

# Reality versus rhetoric: Assessing the Efficacy of Third Party Hate

## Crime Reporting Centres

### **Kevin Wong**

Policy Evaluation and Research Unit (PERU), Manchester Metropolitan University

### **Kris Christmann** (corresponding author)

Applied Criminology & Policing Centre (ACPC), University of Huddersfield

### **Michelle Rogerson**

Applied Criminology & Policing Centre (ACPC), University of Huddersfield

### **Neil Monk**

Hate Crime Champion, Victim Support

### **Abstract**

The under-reporting of hate crime is recognised as problematic for jurisdictions across Europe and beyond. Within the UK, the landmark Inquiry Report into the murder of Stephen Lawrence twenty-five years ago has seen governments faithfully adhering to a policy of promoting the increased reporting of hate crime. An enduring legacy of the Inquiry, third party reporting centres (TPRCs) have been equally, faithfully promoted as the primary vehicle for achieving such increases. While the nations of the United Kingdom have pioneered the development of TPRCs, their function and form have been adopted in other jurisdictions, including Victoria, Australia. Nevertheless, despite their reliance on TPRCs, policy makers have given limited attention to their efficacy. The evidence from a plethora of small scale studies have consistently found that TPRCs have been limited by public awareness, capability, capacity and poor oversight difficulties. Responding to these long-standing problems, the authors have developed the first ‘TPRC assessment tool’ which offers a diagnostic facility to improve effectiveness. The results

of testing this tool and their implications for policy and practice for the UK and internationally are presented, providing an original contribution to the limited evidence-base around third-party reporting.

**Key words:** Hate crime/incidents; Bias crime; Third-party reporting; Hate reporting; Under-reporting of crime

### **Why third party reporting?**

The underreporting of hate crime is a problem across the member states of the European Union, as indicated by the establishment of the hate crime reporting sub-group of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Human Rights (FRA 2016) and the group's Compendium of Practices (FRAa 2017). It has also been recognised in other jurisdictions beyond Europe, such as Australia (Mason et al, 2017) and the United States (Massuci and Langton, 2017). In the United Kingdom, it is twenty-five years since the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence, in a south east London borough and almost twenty years since the public Inquiry into Stephen's death and the bungled investigation by the Metropolitan Police (MacPherson, 1999). One of the many notable recommendations from the Inquiry Report recognised the need to provide an alternative non-police reporting mechanism for victims of racial hate crime in the United Kingdom (UK) (MacPherson, 1999). Intended to circumvent mistrust driven by poor police/community relations, TPRCs have since flourished in a patchwork of provision across the UK, extending their function across five monitored victim strands recognised by Government.<sup>12</sup> Citizens advice bureaux, community and faith groups, student unions, public libraries, neighbourhood offices and day care centres can all be TPRCs. Impetus for their further growth has come from refreshed action

---

<sup>1</sup> There are five centrally monitored strands of hate crime which are based on protected characteristics (although the degree of protection under the law varies by the characteristic, so not all groups enjoy the same degree of protection). These five monitored strands are race or ethnicity; religion or belief (including non-belief); sexual orientation; disability; and transgender identity (O'Neill, 2017). So in addition to this legal protection, these 'monitored strands' also have a formal status under a counting rule, where police forces, and centrally, the Home Office, are required to record victimisation across each strand.

<sup>2</sup> The extent to which other groups (outside of the nationally monitored strands) are similarly open to victimisation on the basis of a shared characteristic or identity and therefore the remit of third party reporting remains contested (Ellison and Smith, 2017, 2013, Akhtar, 2017).

plans on hate crime which explicitly endorse third party reporting (Home Office, 2016, Welsh Assembly Government, 2014).

The ambition with TPRCs, then as now, is to increase the reporting of hate crime, generating a fuller, more accurate picture of the size, patterning and gravity of hate crime victimisation, allowing key statutory agencies, the police and local authorities to devise and deploy more effective solutions (Green et al, 2001; McDevitt et al, 2002). There is considerable evidence to confirm that hate crime is under-reported in the UK, from the Crime Survey England and Wales (CSEW) (Corcoran et al. 2015) to smaller scale studies (Chakraborti et al. 2014, Stonewall, 2013, Wong et al. 2013). Similar evidence exists internationally, for example, in the US (Massuci and Langton, 2017), in Victoria, Australia, (Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Agency, 2010; Mason et al, 2017, Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, 2013).

The impetus for establishing TPRCs, i.e. victim dissatisfaction with the police response to hate crime, remains. In England and Wales, this is confirmed by Corcoran, et al (2015) and by earlier studies (Victim Support, 2005, Leicester Hate Crime Project, 2014; Home Office 2013; Stonewall, 2013, Jarman & Tennant, 2003, Paterson et al., 2008, Quarmby, 2008), and in Victoria, Australia, is highlighted by Mason et al (2017) and Moran & Sharpe (2002).

Given the centrality of third party reporting centres to strategies to address hate crime, it seems to be a major government oversight, that to date, in the UK or anywhere else, there has been no consistent way to assess whether or not hate crime reporting centres are fulfilling their primary aim, that of increasing hate crime reporting. In the absence of Government sponsored remedies, this article presents analysis of empirical data collected via a tool designed by the authors to address this gap and assess the efficacy of hate crime third party reporting centres (TPRCs). The implication of the findings are situated within the context of current policy, practice and evidence of third party reporting in England, Wales and Scotland. Given that the underreporting of hate crime is a problem in other jurisdictions ((FRA 2016, FRA 2017b, Masucci and Langton, 2017, Mason et al, 2017), the findings have wider international applicability, providing an original contribution to the limited evidence base around third party reporting.

## **A brief history of third party reporting**

Third party reporting can take a number of forms: a person can be a 'third party reporter' (for instance, a social worker seconded to a day care centre for people with disabilities); as well as public and voluntary and community agencies physically located in neighbourhoods and communities. For the purposes of this TPRC Tool (discussed further below) we differentiate between third party reporting *services* (for instance Stop Hate UK<sup>3</sup> and TellMAMA<sup>4</sup>) which either provide reporting and support services nationally or near nationally, and third party reporting *centres* (TPRCs) which have a specific geographical location and through this provide reporting and sometimes other aligned services. The TPRC Tool has been designed to assess the latter, which comprise the majority of third party reporting.

Third party reporting *services* generally perform well, providing publicly available statistical reports of incidents as an index of performance, accountability and transparency.<sup>5</sup> However, the wider picture amongst the very many more third party reporting *centres* (TPRCs) is more difficult to gauge. There is a surprising lack of data on hate crimes reported to local reporting centres (Wong, Christmann et al., 2013, Wong and Christmann 2008, and Monchuck and Santana-Acosta 2006; in Wong & Christmann, 2016) and hence the performance of the centres. In one of these studies (Wong et al 2013) the TPRCs, mainly small voluntary and community sector (VCS) agencies) were not even required to collect data on hate crime reporting to minimise the administrative burden on them.<sup>6</sup> The limited research paints a worrying picture about how well TPRCs are operating in fulfilling this basic remit.

The most extensive review to date of TPRCs in England & Wales undertaken by the National Policing Hate Crime Group (NPHCG) was damning. "Many" of the schemes examined had failed to increase hate crime reporting and they were found not to be delivering "any tangible results" (NPHCG 2014:48-

---

<sup>3</sup> Stop Hate UK provides a confidential 24-hour telephone helpline to report all forms of hate crime and provides a range of signposting and support for victims.

<sup>4</sup> TellMAMA is a non-governmental organisation providing a confidential reporting service for all hate crime, although it is best known (and badged) as tackling anti-Muslim incidents.

<sup>5</sup> For instance, Stop Hate UK and TellMAMA.

<sup>6</sup> However, following discussions arising from the research report, this arrangement was reviewed.

9).<sup>7</sup> They recommended that the performance of centres be monitored and any identified shortfalls be addressed. In Scotland difficulties in the consistency of provision by TPRCs, as well as limited numbers of case workers and concerns over the quality of their training have been raised by Scotland's Independent Advisory Group (One Scotland, 2017; 2016). Not all listed centres were operational, some staff were unclear how to deal with hate crime victims, there were low levels of reporting and concerns were expressed about the general level of awareness amongst the wider populations as to the existence of TPRCs (One Scotland, 2017; 2016). These disappointing findings chime with the conclusions of earlier small scale studies which have examined TPRC effectiveness across areas of England. (Chakraborti & Hardy, 2015; Wong and Christmann, 2008; Swift, 2005; JUST West Yorkshire, 2012; Roulstone & Thomas, 2009). Further, it has been posited that successive governments' uncritical acceptance of TPRCs may be acting as an inhibitor to improving their efficacy (Wong & Christmann, 2016). An inspection into the handling of Hate Crime is currently being conducted by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) and the results are awaited with interest (HMICFRS 2017).

While criticism of the efficacy of hate crime reporting centres may be justified, it should be tempered with acknowledging the often limited and variable resources invested in such provision. In the North-East of England, Clayton et al (2016:72-73) attributed 'extremely low' recording rates to budgetary pressures undermining staff capacity. Difficulties with building knowledge and professional capacity, have been exacerbated by insecure funding which has been more acute in dispersed rural areas (Garland & Chakraborti, 2007). There are indications that resourcing and capacity are being further stretched by the dispersal of hate crime victimisation from inner-city urban areas to smaller towns and villages, reflecting changing neighbourhood demographic characteristics and the breaking down of cultural homogeneity in England and Wales (Burnett, 2012a; 2012b; 2012c; Wong et al., 2013; Garland & Charaborti, 2007-; similarly in parts of the US (Grattet, 2009; Lyons, 2008; Green et al., 1998). This underscores the need for provision in areas which had been previously thought of as a lower priority

---

<sup>7</sup> Rather curiously the NPHCG do not provide details of how many TPRCs they assessed in their review or where these were located.

when tackling hate crime, drawing attention to the distribution of TPRC capacity and how current and planned provision will meet this changing ecology. The uneven distribution of TPRC capacity across the country was recently identified by victims in Scotland (One Scotland, 2016). In the South-West of England, a predominantly rural area, a 'post-code lottery' in third party reporting provision prevailed (James & Simmons, 2013:254).

### **Rationale for the TPRC assessment tool**

Not all TPRCs are failing. The authors' contact with relevant stakeholders: PCCs, police, TPRCs, local authorities and victim services suggests; anecdotally at least, that there are examples of active and successful centres. However, adopting TPRCs as an orthodoxy to improving hate crime reporting and recording is at best unproven, and on the current (limited) evidence, in doubt. There is a chronic lack of useable data to assess TPRC performance (Hoong Sin et al 2009:vii). Even attempting to discover the number and distribution of TPRCs throughout England and Wales draws a blank,<sup>8</sup> in contrast to Scotland, where Police Scotland have compiled a list of TPRCs across fifteen geographical areas (totalling 383 TPRCs throughout Scotland).<sup>9</sup>

The most recent government action plan for England and Wales (Home Office, 2016) included a commitment to improve the reporting of hate crime, involving funding three new 'community demonstration projects' to explore innovative ways that communities can respond to hate crime and thereafter distil lessons learnt. This is welcome, but it should not come at the expense of utilising the existing reporting infrastructure, whose capabilities and capacities remain largely unknown. The assessment tool developed by the authors is intended to assess TPRC efficacy at the level of an individual centre, as well as at an administrative area such as police force/PCC and/or local authority.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Home Office were undertaking a survey of TPRCs although the results of this were not publicly available at the time of writing (although it is unclear whether these details will be published).

<sup>9</sup> This number was compiled from data sourced from Police Scotland: <http://www.scotland.police.uk/assets/pdf/205073/hate-crime-3rd-party-reporting-centres> (accessed 13.2.18)

## Developing and testing the tool

Drawing on studies which assessed the effectiveness of TPRCs in England and Wales (Chakraborti and Hardy 2015, Chakraborti et al 2014, Clayton et al 2016, James and Simmons 2013, Christmann and Wong 2010, Wong et al. 2013, Wong and Christmann 2008, Monchuck and Santana-Acosta 2006) allowed the research team to identify eight dimensions pertinent to the efficacy of TPRCs:

- Organisation – purpose, resourcing, capacity and capability
- Staffing – paid/unpaid, training received
- Services provided – reporting methods, operating hours
- Geographical coverage – neighbourhood, local authority, PCC area
- Links to other agencies including police and local authority
- Level of activity – reports to the centre and onward reports to the police and other agencies

These dimensions originally contributed to a single measure of efficacy. This was later revised to two broad efficacy measures: *capacity and capability* of the organisation to provide a third party reporting service; and *activity*, taking hate crime reports and passing these onto other agencies, such as the police, local authorities and other support services (further details are provided in the Findings section). The validity of the eight dimensions and the two broad measures were tested with key informants, representing relevant stakeholders: the director of a charity providing hate crime services across England; a government policymaker responsible for hate crime policy and practice across England and Wales; a local authority officer responsible for hate crime provision in their area; and a voluntary sector co-ordinator of TPRCs in a county of England with additional responsibility for hate crime policy and practice with a national charity. Testing of each dimension was based on three broad themes:

- Was the dimension a valid contributory measure of efficacy?
- Were the questions associated with each dimension applicable to the dimension?
- Content validity; did the questions test what was intended?

The dimensions were validated by the informants and the questions associated with the dimensions were revised, added to or removed in accordance with informant feedback.

A first iteration of the tool was provided as an online survey and tested by 21 (of 44) TPRCs in a local authority area in the north of England (R1) in 2016. The tool was amended based on data analysis and feedback. A second iteration of the tool was tested with 14 TPRCs in a county in England (R2) in 2017. These TPRCs completed the survey using an online or hard copy version. A focus group was held with representatives from the second group testing for:

- Face validity – clarity for the respondent as to the inclusion of the survey question;
- Clear definitions – clear and unambiguous questions to ensure consistency in the understanding of questions by respondents;
- Clear and comprehensive response options – to facilitate ease of response by users;
- Useability within limited time constraints – balancing the requirement to collect a sufficient level of data (to enable a meaningful assessment to be made) against the adjudged time that a respondent is likely to invest in completing the tool.

Both sets of data collected by the tool were analysed in two stages using Microsoft Excel. Firstly, the production of descriptive statistics provide a summary of the nature of provision across the TPRCs. The second stage involved the calculation of efficacy scores. These were produced by applying a weighting to each item and then summing weighting scores across each of the eight dimensions (further details are presented in the Findings section below). TPRC scores were qualitatively checked for congruency with three of the key informants against their knowledge of the TPRCs. Their feedback informed revisions to the tool and scoring system. In addition to providing summary data the analysis highlighted ways in which the tool could be improved, implications of question weightings and broader questions about the functions of TPRCs.

There are limitations to the data collected thus far to test the tool. They are based on small samples and therefore the generalisability of their responses may be limited. However, we have attempted to mitigate this by aiming for representativeness. The key informants who checked the validity of the dimensions, the broad measures and scoring have depth and breadth of experience of third party hate crime reporting provision. The TPRCs which tested the first iteration of the tool are located in an urban area with a diverse population profile (i.e. based on ethnicity, religion, sexuality, gender and disability). The second



iteration of the tool was tested in a primarily rural county comprising villages, small and large towns and with a less diverse population profile. It is important to note that the aim of this process was to develop and test a tool to assess the efficacy of TPRCs. Therefore, rather than maintain the question wording for each test, questions were refined to improve their clarity and produce a broader spread of responses. Although these changes mean that direct comparisons between local authority areas cannot always be made, some clear patterns can be identified.

## **Efficacy**

Drawing on the results from the eight dimensions, efficacy scores were calculated for each TPRC. The first score provided a measure of the centre's *capacity and capability*, based on staffing, funding and scope of service offered. The second score measured the level of *activity* and took into account reports received and conversion of these to onward reports/referrals to police, local authority and support agencies.

A maximum *capacity and capability score* would be received by a TPRC which had the following attributes:

- hate crime reporting as its core business;
- received specific hate crime funding;
- employed paid staff dedicated to hate crime reporting;
- all staff have up-to-date training in handling hate crime reports (i.e. in last 12 months);
- took reports 24 hours a day;
- responded to all types of hate crime;
- offer a full range hate crime related services;
- provided a full range of reporting methods;
- had strong partnership links.

Based on evidence from the literature (cited above) we would expect this hypothetical TPRC to be the best placed to respond to hate crime. These elements were scored and the total converted into a RAG rating. As highlighted in Table 1, responses from the survey suggest that the TPRCs are a long way

from this ‘ideal type.’ In both rounds the modal score was amber: 62% of centres in R1 (13 of 21) and 64% in R2 (9 of 14). Five centres received a green rating in R1 but none of the R2 centres were rated green for capacity.

Table 1 Third Party Reporting Centres: Capacity and Activity Scores

	<b>Round 1 Capacity N (%)</b>	<b>Activity N (%)</b>	<b>Round 2 Capacity N (%)</b>	<b>Activity N (%)</b>
<b>Red</b>	3 (14)	10 (48)	5 (36)	9 (64)
<b>Amber</b>	13 (62)	6 (28)	9 (64)	1 (7)
<b>Green</b>	5(24)	5 (24)	0	4 (28)
<b>Total number of centres</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>

The *activity* score was calculated by comparing the number of reports that would be expected given the capacity and capability of the centre with the number of reports actually received and the proportion of those reports that were converted into police reports or other clear actions. Underreporting of hate incidents means that the true number of hate incidents that could potentially be reported is unknown. Consequently, in this analysis the ‘expected number of reports’ was based solely on the number of reports that were received across each sample – this total number of reports was expected to be shared across centres proportionate to capacity levels. It is hoped that this measure can be refined as data on hate crime incidents improves.

TPRCs were RAG rated based on the level of activity and proportion of conversions. The rationale for the rating was as follows:

- RED: Centre receives no reports when they would be expected to (based on capacity) OR centre receives reports but a low proportion are converted.
- AMBER: Centre receives reports but fewer than expected OR Centre receives expected level of reports but not all are converted
- GREEN: Centre receives expected level of reports (or higher) AND all reports are converted.

As shown in Table 1, in both rounds: R1=48% of centres (10 of 21) and R2=64% of centres (9 of 14) the modal category was RED these were centres which received no reports although they would be

expected to given their capacity. In R1 six centres were rated AMBER because they received fewer reports than would be anticipated. One centre in R2 received this rating – in this case the centre had received the anticipated level of reports but the conversion rate was low. In R1 five centres were rated GREEN, four in R2. These centres received the expected level of reports and all were converted to police reports.

### **Paucity of provision**

The two sites where the tool has been tested - one primarily urban, the other rural but featuring some small to medium sized towns – may not be representative of all local authorities in England and Wales or indeed other jurisdictions. Nevertheless, they offer an indicative insight into third party reporting provision which may have wider applicability, highlighting issues which potentially affect the effectiveness of individual TPRCs and also collectively, provision across a geographical area. The most notable results, across the eight dimensions of the tool, which underpin the efficacy assessments above are as follows.

- There is very limited dedicated hate crime reporting provision and associated with this, very little dedicated funding. Across the two pilot sites, all of the agencies which responded to this question reported that hate crime reporting was not their core business. Only one agency across both sites received any dedicated funding for hate crime reporting (see Table A1 in the Appendix)
- Uptake of reporting services are low. A number of TPRCs had taken no reports in the previous twelve months. In R1 around half of the 21 TPRCs reported receiving no victim contacts in the previous twelve months. In R2 only 5 of the 14 centres reported receiving any victim reports in the previous twelve months. Although in this site, some centres had only become TPRCs part way through the past year.
- While centres may be offering a range of provision (see Table A2), few, if any were monitoring uptake of their own services. All R1 centres offered taking a report for referral to other agencies with nine centres offering to take a report but not pass it on to other agencies. In R2 only seven of the fourteen centres confirmed that they took reports for passing onto other agencies.

However, this appeared to be contradicted by their response to a different question where 11 of the 14 reported that they signposted or referred individuals to other agencies.

- A significant proportion of TPRC staff have had not up to date training on reporting. In R1 on average, only a third of paid staff/volunteers at each centre had received training on hate crime reporting within the last twelve months. In R2 on average only a quarter of staff had received training on hate crime reporting in the last twelve months, although this ranged from 80 percent of staff in one centre to no staff in two centres. Combined with low service uptake, there appear to be few opportunities for staff skills to be tested in a live situation and/or for these to be refreshed.
- Around half of the TPRCs in both sites reported limited links with support agencies which represent the monitored victim groups (see Table A3).
- While the conversion rates from reports received to reports referred to other agencies are good for those TPRCs which had received reports, this commendable level of conversion activity is undermined by the low rates of reporting to the services.

These findings generally confirm patchiness in capacity and capability and a lacklustre picture of TPRC activity identified in past studies (NPHCG, 2014 in College of Policing, 2014; One Scotland, 2017; 2016; Chakraborti & Hardy, 2015; Clayton et al 2016; Wong and Christmann, 2008; Swift, 2005; JUST West Yorkshire, 2012; Roulstone & Thomas, 2009).

### **Policy on the efficacy of third party reporting**

This failing situation is not entirely the fault of the centres' themselves. One could view them almost as being set up to fail. Government reliance on TPRCs as a viable means to increase hate crime reporting seems to be predicated on a lack of appreciation of the resources required to make their policy aim meaningful. It is further predicated on a more widespread held assumption about the capacity of VCS and public agencies to undertake this function *in addition* to the services they are funded to provide. For VCS agencies this is part of a wider under-appreciation by government of VCS resourcing (Hucklesby and Corcoran, 2016; Clinks, 2016). Judged on the proliferation of TPRCs across the UK and other jurisdictions there appears to be no reluctance among agencies to rally to the cause of

supporting the reporting of hate crime – as noted by the authors elsewhere – like motherhood and apple pie, no-one is against it (Wong and Christmann, 2016) With some exceptions (noted earlier) the evidence suggests these good intentions are not matched by effective performance. Fundamentally, third party reporting centres are intended to take reports of hate incidents, collate that information and to ensure (wherever possible) that these are notified to the relevant statutory bodies, police and local authorities. The continued general underperformance of third party reporting provision raises questions (which are not new, see Wong and Christmann, 2016, Christmann and Wong, 2010) about the resourcing and embeddedness of TPRC provision within social networks and a full appreciation of the barriers to reporting. Whether or not third party reporting is better served by concentrating resources in a few, smaller number of agencies that are adequately resourced and have appropriate capable dedicated staff or continuing to rely on a spread of agencies where third party reporting is a service that they offer, in addition to their main funded responsibilities, has not been adequately examined. The corollary to this is that a singular emphasis on capacity and capability could jeopardise wider agency goodwill, reduce legitimacy and inadvertently introduce disenfranchisement. This could be at its most acute among agencies which offer geographical proximity to potential hate crime/incident victims – such as neighbourhood centres - by reducing the potential for reporting face to face. Campaigning organisations which are close to individuals from the protected strands, who advocate for and serve their interests (i.e. LGBT, faith, BME groups) and feel a legitimate right to be involved in delivering such provision may also feel undermined. In the US, McVeigh et al (2003) found that the presence of civil rights organisations and the resources of civil rights organisations contributed to higher numbers of reported Hate Crimes, demonstrating the importance of having an organisational infrastructure to promote positive reporting messages, channel grievances and advocate on behalf of minority groups. In short, there is a trade-off to be made when considering TPRC efficacy, between capacity and capability; representation (both geographical and interest group); and co-production of a socially just ideal. However provision is configured, it is important that we do not lose sight of the purpose of TPRCs (MacPherson, 1999), providing a safe space for victims to report hate incidents and thereby encourage reporting. Considerations of efficacy need to have this goal foremost, and the TPRC tool discussed here offers a means to measure this.

## **Applying the tool**

The findings demonstrate that the tool has a role as a *diagnostic instrument* for two potential groups of end users: individual TPRCs; and those with commissioning and/or crime reduction co-ordinating responsibilities - in England and Wales, these would include PCCs, police, local authorities, community safety partnerships and criminal justice boards. It offers a ready means to collect data across individual and administrative areas and if used in multiple areas, the potential for both benchmarking TPRCs within individual areas and against other comparable areas. For example, at a PCC level, adopting the most similar policing group force areas as guide to comparability from one area to another. The authors acknowledge that the tool does not provide definitive answers about TPRC efficacy. However, as demonstrated by the two separate trials, R1 and R2, the tool does enable specific questions around efficacy to be identified, for example: Why are so few victim reports being received by TPRCs? Why have some TPRCs not received any reports in the last twelve months? Is the very limited level of 24 hour reporting cover acceptable in that particular area? Are there sufficient modes of reporting on offer to enable victims and others to report incidents? As indicated, the tool allows for more focused inquiry and once the problems are better understood, identifying suitable remedies. To make best use of the tool we would argue that it needs to be applied across an administrative area to all TPRCs. This benefits individual TPRCs – providing them with their own efficacy scores, which they can benchmark against other centres in their area.. The presumption (and hope) is that knowing how they fare may spur those who perform less well to improve. This would also afford commissioners and co-ordinating bodies an overview of provision in their area, enabling them to identify existing capacity and capability, gaps in provision, good and poor performance of individual TPRCs and where remedial action, such as further training and support, may be required. It would also allow commissioners to test the viability of new initiatives compared to any existing provision. For example, the effectiveness of launching reporting centres in commercial organisations or NHS sites could be specifically analysed. Equally, the efficiency of further\different funding models could be assessed, providing the commissioner with support to achieve best value.

## **Limitations of the tool**

The authors acknowledge that there are limitations to the tool, in part an artefact of its purpose as an easy to complete diagnostic instrument. Firstly, it is based on self-assessment by TPRCs themselves which limits the reliability and accuracy of the data generated. However, as indicated above, the intention is not that the tool provides a complete solution, instead, it offers an initial diagnostic assessment, which is intended to be followed up by further investigation. Either by individual TPRCs reviewing their own performance and/or external bodies reviewing TPRCs performance across their geographical area of interest. Secondly, it is inevitably limited by the data which the tool gathers – a trade-off between length of the survey instrument, completion fatigue and the amount of useful fine grained data captured therein. Our intention was and remains devising a tool which can be completed easily and within a reasonable period of time. The reasonableness of tool length and effort to complete was tested in R2. Based on this iteration of the tool, both of these criteria were found to have been met by TPRC respondents, with these users reporting that it took less time to complete than they had initially thought. Thirdly, some of the dimensions around which the tool is constructed are open to debate, such as the number of monitored victim groups included - here we recognise that some centres may want to concentrate upon a particular grouping. Overall, it should be noted that the dimensions were devised based on a review of the evidence of TPRC efficacy available in 2016 and the early part 2017. Updating the evidence review and amending the tool to reflect this will form part of further planned refinements.

## **Conclusions**

To date, across England and Wales, potential commissioners of third party reporting provision, PCCs, metro Mayors (such as in London and Greater Manchester) which have subsumed the responsibilities of PCCs into their roles and local authorities have had limited, if any data upon which to make decisions about how best to commission, organise and/or resource third party reporting in their areas. The tool presented in this paper is intended to help to fill this gap. We do not suggest that the tool is perfect, no tool is. This one, like others, has limitations. However, the tool is our practical contribution to

addressing a long-standing problem and it is offered in that spirit. It offers an opportunity to open up a dialogue about what effectiveness looks like and how it can be assessed, and in doing so dislocates the silence from Government, TPRCs themselves<sup>10</sup> and commissioners.

## **Funding**

No funding was received by the authors for the development and trailing of the 'TPRC assessment tool'.

## **Declaration of conflicting interests**

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

## **References**

- Akhtar, Z. (2017) Criminalisation of Caste, Hate Crimes and English Law. *Criminal Law & Justice Weekly*, 181(38).
- Burnett, J. (2012a) *The new geographies of racism: Stoke-on-Trent*. Institute of Race Relations.
- Burnett, J. (2012b) *The new geographies of racism: Plymouth*. Institute of Race Relations.
- Burnett, J. (2012c) *The new geographies of racism: Peterborough*. Institute of Race Relations.
- Chakraborti, N., Garland, J. and Hardy, S. (2014) *The Leicester Hate Crime Project: Findings and Conclusions*. University of Leicester.
- Chakraborti, N., and Hardy, S. (2015) *LGB & T Hate Crime Reporting: Identifying Barriers and Solutions*. Equality and Human Rights Commission.

---

<sup>10</sup> With a few exceptions, such as the provider stakeholders consulted on the development of this tool, who have themselves previously advocated for greater attention to be focused on TPRC efficacy.



- Christmann, K. and Wong, K. (2010) 'Hate crime victims and hate crime reporting: some impertinent questions' in *Hate crime: Concepts, policy and future directions*. N. Chakraborti, Willan Press: 194-208.
- Clayton, J., Donovan, C., & Macdonald, S. J. (2016). A critical portrait of hate crime/incident reporting in North East England: The value of statistical data and the politics of recording in an age of austerity. *Geoforum*, 75:64–74.
- Clinks (2016) *The state of the sector: Key trends for voluntary sector organisations working with offenders and their families*. Clinks.
- College of Policing, National Policing Hate Crime Group (2014) *Hate Crime Operational Guidance* (C118|0514), College of Policing Ltd.
- Corcoran, H., Lader, D. and Smith K. (2015) *Hate Crime, England and Wales 2014/15*. Home Office.
- Dobrowski, S. (2006). Homophobic Hate Crime: The Gay British Crime Survey 2008, Stonewall.
- Ellisson, E. & Smith, L. (2017) Hate Crime Legislation and Violence Against Sex Workers in Ireland: Lessons in Policy and Practice in Amanda Hayes, Jennifer Schweppe and Seamus Taylor (eds.) *Critical Perspectives on Hate Crime*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights) (2016) *Ensuring justice for hate crime victims: professional perspectives*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights) (2017a) *Compendium of practices* accessed at <http://fra.europa.eu/en/theme/hate-crime/compendium-practices> 11.05.18
- FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights) (2017b) *Tackling hate crime under reporting* accessed at <http://fra.europa.eu/en/event/2017/tackling-hate-crime-under-reporting> 11.05.18
- Garland, J., & Chakraborti, N. (2007). “Protean times?”: Exploring the relationships between policing, community and “race” in rural England. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 7/4: 347–365.

- Grattet, R. (2009). The urban ecology of bias crime: A study of disorganized and defended neighborhoods. *Social Problems*, 56:132-150.
- Green, D.P., McFalls, L.H., Smith, J.K., 2001. Hate crime: an emergent research agenda. *Annual Review. Sociology*, 27:479–504.
- Green, D.P., Strolovitch, D.Z. and Janelle S. Wong. (1998) Defended Neighborhood, Integration, and Racial Motivated Crime. *American Journal of Sociology* 104:372–403.
- Her Majesty's Government (2014) '*Challenge it, Report it, Stop it: Delivering the Government's hate crime action plan*'. London: HM Government.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (2017) *Hate crime scoping study: A review of the police response to inform future inspection activity*. London, HMICFRS.
- Home Office (2016) *Action Against Hate: The UK Government's plan for tackling hate crime*, OGL.
- Home Office, Office for National Statistics and Ministry of Justice (2013) *An Overview of Hate Crimes in England and Wales*. HMSO.
- Home Office/ACPO (2005) *Hate crime: Delivering a Quality Service: Good Practice and Tactical Guidance*. Home Office.
- Hoong Sin, c., Hedges, A., Cook, C., Mguni, N. and Comber, N.. (2009). *Disabled people's experiences of targeted violence and hostility*. Office for Public Management. EHRC. Crown Prosecution Service.
- Hucklesby, A. & Corcoran, M. (2016) *The Voluntary Sector and Criminal Justice*. Wiley.
- James, Z. and Simmonds, L. (2013) Exploring Prejudice: Managing Hate Crime in the South West of England, *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 15/4: 241 – 257.
- Jarman, N., and Tennant, A. (2003) *An Acceptable Prejudice? Homophobic Violence and Harassment in Northern Ireland* Institute for Conflict Research.

- JUST West Yorkshire (2012) *JUST's Research Findings on Hate Incident Reporting Centre's in West Yorkshire*. JUST.
- Lyons, C. J. (2008). Defending Turf: Racial Demographics and Hate Crime Against Blacks and Whites. *Social Forces*, 87/1: 357–385.
- Macpherson, W. (1999) *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*. Cm 4262-I. London: The Stationery Office.
- Mason, G., Maher, JM., McCulloch, J., Pickering, S., Wickes, R. & McKay, C. (2017) *Policing Hate Crime: Understanding Communities and Prejudice*. Routledge.
- Masucci, M., Langton, L., (2017) *Hate Crime Victimization, 2004-2015* U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics,
- McDevitt, J., Levin, J., Bennett, S. (2002) Hate crime offenders: an expanded typology. *Journal of Social Issues* 58/2: 303–317.
- McVeigh, R., Welch, M.R. & Bjarnason, T. (2003) Hate Crime reporting as a successful social movement, *American Sociological Review* 2003, Vol 68 (December 843-867).
- Monchuck, L. and Santana-Acosta, J. (2006) *An Audit of the Hate crime Reporting Centres in [study area]* Unpublished report for [study area] Safer Communities Partnership. Applied Criminology Centre, University of Huddersfield.
- Moran, L. and Sharpe, A. (2002) 'Policing the transgender/violence relation' *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 13/3: 269–285.
- One Scotland (2016) *Report of the Independent Advisory Group on Hate Crime, Prejudice and Community Cohesion* (September) OGL.
- One Scotland (2017) *Tackling Prejudice and Building Connected Communities: Scottish Government response to the Independent Advisory Group on Hate Crime, Prejudice and Community Cohesion* (June). OGL.

- O'Neill, A. (2017) *Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2016/17*, (October), 1–33. Retrieved from [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/652136/hate-crime-1617-hosb1717.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/652136/hate-crime-1617-hosb1717.pdf)
- Paterson, S., Kielinger, V., Fletcher, H. (2008). *Women's Experience of Homophobia and Transphobia: Survey Report*. London, Metropolitan Police Service, Diversity and Citizen Focus Directorate.
- Quarmby, K. 2008. *Getting away with murder: Disabled people's experiences of hate crime in the UK*. Report for Disability Now, UK Disabled People's Council and SCOPE, London.
- EHRC (2011) *Hidden in plain sight Inquiry into Inquiry into disability-related harassment*. Equality and Human Rights Commission.
- Roulstone, A. and Thomas, P. (2009) *Hate Crime and Disabled People: A Survey of Practice Activity and Approaches in the North West of England*. Breakthrough UK Ltd and The Equality and Human Rights Commission.
- Smith, K., Lader, D., Hoare, J. and Lau, I. (2012). *Hate crime, cyber security and the experience of crime among children: Findings from the 2010/11*, British Crime Survey: Supplementary Volume 3 to Crime in England and Wales 2010/11. Home Office Statistical Bulletin. London, Home Office.
- Stonewall (2013) *Homophobic Hate Crime: The Gay British Crime Survey 2013*. Stonewall.
- Swift Research (2005) *West Yorkshire Police Hate Crime Reporting Centres*, Unpublished Report submitted to West Yorkshire Police (Report ref: 05/106).
- Victim Support (2005) *The Impact of Hate Crime: needs, practical and emotional support for victims, a literature review*. Victim Support. London.
- Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission (2010) *Review of identity motivated hate crime (consultation issues)*' Melbourne: Department of Justice.

Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, 2013 *Reporting racism > What you say matters*. VEOHRC.

Welsh Government (2014) *Tackling Hate Crimes and Incidents: A Framework for Action*. HMSO.

Wong, K. & Christmann, K. (2016) Hate Crime Reporting: Narrowing the gap between policy aspiration and victim inclination, *British Journal of Community Justice* **14**/3.

Wong, K. and Christmann, K (2008) The Role of Decision-Making in Reporting Hate crimes, *Safer Communities Journal*, 7/2:19-34.

Wong, K., Christmann, K., Meadows, L., Albertson, K. and Senior, P., (2013) *Hate crime in Suffolk: Understanding prevalence and support needs*, Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University.

## Appendix 1 Selected results from the analysis of tool responses

Table A1. Third part reporting centres: Organisation and victim strands covered.

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>TPRC responses</b>	
	<b>R1 N (%)</b>	<b>R2 N (%)</b>
Hate crime reporting <i>not</i> their core business	21 (100)	12 (100)
In receipt of dedicated funding for hate crime reporting	0	1 (7)
<b>Victim strands covered</b>		
Hate crime reporting for five monitored victim strands	19 (90)	10 (71)
Hate crime reporting: religiously motivated only	1 (4)	0
Hate crime reporting: racially motivated only	1 (4)	0
<b>Total number of centres</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>

Table A2 Third party reporting centres: Staffing and staff training

<b>Staffing</b>	<b>TPRC responses</b>			
	<b>R1</b>		<b>R2</b>	
	<b>Paid staff N (%)</b>	<b>Volunteers N (%)</b>	<b>Paid staff N (%)</b>	<b>Volunteers N (%)</b>
Type of staff taking hate crime reports (all)	21 (100)	2 (9)	10 (71)	6 (43)
Type of staff taking hate crime reports - as part of their wider role	-	-	10 (71)	5 (36)
Type of staff taking hate crime reports - dedicated role	-	-	0	2 (14)
<b>Training</b>	<b>R1</b>		<b>R2</b>	
Average proportion of staff receiving training in hate crime reporting	61%		25%	
Average proportion of staff receiving training in hate crime reporting - in the last 12 months	33%		13%	
<b>Total number of centres</b>	<b>21</b>		<b>14</b>	

Table A3 Services provided and reporting methods offered by Third Party Reporting Centres

<b>Services Provided</b>	<b>R1 N (%)</b>	<b>R2 N (%)</b>
Confidence Building	6 (95)	6(43)
Advice	20 (95)	12 (86)
Support	11(52)	10 (71)
Enforcement	1(5)	3 (21)
Signposting or referral	21 (100)	11 (79)
Target hardening	4(19)	0
Taking reports: information only	9 (43)	2 (14)
Taking reports: passing on to other agencies	21 (100)	7 (21)
Raising public awareness	19 (90)	8 (57)
<b>Reporting methods</b>		
Telephone	8 (38)	10 (71)
Online (including smartphone Apps, and web forms)	3 (14)	3 (21)
Email	5 (24)	8 (57)
Letter	5 (24)	7 (50)
Face-to-face	21 (100)	13 (93)
Text messages	3 (14)	2 (14)
<b>Total number of centres</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>

Table A4 Relationships between Third Party Reporting Centres and relevant support agencies

	<b>R1 N (%)</b>					
	<b>Race</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<b>Disability</b>	<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<b>Gender Identity</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Limited</b>	10 (48)	11 (52)	12 (57)	12 (57)	11 (52)	10 (48)
<b>Good</b>	11 (52)	10 (48)	9 (43)	9 (43)	10 (48)	11 (52)
	<b>R2 N (%)</b>					
<b>Limited</b>	8 (57)	7 (50%)	1 (7)	8 (57)	8 (57)	6 (43)
<b>Good</b>	4 (29)	4 (29)	8 (57)	5 (36)	5 (36)	5 (36)
<b>Very good</b>	2 (14)	3 (21)	5 (36)	1 (7)	1 (7)	3 (21)