

Title: Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: Perspectives from voluntary advisors

Abstract:

*Purpose:* Third party reporting services provide a route for victims of hate crime to report their experiences to an organisation other than the police. There is repeated evidence of under-reporting of hate crimes within the UK, and many victims of hate crime are unaware of the existence of third party reporting (TPR) mechanisms. Little research attention has been given to an understanding of the merits of TPR, beyond evaluating how often they are used. This study explored the delivery of TPR from an advisor perspective. *Design/methodology/approach:* The research evaluated a small third party reporting centre based within a charitable organisation. The research, part of an undergraduate study, analysed the experiences of volunteer advisors working on the service through a semi-structured questionnaire. *Findings:* Results were mixed. Findings indicated the service contributed to an enhanced awareness of hate crimes in the community, however, greater promotion of the TPR centre was advocated. The results also indicated a significant lack of understanding and knowledge by trained volunteer advisors about hate crimes. *Originality:* Most hate crime research is victim centred and this study is innovative in looking at those receiving hate crime reports. There is limited evidence on third party reporting service provision in the UK, particularly on service delivery staff, and this research contributes to the gap in knowledge. *Implications:* A lack of informed awareness of what hate crimes are could result in victims of hate crime not being recognised or supported as such.

Key words: hate crime, third party reporting, qualitative research, volunteers, victims

## Introduction

Hate crime is a significant social and criminal justice issue which impacts upon victims, their families and our communities (Home Office, 2016), despite significant under-reporting (Hardy, 2019). Following the United Kingdom's (UK) referendum on leaving the European Union (EU) in 2016, recorded hate crimes increased in England and Wales by an estimated 29 percent, to record levels at the time (Chakraborti, 2018; O'Neil, 2017). Figures continue to grow and in 2021 there were 124,091 hate crimes reported in England and Wales, an increase of 9% on the previous year alone (Home Office, 2021). Structural and wider social and economic factors such as the Home Office's 'hostile environment' policy on immigration and more recently the Covid-19 pandemic are potentially contributing to the rise in hate crimes (Hill, 2017; Gray and Hansen, 2021). Dorset, in the South West of England, experienced the highest percentage increase of hate crime reporting, with figures from the last 5 years showing an increase from 726 hate crimes in 2018/19 to 1,021 in 2020-21 (Home Office, 2021). Dorset's population is relatively small and geographically spread, with approximately 773,000 people living in the county, the majority of whom are in the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole unitary area, of which 91.9% identify as White British (ONS, 2020).

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

In 2018, the Home Office funded a significant number of regional and community projects within their 'Building a Stronger Britain' scheme to address hate crimes and improve reporting and recording through a strategic focus on targeting extremism. Funding was made available via the Home Office's Counter Extremist Strategy (2015) for charities and organisations to run hate crime projects. This suggests that the nexus between hate crimes and extremism lacks clarity from a national, strategic perspective, reflecting perhaps governmental ambiguity on the distinction (and any relationship) between hate crimes and extremism (Zedner, 2021). One such project to be awarded funding was a charitable organisation in Dorset who were awarded funds to promote hate crime awareness and improve third party reporting services. For the purposes of this paper, we have called the provider "CAD". The project was established in January 2019 to address hate crime within a predominantly urban area and with its own dedicated third party reporting (TPR) service.

Third party reporting services were introduced in the wake of the Macpherson Inquiry's (1999) recommendations to engage with marginalised communities who were reluctant to report to the police and to address the problem of under-reporting. CAD had not previously been a TPR service provider and this research was designed to evaluate its effectiveness. The researcher was particularly interested in the views of voluntary service advisors about their experiences of the project and their engagement with community members. The primary goal of this study was therefore to understand how Dorset communities were interacting with the CAD from an advisor's perspective. The advisors who work for CAD are volunteers and arguably a core element to the organisation. Insight from the perspectives of the advisors was invaluable, in that they are at the frontline of TPR reporting: receiving and passing information, advice and guidance on to the victims. As the advisors directly receive and respond to hate crime reports, these individuals offer valuable insights into reporting trends and patterns.

### **Understanding Hate Crime**

There have been repeated attempts to achieve an agreed definition of hate crime in both academic and policy arenas (Hall, 2013). As a result, there is no single framework that defines hate crime, but efforts have been made to create a common understanding. The Crown Prosecution Service (2018, p.2) defines hate crime as:

“any criminal offence which is perceived by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice based on a person's race or perceived race; religion or perceived religion; sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation; disability or perceived disability and any crime motivated by hostility or prejudice against a person who is transgender or perceived to be transgender”

Hate crime as a concept gained most recognition in the UK following the murder of Stephen Lawrence. The 'Stephen Lawrence Inquiry' (Macpherson, 1999) became a catalyst for hate crime legislation and laid the groundwork for victim-focussed policing. Macpherson's report made a number of recommendations for policing practice, following its identification of institutional racism in the Metropolitan Police and acknowledgement of ethnic stereotyping and disadvantages to ethnic minorities (Hall, 2013). There are currently five strands of hate crime protected by legislation, including race or ethnicity, religion or beliefs, sexual orientation, disability, and transgender identity (Home Office, 2016), though these are currently undergoing a review by the Law Commission (2020). Whilst the Macpherson Report laid the foundations for race hate legislation, other major events Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

within the UK helped shape subsequent legislation, such as the nail bomber attacks (Donovan *et al.*, 2018) on spaces and geographical areas frequented by LGBTQ residents and ethnic minority groups. These events led to the addition of religion as a monitored strand in the Anti-Terrorism Crime and Security Act, and sexual orientation (2001; Donovan *et al.*, 2018). Consequently, transgender identity and disability were introduced by legislation within Section 146 of the Criminal Justice Act (2003). With each additional legal enactment, public awareness of hate crimes grew. Hence, policy and legislation has increased visibility of hate crimes and attempted to improve the way it is responded to. The College of Policing (2014) provides guidance for setting policing standards, which includes responding to hate crimes. This includes a requirement to record all hate crimes and hate incidents (non-crime events). They state:

“The police service must provide an appropriate level of service to victims of hate crime. All officers and staff must have a clear understanding of what constitutes a hate incident and a hate crime. They must understand motivation and which strands of hate crime are monitored and which are not.” (College of Policing, 2014, p.9)

Scholars will debate definitions for hate crime but it is the word ‘hate’ that is most troublesome and potentially misleading. Society uses *hate* commonly with enthusiasm (Hall, 2013), but it is questionable as to whether individuals understand the context and meaning of the word in relation to hate *crimes*. Hate crimes are better understood as those crime that are motivated by prejudice, hostility and bias towards a particular protected characteristic. As such, it is generally accepted that much of hate crime is about hostility or prejudice, of which hatred is perhaps only part (Hall, 2013), as can be evidenced from the definition used above. The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) also distinguishes between a hate crime and a hate incident. Both forms of hate data are recorded, as a pattern of incidents could suggest potential social problems or lead on to further criminal behaviour (College of Policing, 2014). However, these definitions rely on the *perception* of the victim (or any other person) and many victims are unsure exactly what a hate crime is (Chakraborti, Garland and Hardy, 2014). Consequently, there is the risk that victims of hate *incidents* may feel unduly let down by a criminal justice system that fails to recognise their experiences as hate *crime* (Healy, 2020). Thus, an understanding of the parameters and meaning of both hate crimes and hate incidents are important for responding to hate crime victimisation.

### **Third Party Reporting Services (TPRs)**

There are many factors which contribute to victims feeling able or willing to report their experiences of hate crimes. These include recognition that a crime has taken place, a fear of reprisals, previous experience with the police and a normalisation, or acceptance, of what is happening to them (Chakraborti, Garland and Hardy 2014; Wong and Christmann, 2008; Iganski, 2008). Unfortunately, hate crime reporting numbers are considered low compared to other forms of crime and decision making in relation to reporting is continuing to create challenges for criminal justice agencies (Hardy, 2019). Consequently, there has been an increase in reporting to non-criminal justice organisations (Chakraborti, Garland and Hardy, 2014) such as TPRs. Link and Phelan (2001) suggest that perpetrators target stigmatized minorities because they are different. Similar motivations are proposed by Perry’s theory of ‘doing difference’ (2001), which considers how stigmatised individuals are rejected or Othered by perpetrators. Reporting hate crime allows potentially stigmatised individuals to take action, alongside an expectation that police will address the offending behaviour.

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

Those who do not choose to report to the police or other agencies often suffer in silence by not receiving support services (Hardy, 2019). Hence, TPR services were introduced to help those marginalised communities who were unwilling or unable to report directly to the police, providing an alternative reporting mechanism and a source of support (Macpherson Inquiry, 1999). TPR services provide opportunities for victims to report their experiences through alternative providers to the police, through a 'third' party. Services are usually run by charities, educational providers, and sporting organisations, with funding from stakeholders or government. The goals of many TPR centres are to target marginalised or fearful individuals or communities, providing them with an alternative avenue to report their experiences of hate crimes. These TPRs in turn report those experiences to police to provide additional intelligence on otherwise unreported patterns of behaviour.

TPR was lauded within the Home Office (2016) Hate Crime Action Plan, as an opportunity to improve hate crime reporting overall but especially via local organisations, such as charities like CAD. There were concerns that victims did not feel that the police took hate crime cases seriously enough, especially when perpetrators were not identifiable. However, evaluations of TPR services are extremely limited in extant literature and no studies have to date consider the experiences of those in the TPR services who receive the reports.

Currently, the limited research into TPR provision that exists suggests that those in vulnerable communities particularly are unaware of TPR services for victims and witnesses (Wong and Christmann, 2016). Wong and Christmann (2008), in a study on TPR services in the UK, found that victims were more likely to report to the police than a TPR site as they felt they would benefit from a more immediate response from the police. This is reinforced through Hardy's (2019) research which found that only 14.5% of her participants utilised TPR centres. Hardy conducted interviews which also documented how the majority of victims of hate crimes were not aware of what TPR was.

Funding is a major barrier to delivery for TPR service providers, as these are often charitable organisations that rely on government or stakeholder financial support. Donovan and colleagues (2018) conducted analysis of TPR services provided by the Arch reporting centre in the north west of England. This centre was funded by four local authorities and began as a 24-7 helpline for racist incidents then expanded over time. At the peak of their success they provided 93 reporting centres in hot spots where hate crime was perceived to be high, collecting as many as 3,908 hate crime incidents. Unfortunately, funding for the project was cut in 2015, resulting in a reduction of service to a telephone helpline only, suggesting that, despite national guidance, TPR provision was not a priority for local government.

In contrast to Wong and Christmann, above, Pickles' (2019) research with young LGBT+ individuals provided insight to young people's perspectives on TPR services. Although a small sample, the research confirmed that individuals did not want to report hate crime experiences to police but would prefer to report to youth workers and adults. Like Donovan *et al.*'s (2018) research, they identified increasing reporting numbers of hate crimes and incidents within TPR centres, demonstrating positive engagement when active service providers engage with their communities.

Existing research therefore exposes questions as to the utility of TPR centres and their strategies to promoting reporting. Overall, the evidence highlights how few studies there are in TPR services in England and Wales, and suggests a mixed response in terms of their utility and import. This research study was keen to investigate the use of TPR services in an organisation where the first author was

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

volunteering, and is the first of its kind to garner information from the voluntary advisors who provide a potentially vital service.

## **Methodology**

CAD had nine voluntary advisors who were trained on receiving reports of hate crimes and incidents. As this was a newly funded project which the first author was also working on in another area, the opportunity arose for him to evaluate the volunteers' experiences of the project. In discussions with CAD personnel, a questionnaire was the most preferred method of data collection for the participants, and all nine volunteers were approached and invited to participate. Seven agreed to do so. A qualitative questionnaire was distributed by hand by the first author, and collected a week later. Predominant methods of hate crime research have tended to prefer focus groups or interviews (Gadd *et al.*, 2005), however, because of the nature of volunteering and the capacity of the advisors, interviews and focus groups were unsuitable. Given the small size of the cohort, the only personal information collected was the length of time they had volunteered at CAD.

The research had full ethical approval from Bournemouth University's Social Science Ethics sub-committee and complied with the British Society of Criminology (2020) ethical guidelines. The questionnaire included 14 questions, the majority of which were open-ended, written questions, with the option to add additional comments if they wished to, on the bottom of the form. Results were analysed thematically (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

One obvious limitation of the study was the small pool of participants, and findings presented below must be considered in light of this. We acknowledge that this is a small sample size, however, represents the majority of TPR advisors working within this specific organisation. Similar to Pickles (2019), we argue that their insights are thus representative and make a valuable contribution to extant debate around the value of TPRs, due to the limited research currently available. The studies presented in the previous section were somewhat larger; for example, Wong and Christmann's (2008) research included 47 participants, however, the majority of research in this field similarly applied a qualitative approach, including purposive sampling of participants with specific expertise and experience. This study aligns with their approach, adding to the body of knowledge in this subject area. The sample size herein thus reflects the optimum number of participants available, given the small size of CAD's volunteer pool, and the pragmatic approach of the researcher (Marshall, 1996). The findings present a rich, contextualised interpretation of the experiences of a hard to reach group, amplifying the desire for further research in this field (Polit and Beck, 2010).

## **Findings**

The thematic analysis of the qualitative questionnaires produced several themes which were categorised broadly into the following sections: insufficient training, funding constraints, inadequate hate crime awareness and aspirational community engagement.

### *Insufficient training*

Organisational and subject-specific training is essential for CAD advisors, who are mandated to complete an on-site training programme before they become a qualified advisor. This includes an introduction to the organisation, its services and reporting systems, and to ensure volunteers are up

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

to date with legislation and guidelines. Additionally, Hate Crime Project advisors were trained in responding to third party reports. The responses given throughout the questionnaire however demonstrated a disappointing and concerning lack of knowledge of what a hate crime is, and a lack of awareness of the types of incidents that can occur. When asked “what is a hate crime” each participant gave a different answer, as these examples below demonstrate:

‘A crime committed against a person motivated by negative feelings towards a protected characteristic’

‘Some form of incident directed at someone in relation to a protected characteristic - Discrimination of you’

Advisors did not specify what they meant by ‘protected characteristic’ and referred to Equality Act legislation rather than hate crime policy.

Another defined hate crime as:

‘A crime motivated by prejudice, race, sexual orientation’

This definition indicates a lack of awareness of hate incidents, and of religious, disability and transgender motivated hate crimes.

The definitions proffered by the advisors suggest a limited level of knowledge and understanding as to what constitutes a hate crime. Some responses do link to official hate crime definitions using common vocabulary such as ‘motivated’ and ‘prejudice’ however there is no mention of demonstration of hostility, or of hate incidents, suggesting a lack of wider conceptual understanding. Prosecution policy guidance states that hate crimes are either motivated by hostility or prejudice (as discussed above), or a demonstration of hostility or prejudice (CPS, 2019). Improvements to training are therefore warranted.

Advisors were asked for suggestions as to where the project could improve in future. Participant ‘B’ responded with ‘what contributes to a hate crime’. This is deeply concerning. Given that the advisors were trained to respond to hate crime reports one would expect an understanding of the motivations for hate crimes would be part of this training. Overall, responses indicated an urgent need for additional training.

Awareness training is especially important within different reporting structures. As TPR services are offered as an alternate reporting route to the police, victims are less likely to report to them if their experiences are not recognised as constituting hate crimes. This finding was demonstrated in Question 12 where advisors were asked would they recommend this project to other people. Participant E stated, ‘after contacting the police, then yes’. Thus, even an established advisor would not recommend this reporting centre as a primary mechanism for reporting. One of the goals of the project was for victims to report hate crime to CAD when they do not feel able to contact the police. However, if advisors are unable to recognise what a hate crime is, they cannot be logged and reported onwards. Healy (2018) proposes that a failure to recognise the impact of reporting apparently minor incidents of hate crime is problematic in terms of identifying an accurate figure of hate crime experiences and avoiding escalation to further, more serious incidents and crimes.

### *Funding Constraints*

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

As stated above, CAD were issued with a grant from the Government scheme 'Building a Stronger Britain' (2019). Funding pressures were a concern for the advisors, understandable given that CAD is a charity with a limited number of employees. Participants agreed that the project needed further funding to continue its work. Participant A stated: 'we need to keep the project going, this will be easier to do so with funding'. For most hate crime projects lack of funding is a barrier to success, as was demonstrated in the research on the Arch project (Donovan *et al.*, 2018), who saw their successful TPR services being reduced to a telephone helpline.

Despite the advisors' belief that the project was performing well and deserves additional funding, its success relies on community members feeling able to report their experiences to it. When asked about their views on this, Participant (C) stated: 'Depends. Engagement not awareness', somewhat surprisingly given that both actions should be part of service provision. Victims cannot engage with a service if they are not aware of it. Without community engagement, the project cannot claim to deliver an effective service. Relatedly, only two of the advisors stated that they had received hate crime reports, suggesting that either there is limited community awareness of the project, or that advisors were not recognising reports made to them *as hate crimes*. Although this project offers more than just TPR services (it also offers training for frontline workers which has helped create an impact) the core objective of this project is clearly lacking. It must be considered that the reason for a lack of reports may be a lack of *recognition* by advisors of hate crime experiences.

#### *Inadequate Hate Crime Awareness*

Project awareness was a key theme to emerge from the analysis. Participants were asked how CAD could improve the project and the consensus was that greater public awareness and promotion of the scheme was needed. For example:

'Public more aware, of reporting and what contributes to a hate crime'

'More awareness, integrate more if possible, delivery the core system'

'Raise Awareness'

As discussed above, most advisors did not receive any reports of hate crime over the project period (or the time they had been volunteering) and as such a correlation between awareness and reporting figures is likely. This is a pattern within TPR research as Hardy (2019) acknowledges that the utilisation of these services is low usually because victims were unaware of what TPR services can provide.

Similarly, the advisors were 'not aware of alternates' of other TPR services in their local area (Participant B). In fact, CAD's TPR services were in competition with over 20 other localised TPR centres in the region (Dorset Police, 2020), some of which were well established in supporting minority communities experiences of hate crime victimisation. Standing out amongst an overabundance of TPR options is crucial when there are so many services that victims could report to, not including national reporting mechanisms such as True Vision or Tell Mama. This suggests that other reporting centres in the region have a more established foothold in TPR services and a recognised identity for communities, or are connected to a landmark institution, such as educational facilities, local government, or sporting clubs. However, if this pattern were to be replicated in other urban areas, it suggests there exists a crowded market for TPR centres, many of which may fail to

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

make an impact and garner much engagement, calling into question any financial value to their provision.

Victim decision-making can be influenced by which service they feel offers the best support, and many will turn to organisations that align with their specific identity characteristic(s). CAD did not have an established foothold in providing TPR support in the area prior to the project and did not align with a specific identity or strand of hate crime. Additionally, if value for money is a factor in resourcing TPR services then many may be at risk of losing financial support due to lack of uptake or competing local priorities, as demonstrated in Donovan *et al.*'s study. The CAD project had a social media campaign that regularly promoted the service online, to encourage community uptake, but this appears to have been unsuccessful, given the reported numbers.

Similar to this study, Wong and Christmann (2008) found very limited awareness of local TPR services in their research of victim decision making in reporting hate crimes. Only five of their 47 participants were aware of TPR services in their community, despite some being affiliated with the organisations delivering TPR. Their findings were comparable to this study, in that they identified a wide selection of TPR services on offer, many of whom were relatively new to the provision, as with CAD. As such, they argue that TPR centres failed to provide a "known, effective and credible service" to vulnerable victims of hate crimes (p.31), and this evidence suggests a similar pattern exists in Dorset.

#### *Aspirational Community Engagement*

The geographical area that CAD cover is diverse. Recent statistics have shown an increase of hate crime within Dorset (Home Office, 2020), suggesting a need for alternative reporting provision for at-risk communities. Some advisors recognised the benefit to the local area from this project, given increases in hate crime numbers locally and nationally. For example, Participant A stated that there was a need for this project because of 'how society is at this current time'. Likewise, Participant B stated that: 'there are issues which need to be addressed' within the community which this project could deliver on. There is a conscious awareness of the wider community concerns of increasing discrimination, prejudice and intolerance, particularly given the dominance of white British residents in the county. Community wellbeing was a significant driver for the participants. For example, Participant E told us: 'Discrimination is too big to ignore'. The EU referendum highlighted views and opinions which, for many, placed immigration as a central theme. This was acknowledged by Participant E who said that 'Race, political, worldwide events lead to a spike in a number of cases (Brexit, Coronavirus)'. This view aligns with a recognition of increased hate crimes after the EU referendum (BBC News, 2017; O'Neil 2017), underlining the importance for communities to be able to report hate crime victimisation. Participant A wrote that they believed that the project was needed 'due to the current political climate.' TPR services therefore have an opportunity to provide an essential role in gathering reports from vulnerable or at-risk communities who are unable to report to the police. They could provide a valuable local picture of patterns of discriminatory or prejudicial acts which can inform policing response and community safety, had their uptake and engagement been more effective.

#### **Discussion**

This research has demonstrated how TPR services are failing to engage within the local communities involved in this study, driven by a lack of awareness and understanding of hate crimes on the part of trained, voluntary advisors, and a myriad of different TPR services competing against each other. Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>



Despite being one of the recommendations of the Macpherson Inquiry, to offer an alternative 'third party' agency to report experiences to, the merits of TPR services are at risk of being diminished by a lack of engagement from community members and inexperienced advisors for those who do engage. A review of TPR by College of Policing (2014) found that many failed to deliver improvements in reporting at the time and the figures presented herein suggest that this continues to be the case. Wong and Christmann (2016) have successfully argued that, despite a lack of evidence of their success, the orthodoxy of TPRs have been 'uncritically' endorsed by successive governments, describing their utility as "more like an act of faith" when tackling hate crimes (p.17). This paper has allowed a discussion to develop surrounding TPR services and the output of service they provide. A recommendation from this paper is for a scoping review of existing TPRs to explore their value and public confidence in them.

Aligned to this are increasing concerns about rising hate crime victimisation. The UK's political climate has been dominated with contentious issues around migration and nationality, as demonstrated by the increase of hate crime following the Brexit referendum (Home Office, 2020; O'Neil 2017). The current covid-19 pandemic has also demonstrated a spike in hate crimes locally and nationally (BBC News, 2020; Lovett, 2020). The added political stances of outspoken right-wing parties helped fuel emotions towards minorities who are somehow 'different'. Perceived difference can ignite hate crimes towards individuals who do not fit the norm (Perry, 2001) and for many, Brexit and the Covid-19 pandemic have drawn attention to minority groups who were previously not perceived to pose a threat to society.

Consequently, this project is especially poignant as a new wave of hate crime towards ethnic minorities is evidenced (Chakraborti and Hardy, 2017). Attempts to address under-reporting of hate crimes need to be conscious and reflective of the challenges and diversity of the communities they serve, particularly when so many TPR services are available in such a small urban area. There are a number of ways in which TPR can be delivered and local services commissioned but in many areas there are a host of community-based, often voluntary, organisations that cater to a variety of hate crime experiences. This can create a 'busy' marketplace for hate crime victims who may not be sure which agency to turn up. Aligned with this is the value of TPR services to organisations involved. Macdonald *et al.*, (2017) found that police were focussed on the contribution of intelligence-gathering via TPR, as opposed to prioritising victim needs and support. Thus, TPR service providers need to be clear about their motivations for provision, and what they will do with their data, particularly when they are funded through counter-extremism strategic streams.

This paper acknowledges that further research is needed in this area. The dearth of large-scale studies into TPR services suggests a lack of interest academically and yet they are at the forefront of victim support services. This study, though limited in participants, highlights how many hate crimes may be going unrecognised by TPR providers who are relying on poorly trained volunteers. Additional Government funding is urgently needed if TPR is to be fit for purpose.

## **Conclusion**

This study presented analysis of a qualitative questionnaire completed by voluntary advisor members of "CAD", a charitable organisation in Dorset running a Home Office-funded hate crime project. It suggests that Dorset communities failed to interact with a new TPR service in an already busy marketplace of providers, and that trained advisors lacked comprehensive knowledge as to what hate crime is. It identified limited victim reporting, suggesting low engagement locally,

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

although the advisors believe the project had value for local communities in that it provided promotional and awareness-raising materials.

The level of training of advisors is particularly concerning. The questionnaire unveiled that there was a clear lack of the knowledge when defining and understanding hate crime. This suggests extra training is urgently required, so advisors can recognise hate crimes clearly and record them as such. Although there can be staffing issues, given the voluntary nature of the roles, each advisor should be trained to a standard protocol to avoid this disparity of knowledge. This is especially relevant as the volunteers at CAD were investing their time freely to support community-based projects. The sample size was small however the findings uncovered themes which are vital for any TPR service. Furthermore, it is suggested that a wider scale research project would be useful, to help identify the national context of TPR services.

If advisors are not sufficiently trained to recognise and respond to different types of hate crimes, at a time when reports of hate crimes are rising, victims may be left feeling unsupported and isolated and may not turn to a TPR service if they experience further victimisation, raising questions as to their merit and value in an increasingly competitive arena.

## Reference List

- Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act* (2001), available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2001/24/contents> (accessed 10 May 2020).
- BBC News (2017) "Record hate crimes' after EU referendum", available at: *BBC News* (2020) "Coronavirus: Hate crime reports rise in Exeter", available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-devon-51773774> (accessed 10 April 2020).
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), "Using thematic analysis in psychology", *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, Vol 3, pp.77–101, doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.
- British Society of Criminology (2020), "Statement of Ethics", available at: <http://www.britisoccrim.org/ethics/> (accessed 20 May 2020).
- Chakraborti, N. (2018), "Responding to hate crime: Escalating problems, continued failings", *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 387-404.
- Chakraborti, N. and Hardy, S-J. (2017), "Beyond empty promises? A reality check for hate crime scholarship and policy", *Safer Communities*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp.148-154.
- Chakraborti, N., Garland, J. and Hardy, S.-J. (2014), "The Leicester Hate Crime Project: Findings and Conclusions", available from: <https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/fc-full-report> (accessed 18 August 2016).
- College of Policing (2014), "National Policing Hate Crime Strategy", available at: <http://library.college.police.uk/docs/college-of-policing/National-Policing-Hate-Crime-strategy.pdf> (accessed 20 January 2020).
- Criminal Justice Act* (2003), available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/44/section/146-> (accessed 20 May 2020).
- Crown Prosecution Service (2018) "Hate Crime Strategy 2017-2020", available at: <https://www.cps.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/publications/CPS-Hate-Crime-Strategy-2020-Feb-2018.pdf> (accessed 10 April 2020).
- Crown Prosecution Service (2019), "Hate Crime Annual Report", available at: <https://www.cps.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/publications/CPS-Hate-Crime-Annual-Report-2018-2019.pdf> (accessed 20 January 2020)
- Donovan, C., Clayton, J. and Macdonald, S. (2018), "New Directions in Hate Reporting Research: Agency, Heterogeneity and Relationality", *Sociological Research Online* Vol. 24. DOI: 136078041879884. 10.1177/1360780418798848.
- Dorset Police (2020) "Hate Crime", available at: <https://www.dorset.police.uk/help-advice-crime-prevention/abuse-exploitation-neglect/hate-crime/> (accessed 20 May 2020).
- Gray, C. and Hansen, K. (2021), "Did Covid-19 Lead to an Increase in Hate Crimes Toward Chinese People in London?", *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp.569-588
- Hall, N. (2013) *Hate crime*, Routledge, London.
- Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

Hardy, S. (2019), "Layers of resistance: Understanding decision-making processes in relation to crime reporting", *International Review of Victimology*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp.302-319.

Healy, J. C. (2018), "On the periphery of hate crime: Disability at the intersections of marginalisation, vulnerability, and difference", Thesis (PhD), Middlesex University, London, available from: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/25907/> (accessed 22 April 2020).

Healy, J. C. (2020), "'It spreads like a creeping disease': Experiences of victims of disability hate crimes in austerity Britain", *Disability & Society*, Vol. 35 No.2, pp.176-200.  
Doi:10.1080/09687599.2019.1624151

Hill, A. (2017) 'Hostile environment': the hardline Home Office policy tearing families apart. *The Guardian online*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/nov/28/hostile-environment-the-hardline-home-office-policy-tearing-families-apart> Accessed 1 April 2022.

HM Government (2015), "Counter-Extremism Strategy", available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/470088/51859\\_Cm9148\\_Accessible.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/470088/51859_Cm9148_Accessible.pdf) (accessed 10 May 2020).

Home Office (2016), "Action against hate: The UK Government's plan for tackling hate crime", available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/543679/Action\\_Against\\_Hate\\_-\\_UK\\_Government\\_s\\_Plan\\_to\\_Tackle\\_Hate\\_Crime\\_2016.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/543679/Action_Against_Hate_-_UK_Government_s_Plan_to_Tackle_Hate_Crime_2016.pdf) (accessed 1 May 2020).

Home Office (2018), "Action Against Hate: The UK Government's plan for tackling hate crime – 'two years on'", HM Govt: London.

Home Office (2020), "Police recorded hate crime open date tables", available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/839574/prc-hate-crime-open-data.ods](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/839574/prc-hate-crime-open-data.ods) (accessed 20 May 2020).

Home Office (2021) 'Hate crime, England and Wales, 2020 to 2021'. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/hate-crime-england-and-wales-2020-to-2021/hate-crime-england-and-wales-2020-to-2021> (accessed 1 April 2022)

Lovett, S. (2020), "Coronavirus: Hate crimes against Chinese people almost triple in UK during pandemic, police data shows. *The Independent*, 6 May 2020, available at: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/coronavirus-uk-hate-crimes-chinese-people-china-a9499991.html> (accessed 11 May 2020).

Macpherson, W. (1999), "The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. Report of an Inquiry" available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-stephen-lawrence-inquiry> (accessed 11 May 2020).

Marshall, M. N. (1996), "Sampling for qualitative research", *Family Practice*, Vol. 13, No. 6, pp. 522-525.

O'Neil, A. (2017), "Home Office, Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2016/17", available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/652136/hate-crime-1617-hosb1717.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/652136/hate-crime-1617-hosb1717.pdf) (accessed 10 April 2020).

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>

ONS (2020), "Estimates of the population for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland", 24 June 2020, available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk> (accessed on 1 March 2021).

Perry, B. (2001), *In the name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crime*, Routledge, New York/London.

Pickles, J. (2019), 'Designing hate crime reporting devices: An exploration of young lgbt+ people's report needs', *Journal of LGBT Youth*, doi: 10.1080/19361653.2019.1685057 (accessed 24 May 2020).

Polit, D. F. and Beck, C. T. (2010), "Generalization in quantitative and qualitative research: Myths and strategies", *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, pp.1451-1458.

The Law Commission (2020). Hate crime. [online] Available at: <https://www.lawcom.gov.uk/project/hate-crime/> [Date Accessed 10<sup>th</sup> May 2020]

Wong, K. and Christmann, K. (2008), "The Role of Decision-Making in Reporting Hate crimes", *Safer Communities*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp.19-34.

Wong, K. and Christmann, K. (2016), "Increasing Hate Crime Reporting: Narrowing the Gap between Policy Aspiration, Victim Inclination and Agency Capability", *British Journal of Community Justice*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 5-23.

Zedner, L. (2021), "Countering terrorism or criminalizing curiosity? The troubled history of UK responses to right-wing and other extremism", *Common Law World Review*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp.57-75.

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C. and Healy, J. (2022), Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors, *Safer Communities*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012>