

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

Joy D. Patton¹

¹ Our Lady of the Lake University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Survey Design: The survey encompasses a large sample size (2,265 respondents), which enhances the reliability of the findings, however, there is no explicit mention of reliability testing of the survey instrument in the article. This is a potential area for improvement in the study, as reliability testing is crucial for ensuring consistent results over time.

The article mentions that the survey items concerning those who experienced hate incidents were mainly adapted from existing surveys validated by the ONS (2019) and the Crime and Victims' Commissioner (2018). This suggests that the scale has face and content validity. Testing for construct validity with the revised scale to ensure the scale was measuring the concept it was intended to measure would have strengthen this study.

Additionally, without specific details about the questions and response options on the scale, it's challenging to fully assess the adequacy of the scale. In comprehensive research studies, especially those involving survey methodologies, it is standard practice to provide an overview or examples of the survey items used, particularly when discussing the methodology. This inclusion helps readers understand how the questions align with the research objectives and how the data collected addresses the research questions.

The authors should also explain how the items on the scale relate to the research questions to establish a clear link between their data collection methods and their research objectives. This explanation is crucial for validating the research design and ensuring that the survey instrument effectively captures the necessary information to answer the research questions. If such details are not included in the article, it could be seen as a limitation in terms of transparency and replicability.

Analysis: The article provides a detailed analysis of hate incidents, including the nature and frequency of these incidents and the patterns in reporting them, offering valuable insights. The descriptive analysis and cross-tabulation written in the article are appropriate methods for understanding the distribution and basic relationships in the data. The authors report effect sizes, which is always a good practice. Using logistic regression to predict the likelihood of experiencing and reporting hate incidents, given the respondents' background characteristics, is a appropriate for this study. The results however, should be cautiously interpreted because of possible sample bias (voluntary participation) and the imbalance in the groups.

Thematic Analysis: The use of thematic analysis to understand the participants' views on hate crime policies and reporting mechanisms adds a qualitative depth to the study and complements the quantitative analysis well.

Research and Policy Implications: The findings of the study are well-linked to potential research and policy implications, emphasizing the need for clear institutional policies and support systems.

Inclusion of Diverse Groups: The study pays attention to various subgroups, such as people with disabilities and different ethnic backgrounds, which is crucial for understanding the dynamics of hate incidents in a diverse university setting. Including data from a neighboring university for comparison, despite the lower response rate, adds a broader context to the findings and aids in understanding if the patterns observed are unique to one institution or indicative of a wider trend in higher education.