

Review of: "Understanding the Patterns of Hate Incidents and Reporting Attitudes at a UK University"

Margareta Jelić

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic of the article is relevant and timely. Research on hate crimes in universities is a very important issue to address, and these findings could help to understand the scope of the issue and what is needed to address it. The sample size is large, even if not representative. The article is well based in theoretical terms.

However, there are some limitations to the research that should be addressed.

First, authors should describe their instruments in more detail, including information on the original scales from which their scale was derived, the sample item for each scale, the number of items in each scale, and the reliability of each measure, as well as the construct validity of the scales if they were not used before.

Additionally, authors do not provide information on the type of sociodemographic data that was requested. Although the sample is indeed large, more information should be provided about the sample.

The authors could rethink their analytical approach. The article only shows results of the descriptive analysis (means and percentages), whereas the data offers more possibilities to gain better insight into the problem of hate crimes at the university level. The main comparison in the sample is between respondents who reported having experienced a hate incident and those who reported not having experienced any hate incident. Why is there not an analysis that compares students and university staff? An attempted comparative analysis with the other university is only mentioned and not analysed or interpreted in depth. When making a judgement as to whether 27% is a high or low level of hate incidents by comparing it to another university in the region, it is not clear how this comparison could provide this information. Cannot both be high (or low)? Would it not be better to compare it to recent studies in the UK and in Europe? Furthermore, authors do not use statistical analysis to support their comparisons; why not use the chi-square test to do this? Moreover, authors could analyse the most typical harassment experienced by each specific group.

The thematic analysis section is not presented with enough detail. Authors could improve that by adding information on what the coding unit was, who the coders were, and what the agreement was between their assessments. Also, it seems that only two themes were recognised and presented. I would suggest that all the identified themes and subthemes be mentioned in the article or in the supplemental material.

The discussion of the results could be more comprehensive by commenting on how these results resonate with the recent (and less recent) findings in this area. The implications of the study at the end of the discussion section would further enhance the quality of the paper.

