy and Practice*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Victim Support. (2017). *Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour: Supporting Repeat Victims*.
- Walklate, S., McCulloch, J., Fitz-Gibbon, K. & Maher, J. (2019). *Domestic Violence Disclosure Schemes: A Global Perspective*. Routledge.
- Westmarland, N., Kelly, L., & Chalder-Mills, J. (2018). *Domestic Violence Protection Orders (DVPOs): A Process Evaluation*. London: Home Office.