“Who cares about us?”:

Insights and implications from survivors who reported hate crimes and incidents to organizations in Edmonton

by

Landon Turlock

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Community Engagement

School of Public Health

University of Alberta

Abstract

Reports of hate crimes in Canada increased by 72% from 2019 to 2021 (Moreau, 2022). Hate crimes have significant negative impacts on both those directly impacted and members of targeted communities (Erentzen & Schuller, 2020). Canadian research primarily focuses on the effects of hate crimes and their underreporting. However, there is little understanding of survivors' experiences when they report a hate crime or incident, and how organizations respond to these reports. I worked alongside Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton (CCEE) using a Community-Based Participatory Research approach to address this gap. This study is guided by three research questions: What are the experiences of people who report hate crimes and/or incidents to organizations in Edmonton? How do individuals who have reported hate crimes and/or incidents experience organizational responses to these reports? What are the policy and practice implications of these experiences for organizations that respond to hate crimes and/or incidents? I conducted 20 interviews with 18 participants who reported a hate crime or incident to an organization in Edmonton over the past five years. Participants shared several insights. Firstly, how organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents does not reliably meet the needs of people victimized by these occurrences and can significantly impact survivors. Secondly, understandings and experiences of hate crimes and incidents and how organizations respond to them are based in lived experiences of historical and ongoing systemic and societal discrimination. Thirdly, interpersonal relationships, existing knowledge and beliefs, and previous experiences influence the series of choices involved in reporting a hate crime or incident. We provide recommendations to address the implications of this research.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Landon Turlock, with Community-Based Participatory Research completed in collaboration with Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board 1, “Understanding organizational responses in Edmonton to reports of hate crimes and/or incidents from the perspective of those reporting”, Pro00115909, on December 15, 2021. The Alberta Public Interest Research Group (APIRG) and the John Humphrey Centre for Peace and Human Rights funded this research in 2022.

Dedication

To the knowledge co-creators in this study who so genuinely shared their stories, and the Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton members who made this study happen, all in the hopes that things can be better for others.

And to Ezekiel – you made me want to do work like this, and I'm sorry I'll never be able to tell you that.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, thank you to those who shared their stories and insights with me throughout our interviews. I commit to make what you shared heard. It matters so much.

This study would not have existed without Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton (CCEE), and the countless ways its members brought this study to life. Many people in CCEE made this happen. However, I want to specifically acknowledge Helen Rusich and Ali Mahdi (REACH Edmonton); Renée Vaugeois, Tiffany Efird, Angelica Quesada, and Gurpreet Bolina (John Humphrey Centre for Peace and Human Rights); Farshad Labbaf (University of Alberta); William Howe (Edmonton Public School Board); Shalini Sinha (City of Edmonton Anti-Racism Advisory Committee); and Robert Lee (Victims Rights Law).

Thank you to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Maria Mayan, for showing me a truly generous amount of gentleness, grace, guidance, respect, and trust throughout this process. I am incredibly grateful to Dr. Ruth Wolfe and Dr. Justin Tetrault for their invaluable contributions to this research and my learning as members of my advisory committee.

Christina Kruszewski, I cannot thank you enough for listening to me talk incessantly about hate crimes and research for the past few years. I appreciate the sacrifice you made by marrying an academic.

There is no amount of gratitude that is enough to appreciate Matt Turlock for showing me this path existed, and Sandra Turlock, Greg Turlock, and Peter Labuda for helping me walk it.

Thank you to Irfan Chaudhry and Stephen Camp for your mentorship, friendship, and support in this work.

Thank you to the Alberta Public Interest Group (APIRG) and the John Humphrey Centre for Peace and Human Rights for funding the compensation of participants in this study.

Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

APIRG – Alberta Public Interest Research Group

CBPR – Community-Based Participatory Research

CCC – Criminal Code of Canada

CCEE – Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton

KKK – Ku Klux Klan

UK – United Kingdom

Glossary of Terms

Community-Based Participatory Research

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is a collaborative and equitable research approach that brings researchers and community stakeholders together to address social inequities concerning community members (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). Alternative but comparable terms like "community-engaged scholarship," "community-based research," "action research," and "participatory action research" are also used (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020, p. 5).

Hate Crimes

Defining hate crimes is contentious and complex, and these nuances will be further discussed throughout this thesis. However, for this study, we broadly define hate crimes as: "crimes motivated by hate, based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or any other similar factor" (The Canadian Criminal Code of Canada, as cited in #StopHateAB, para. 4, 2020). Four charges in the Criminal Code of Canada are often associated with hate crimes: Section 318(1): Advocating genocide; Section 319(1): Public incitement of hatred; Section 319(2): Willful promotion of hatred; and Section 430(4.1): Mischief relating to religious property, educational institutions, etc. There is also the 718.2ai sentencing principle, which allows the court to increase sentencing if the prosecution proves that an offence was motivated by hate or bias. However, the Criminal Code of Canada has no standalone definition of a hate crime (Camp, 2021).

Hate Incidents

As Bell and Perry (2015) have emphasized, many harmful noncriminal acts are motivated by hate. For this thesis's purposes, we define these noncriminal acts as hate incidents, aligned

with the use of the term as articulated by Chaudhry (2021), Facing Facts (2012), and #StopHateAB (2020).

I and We

Throughout this thesis, I use 'I' and 'we' at different points. When referring to the broad and collaborative elements of this research study, such as its design, recruitment, and reviewing of themes, I tend to use 'we' to refer to the research subcommittee composed of Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton members and my thesis advisor. When I use 'I', I am referring to activities I carried out independently, such as interviews and data analysis.

Participants/Victims/Survivors/Complainants

There is a general move away from victim-oriented language when describing people whom the actions of others have harmed. As such, it is rare that I use the term 'victim' in this thesis outside of referencing other studies. Throughout this document, I refer to the people I interviewed as participants or survivors. I refer broadly to people who have experienced a hate crime or incident and reported their experience to an organization as survivors. In cases where I am specifically discussing a survivor in the context of filing a police report or legal scenario, I may use the term 'complainant.' For clarity, the terms 'participant,' 'victim,' 'survivor,' and 'complainant,' while notable in their differences, consistently describe the same individuals — namely, those who have survived a hate crime or incident and reported it.

Reporting

'Reporting' means contacting an organization to make them aware of a person's experience of a hate crime or incident and potentially accessing services from that organization. The types of services expected and received vary widely, as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

Secondary Victimization

Secondary victimization is described by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (2020) as:

> …victimization that occurs not as a direct result of the criminal act but through the response of institutions and individuals to the victim. This includes, but is not limited to, not recognizing and treating the victim in a respectful manner, an insensitive and unprofessional manner of approaching the victim and discrimination of the victim in any kind. (pp. 13-14)

Chapter 1: Introduction

Reports of hate crimes increased in Canada by 72% from 2019 to 2021 (Moreau, 2022). Hate crimes are unique for their significant impacts on survivors compared to other types of crime (Iganski & Lagou, 2015) and the harm they cause to affected communities (Perry & Alvi, 2011).

Within Canadian research on hate crimes and incidents in Canada, there is a general understanding of the experiences and impacts of these crimes on different demographic groups (Bell & Perry, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011), the underreporting of these crimes (Ahmad, 2019; Angeles & Roberton, 2020; Erentzen & Schuller, 2020), and legal and policing approaches to these topics (Ashley, 2018; Bryan & Trickett, 2021; Hardy & Chakraborti, 2019; Meyers, 2019; Perry & Samuels-Wortley, 2021; Provost-Yombo, et al., 2020; Swiffen, 2018). Some studies in Canada (Canadian Race Relations Foundation, 2022) and the United Kingdom (Chakraborti et al., 2014; Fitch-Bartlett & Healy, 2022; Healy, 2020) describe what happens when a survivor reports a hate crime or incident and the services available to survivors. However, there is limited exploration into Canadian survivors' perspectives on these responses.

I worked alongside Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton (CCEE), a group of organizations focusing on anti-racism, hate crimes prevention, and anti-discrimination. Together, we developed a qualitative, descriptive Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) study to answer the following questions:

1. What are the experiences of people who report hate crimes and/or incidents to organizations in Edmonton?

2. How do individuals who have reported hate crimes and/or incidents experience organizational responses to these reports?
3. What are the policy and practice implications of these experiences for organizations that respond to hate crimes and/or incidents?

I conducted 20 semi-structured interviews with 18 participants to answer these questions. Study participants had reported a hate crime or incident to an organization in Edmonton over the past five years. I then used qualitative content analysis to analyze the collected data. I verified findings and recommendations with research participants and partners. Participants shared three major insights:

1. The ways that organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents do not reliably meet the needs of people victimized by these occurrences and can significantly impact survivors.
2. Participants' understandings and experiences of hate crimes and incidents and how organizations respond to them are based in their lived experiences of historical and ongoing systemic and societal discrimination.
3. Interpersonal relationships, existing knowledge and beliefs, and previous experiences influence the choices to report a hate crime or incident.

Insights from our study are consistent with existing research in the area. This study expands upon existing research as it articulates the responses of a breadth of organizations to reports of hate crimes and incidents from the perspective of survivors. This study is novel in demonstrating the impacts of these responses on survivors, and the factors that influence the understanding and reporting of hate crimes and incidents among survivors. Our research offers substantial

recommendations for organizations and governments to more fully inform how they support survivors of hate crimes and incidents. Additional areas of research inquiry are also indicated.

Thesis Structure

Chapter 2 covers relevant literature related to the subject of this thesis, further identifying the gaps that this study helps to address. Chapter 3 explains the methodology used in this study. Paper 1 (Chapter 4) contends that CBPR is appropriate but underutilized when studying hate crimes and incidents. It also offers emerging practices from our study to prospective CBPR researchers in this area. Paper 1 is significant primarily for its methodological contributions to the study of hate crimes and incidents. Paper 2 (Chapter 5) explores the insights shared by participants and offers implications for how organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents while supporting survivors. In the discussion and conclusion (Chapter 6), I contextualize these findings within existing research on hate crimes and incidents.

Please note that Paper 1 (Chapter 4) and Paper 2 (Chapter 5) contain background, methodological, and discussion elements also found in Chapter 2, Chapter 3, and Chapter 6. This duplication is intentional as I intend for Papers 1 and 2 to be standalone documents for publication in peer-reviewed journals. Ultimately, this manuscript-based thesis contains two papers (Chapters 4 and 5) with additional chapters. The paper in Chapter 4 has been submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, and I am preparing the paper in Chapter 5 for submission to a peer-reviewed journal.

References

Ahmad, S. (2019). Islamophobic violence as a form of gender-based violence: A qualitative study with Muslim women in Canada. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence, 3*(1), 45-66. **https://doi.org/10.1332/239868019X15492770695379**

Ashley, F. (2018). Don't be so hateful: The insufficiency of anti-discrimination and hate crime laws in improving trans well-being. *The University of Toronto Law Journal, 68*(1), 1–36. **https://www.jstor.org/stable/90019657**

Angeles, L., & Roberton, J. (2020). Empathy and inclusive public safety in the city: Examining LGBTQ2+ voices and experiences of intersectional discrimination. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 78, 1-12. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2019.102313**

Bell, J., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay, and bisexual hate crime. *Journal of Homosexuality, 62*(1), 98-120. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957133**

Chakraborti, N., Garland, J., & Hardy, S. (2014). The Leicester hate crime project: Findings and conclusions. Leicester, UK: University of Leicester. **https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/fc-full-report**

Erentzen, C., & Schuller, R. (2020). Exploring the dark figure of hate: Experiences with police bias and the under-reporting of hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 62*(2), 64-97. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2019-0035**

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C., & Healy, J. (2022). Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: Perspectives from voluntary advisors. *Safer Communities, 21*(3), 215-225. **https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012**

Healy, S.J. (2020). ‘It spreads like a creeping disease’: Experiences of victims of disability hate crimes in austerity Britain. *Disability & Society, 35*(2), 176-200. **https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1624151**

Iganski, P., & Lagou, S. (2015). The personal injuries of ‘hate crime’. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 34-46). Routledge.

Moreau, G. (2022, August 3). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2021*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00013-eng.htm**

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Definitions of Hate Crimes and Incidents in A Current Context

Hate crimes are challenging to describe, and definitions vary internationally and between local jurisdictions (Alberta Hate Crimes Committee, 2009; Chakraborti, 2015). Even among police officers who ultimately need to respond to and investigate hate crimes, there is a lack of familiarity or confidence with these concepts (Perry & Samuels-Wortley, 2021).

Perry (2001) offers this definition of hate crime:

> ... acts of violence and intimidation, usually directed toward already stigmatized and marginalized groups. As such, [hate crime is] a mechanism of power, intended to reaffirm the precarious hierarchies that characterize a given social order. It attempts to recreate simultaneously the threatened (real or imagined) hegemony of the perpetrator's group and the appropriate subordinate identity of the victim's group. (p. 10)

This definition highlights the interconnection between the perpetration of hate crimes and the societal contexts from which they emerge. However, Perry's definition is not a legal definition. The first Criminal Code entries in Canadian legislation were established as early as 1970, being some of the earliest federal hate crime legislation adopted worldwide before being updated in 2017 (Chakraborti et al., 2020). As it stands, there are four charges in the Criminal Code of Canada often associated with hate crimes: Section 318(1): Advocating genocide; Section 319(1): Public incitement of hatred; Section 319(2): Willful promotion of hatred; and Section 430(4.1): Mischief relating to religious property, educational institutions, etc. There is also the 718.2(a)(i) sentencing principle, which allows the court to increase sentencing if the prosecution proves that an offence was motivated by hate or bias. However, the Criminal Code of Canada has no standalone definition of a hate crime (Camp, 2021).

In addition to hate crimes, Bell and Perry (2015) observe that many noncriminal acts motivated by hate cause significant harm. These noncriminal acts are defined as hate incidents, as articulated by Chaudhry (2021) and Facing Facts (2012):

> …an act that involves prejudice and bias-motivated by hate, based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or any other similar factor but which does not amount to a crime. (p. 9)

Limited Canadian Research on Hate Crimes and Incidents

Hate crime legislation emerged in Canada in 1970 (Chakraborti et al., 2020). A cursory review of databases suggests that hate crimes and incidents were hardly researched in Canada before 1988. An increase in research on the topic seems associated with the conviction of Albertan high school teacher James Keegstra for teaching antisemitic conspiracy theories and holocaust denial in his classroom (McCoy et al., 2019). There is still a great deal of research on hate crimes and incidents to be done in Canada as this is a relatively new crime type in legislation and an underreported phenomenon (Canadian Race Relations Foundation, 2022; Erentzen & Schuller, 2020). This relative paucity is evident throughout this chapter in the repeated references to a small number of studies.

Policing and Legal Approaches to Hate Crimes and Incidents in Canada

Canadian research and public sources reveal policing realities addressing hate crimes in Canada. For example, Canadian police officers must receive written consent from the attorney general before proceeding with hate crime charges (Corb, as cited in Hardy & Chakraborti, 2019, p. 29). This process leads to delays in cases and low prosecutions. The ways that police in Canada address hate crimes are affected by the ambiguousness of existing hate crime legislation and challenges in prosecution (Perry & Samuels-Wortley, 2021). Further, a lack of trust between

police and communities may limit the kind of collaboration, dialogue, and information-sharing necessary for police to address hate crimes in a way that reflects the voices of community members. Organizational factors, including leadership, policy, responsibility, hate crime portfolios, and communication, also impact police responses to hate crimes. Cultural and enforcement-oriented biases held by police, lack of understanding of hate crimes, and training limitations further affect responses to hate crimes. This complexity in policing and understanding hate crimes is also evident as police services across Canada are not united in their definitions of hate crimes (Alberta Hate Crimes Committee, 2009; Camp, 2021). Further, Bryan and Trickett (2021) observe differences between how police services approach hate crimes in their policies and their actual responses. They argue that police apply a policing lens that denies, minimizes, or decontextualizes the experiences of people who are victimized instead of using a victim-centered lens, despite their victim-centered policies.

Meyers (2019) posits that Canadian hate crime laws fail to address right-wing extremist movements adequately. Further, Swiffen (2018) argues that hate crime laws in Canada and the United States are ambiguous, which makes proving a hate motivation difficult. Swiffen (2018) has documented criticism of hate crimes legislation in Canada for being too narrowly applied. These legal challenges are evident when observing that Section 718.2(a)(i) was successfully applied 31 times across the nation between 2008 and 2020 (Provost-Yombo, et al., 2020). Section 718.2(a)(i) would not apply to all reported hate crimes. However, 31 applications over 12 years is a minimal number, considering that 2669 hate crimes were reported to police in Canada in 2020 alone (Wang & Moreau, 2022). These challenges are not new: "The fact that only a handful of people in Canada have been prosecuted under hate crime legislation since the

1970s speaks volumes about the legal issues facing the Canadian judicial system" (Corb, 2015, p. 164).

Some scholars point out the weaknesses of legal definitions of hate crime in Canada, while some call for a standalone hate crime definition to respond to some of these challenges (Camp, 2021; Swiffen, 2018). Nonetheless, Ashley (2018) suggests that anti-discrimination and hate crime laws may not effectively prevent hate crimes or improve the lives of transgender people in Canada. Others suggest that legal definitions of hate crimes individualize these behaviours instead of locating them socio-politically in contexts of power imbalances and inequality (Bell & Perry, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry, 2001). Mercier-Dalphond and Helly (2021) argue that hate crime definitions fail to recognize the cumulative impacts of repeated, often daily exposure to harassment for individuals and communities. Further, they do not adequately address online hate crimes. Chakraborti's (2015) and Mason-Bish's (2015) observations of the intersectional nature of hate crimes reveal a potential deficit in how hate crimes are currently defined. McCaslin (2014) further critiques Canadian definitions of hate crimes for not addressing "the complex, layered, and historical issues that affect Aboriginal people, distinct as these issues are from those facing any other population living in Canada" (p. 22).

Impacts of Hate Crimes and Incidents on Individuals and Communities

The reporting of hate crimes and incidents increased in Canada by 72% from 2019 to 2021 (Moreau, 2022). That this increase in a crime type is not always effectively addressed by the police and legal system is of concern, especially considering the harm these acts cause. A UK study on this topic identifies impacts of hate crime that include increased physical, psychological, and behavioural injuries compared to other crimes (Iganski & Lagou, 2015).

Furthermore, Chaudhry et al. (2022), the Government of Wales (2020), and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (2021) explicate the emotional and psychological injuries associated with hate crimes on individuals. These can include Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, anger, annoyance, depression, panic attacks, trouble sleeping, and loss of confidence at higher rates than crimes not motivated by hate (Iganski & Lagou, 2015). Behavioural change is also a common impact of hate crimes. Survivors may move homes, distrust others, be highly alert, remove religious garb and symbols, no longer express affection with partners in public, and stop attending places of worship or speaking in public (Chaudhry et al., 2022; Government of Wales, 2020; Iganski & Lagou, 2015).

Hate crimes and incidents can also severely impact members of the affected community (Perry & Alvi, 2011). Hate crimes send an exclusionary message to communities that experience marginalization (Perry, 2001). Perry and Alvi (2011) studied participants' reactions to hate crimes targeting a community member. Study participants experienced emotional and psychological harm, reduced safety, fear, vulnerability, suspicion, shame, a sense of being unwelcome, fear and distrust towards the community of the perpetrator, concern that people did not intervene to stop the incident, and fear that a similar incident could happen to themselves or other community members (Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011). Participants identified fear of other people in the perpetrator's community, a lack of belonging, a desire for revenge, that they did not have the same rights as others, and doubts about Canada's multiculturalism and tolerance (Perry & Alvi, 2011). People from communities targeted by hate may also engage in behavioural change. Such adaptive behaviour may include altering their appearance, their schedule, where they spend their time, how they travel, to whom they disclose their identity, and with whom they associate (Bell & Perry, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly,

2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011). At the same time, many felt motivated to become involved in stopping harassment and discrimination (Perry & Alvi, 2011).

Underreporting of Hate Crimes and Incidents

In addition to legal and policing challenges to addressing the severe impacts of hate crimes, this crime type is significantly underreported. The Statistics Canada General Social Survey found that, in 2019, there were 223,000 self-reported hate-motivated incidents in Canada (as cited in Canada Race Relations Foundation, 2022, p. 7). This number is extraordinarily significant compared with the 1,946 criminal incidents motivated by hate reported by the police in the same year (Moreau, 2021). Ahmad (2019), when speaking to 21 Muslim women who disclosed 30 incidents of Islamophobic violence, found that these women reported only three occurrences to the police.

The reasons that people do not report hate crimes vary. They include fear of retaliation, concerns about experiencing racism from police, past traumatic experiences of police discrimination, police distrust, a feeling that their concern was not serious enough to report, as well as a lack of faith in the efficacy of police or that the perpetrator would be prosecuted (Angeles & Roberton, 2020; Erentzen & Schuller, 2020). When survivors of hate crimes and incidents do not turn to the police, they may instead connect with friends, family, partners, social media, mental health services, community organizations, and local businesses (Angeles & Roberton, 2020; Chakraborti et al., 2014).

Survivors Reporting Hate Crimes and Incidents in Canada and the United Kingdom

Policing and hate crimes legislation may not effectively prevent hate crimes or support the well-being of the people these crimes impact (Ashley, 2018; Bryan & Trickett, 2021). Further, hate crimes are significantly underreported (Erentzen & Schuller, 2020). These two

factors support inquiry into what happens when survivors report hate crimes and incidents and how responding organizations support them. In 2018, the Edmonton Centre for Race and Culture (CFRAC) studied the experiences of racialized and Indigenous individuals after encountering racial or cultural discrimination or harassment and their attempts to document the incidents or access support (de Koninck & Lauridsen, 2018). While not explicitly based on experiences of hate crimes and incidents, the report revealed that impacts of racism and discrimination were present throughout individuals' experiences of seeking support from organizations. Individuals struggled to reach appropriate and effective services and rarely encountered empathy when reporting. They also often felt reduced to their ethnic, cultural, or racial identities, and encountered bureaucratic responses. In 2022, the Canadian Race Relations Foundation (CRRF) independently assessed services for survivors of hate crimes and incidents across the nation. They observed that services are not proportionate in terms of consistency, quality, or quantity to the needs of survivors of hate crimes and incidents. Siloing, fragmentation, and inconsistent services can significantly impact survivors. This phenomenon is known as 'secondary victimization' and is described as:

> …victimization that occurs not as a direct result of the criminal act but through the response of institutions and individuals to the victim. This includes, but is not limited to, not recognizing and treating the victim in a respectful manner, an insensitive and unprofessional manner of approaching the victim and discrimination of the victim in any kind. (European Crime Prevention Network, as cited in Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, 2020, pp. 13-14)

Research from the United Kingdom (UK) also investigates the experiences of those who report hate crimes. The Leicester Hate Crime Project (Chakraborti et al., 2014) engaged with

over 4000 participants to understand people's experiences of hate crimes, the harms caused by these experiences, and ways to improve support for people victimized by hate crimes. Only a quarter of people reported their victimization to the police, and only half reported it to anyone. Fifty-five percent of respondents were fairly satisfied with the police response, while 35% were dissatisfied. Participants most significantly affected by a hate crime or who had experienced hate-motivated violence were more likely to be dissatisfied with a police response. Participants who expressed satisfaction with police responses valued the police's follow-up and support. Dissatisfied participants noted that police did not take their concerns seriously, that they did not receive follow-up and that officers were rude. Healy's (2020) UK study examined the victimization of 12 people due to their experiences of disability and how the criminal justice system responded to them. Reporting to the police resulted in a range of police responses, including dismissive or uninterested responses, delayed processes, difficulty in achieving convictions, discouragement from pressing charges, discriminatory assumptions, and the need to escalate reports to senior police leadership before action was taken. Fitch-Bartlett and Healy (2022) found that third-party reporting services for victims of hate crimes in the UK helped increase awareness of hate crimes in the community. However, these services still required further promotion, and trained volunteer advisors lacked understanding and knowledge about hate crimes.

The Current Context of Hate Crimes and Incidents in Alberta and Edmonton

As Perry (2001) observes, we must understand hate crimes and incidents within a given social order. Our study is explicitly grounded in the context of Edmonton and Alberta.

There is a long history of hate crimes in Alberta, present since its formation and, likely, long before, especially considering the history of Canada's colonization and colonial structures

that perpetrate hate (Canadian Race Relations Foundation, 2022). Residential schools were prominent in the area that became Alberta in the 1880s, with 25 operating in what became the province (Government of Alberta, 2022). In 1927, the white supremacist hate group Ku Klux Klan (KKK) had 1000 members, growing to between 7000 and 8000 in 1931 (McCoy et al., 2019). The Government of Alberta granted the KKK a formal charter twice and was the only Canadian entity to grant them a charter (Lund, 2006). The City of Edmonton Mayor's Office sanctioned cross-burnings during that time (Mohamed, as cited in Braat, 2019, para. 22). The KKK was legally recognized as a society in Alberta until 2003. The provincial Social Credit Party espoused antisemitic campaigns before and after World War II. The party formed a majority government in 1935 (Lund, 2006). It exists to this day as the Pro-Life Alberta Political Association (Cournoyer, 2016).

While such actions were less high-profile in the province following World War II, the KKK saw a resurgence in Alberta in the 1980s (McCoy et al., 2019). In 1988, two KKK members were charged and convicted for planning to bomb a Jewish community centre in Calgary (McCoy et al., 2019). 1990 saw the rise of extreme hate-motivated violence perpetrated by skinhead groups in Edmonton, carrying out assaults and distributing hate propaganda (Corb, 2015). Between 2006 and 2017, Calgary became a hub of white supremacist activity, carrying out murders, bombings, and intergroup violence (McCoy et al., 2019). A recent Alberta-based report observes that such militia and patriot groups have declined in recent years (St-Amant et al., 2022).

However, this reported decline in militia and patriot groups does not mean that hate crimes and incidents are receding in the province. For example, perpetrators have targeted at least seven Black Muslim women since 2020 in Edmonton (St-Amant et al., 2022). Further,

StopHateAB.ca (2021), an online platform for Albertans to report hate incidents, recorded 316 hate incidents in the province between 2017 and 2021. Overall, Alberta has seen a 39% increase in hate crimes reported to police from 2020 to 2021 (Statistics Canada, 2022).

Several organizations across the province have formed to address these issues over the years. The Alberta Hate Crimes Committee has created reports and training to raise awareness and capacity to address and prevent hate crimes (“About,” n.d.). The Organization for the Prevention of Violence uses a combination of research and intervention to address hate-motivated violence and violent extremism (“About the OPV,” n.d.). Coalitions Creating Equity (“About,” n.d.) has united organizations across the province to advance equity issues and human rights. Further, the Government of Alberta recently created a Hate Crimes Coordination Unit (Red Deer Advocate, 2022, May 27). In May 2022, the provincial government appointed two Hate Crimes Community Liaisons to recommend ways to improve the province’s approach to hate crimes to the Ministry of Justice (Red Deer Advocate, 2022, May 27). In the fall of 2022, the Alberta government also commissioned two studies to understand the scope and impact of hate crimes and incidents in Alberta (Michelin, 2022, September 22).

Community-Based Participatory Research as a Way to Address Hate Crimes and Incidents

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is a collaborative and equitable research approach. This approach brings researchers and community stakeholders together to address social inequities concerning community members (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). Alternative but comparable terms like "community-engaged scholarship," "community-based research," "action research," and "participatory action research" are also used (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020, p. 5). Janzen and Ochocka (2020) note that unifying elements of these types of research include being action-oriented, community-driven, and participatory. Considering the

community impacts of hate crimes and incidents, CBPR seems well-suited to explore and identify various ways to address the harms resulting from these issues.

The scholarly CBPR literature on hate crimes and incidents is minimal. Gauthier et al. (2021) used a CBPR approach to understand victimization and underreporting of hate crimes among members of the transgender community in Los Angeles. They created an Advisory Board of service providers serving transgender people. Together, they co-developed the research design, supported participant recruitment, provided venues for focus groups, offered context and recommendations based on the study's outcomes, and assisted in disseminating findings. The available paper did not provide a significant discussion of using a CBPR approach to study hate crimes. However, researchers did note that theirs was the first study they were aware of that had used CBPR to study hate crimes.

Burch (2022) worked with six organizations in England to research disability hate crimes. Burch explored the importance of relationship building, informed consent, flexibility, and arts-based "mood boards" to facilitate participants being treated as experts on their own experiences. Burch (2022) reflects upon this methodological approach to support meaning-making. Further, this approach facilitated more collaborative, participatory research processes while using mood boards to disseminate knowledge in meaningful ways.

There is a lack of scholarly CBPR literature on hate crimes and incidents. However, a number of Canadian community organizations have worked to fill this gap. Organizations have developed guides, toolkits, and reports on responding to and preventing hate crimes. For example, some Canadian reports discuss victim support and referrals, university campus responses, media appearances, community dialogues, vigils, restorative justice, and peer-to-peer

support (Archway Community Services, 2019; Coalitions Creating Equity, 2020; Kochar et al., 2019; The Lead Fund, 2019).

However, the role of community engagement in responding to hate crimes and incidents is not just the purview of community organizations, but can also include police. Perry and Samuels-Wortley (2021) identified that police must build relationships and trust with diverse communities to respond to hate crimes effectively. To do this, they recommend that police commit to inclusivity while understanding and recognizing the harm caused to individuals and communities victimized by hate crimes. The researchers further recommend that police practice increased awareness building, public education, outreach, and transparency.

Canadian organizations and researchers (Perry & Samuels-Wortley, 2021) call for community engagement to respond to hate crimes. However, there is a lack of community-engaged scholarship on hate crimes and incidents. As such, there is a clear role for CBPR to address hate crimes.

References

Ahmad, S. (2019). Islamophobic violence as a form of gender-based violence: a qualitative study with Muslim women in Canada. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence, 3*(1), 45-66. **https://doi.org/10.1332/239868019X15492770695379**

Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. (n.d.). *About*. Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. **https://sites.google.com/albertahatecrimes.org/ahcc**

Alberta Hate Crime Committee. (2009). *Alberta hate/bias crime report*. Alberta Hate Crime Committee. **https://cfrac.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Alberta-Hate-Bias-Crime-Report-2.pdf**

Angeles, L. & Roberton, J. (2020). Empathy and inclusive public safety in the city: Examining LGBTQ2+ voices and experiences of intersectional discrimination. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 78, 1-12. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2019.102313**

Ashley, F. (2018). Don't be so hateful: The insufficiency of anti-discrimination and hate crime laws in improving trans well-being. *The University of Toronto Law Journal, 68*(1), 1–36. **https://www.jstor.org/stable/90019657**

Archway Community Services. (2019, August). *Abbotsford community protocol: A response to critical incidents of discrimination and hate crime*. Archway Community Services. **https://archway.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Community-Protocol-2019-updated.pdf**

Bell, J., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay, and bisexual hate crime. *Journal of Homosexuality, 62*(1), 98-120. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957133**

Braat, T. (2019, February 12). *Edmonton man shines light on Alberta's racist past with interactive archive.* Global News. **https://globalnews.ca/news/4949847/black-history-month-alberta-racism-history-twitter/**

Bryan, T., & Trickett, L. (2021). "It's not Really Hate Crime" – Reframing Hate Crime as not Police Business" – Police Narratives of Resistance and Denial. *Journal of Hate Studies, 17*(1), 74–84. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.206**

Burch, L. (2022). 'We shouldn't be told to shut up, we should be told we can speak out': Reflections on using arts-based methods to research disability hate crime. *Qualitative Social Work, 21*(2), 393-412. **https://doi.org/10.1177/14733250211002888**

Canadian Race Relations Foundation. (2022). *Reimagining a path to support all Canadians: A review of services for victims of hate in Canada*. Canadian Race Relations Foundation. **https://www.crrf-fcrr.ca/images/CRRF_-_A_review_of_services_for_victims_of_hate_in_Canada__Full_report.pdf**

Chaudhry, I. (2021). Making hate visible: Online hate incident reporting tools. *Journal of Hate Studies*, *17*(1), 64–73. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.188**

Chaudhry, I., Turlock, L., Tyler, J., Pandher, G., & Johal, S. (2022). *Supporting victims of hate crimes and incidents: A community centered approach*. StopHateAB. **https://stophateab.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/31328.pdf**

Chakraborti, N., Garland, J., & Hardy, S. (2014). The Leicester hate crime project: Findings and conclusions. Leicester, UK: University of Leicester. **https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/fc-full-report**

Chakraborti, N. (2015). Framing the boundaries of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Coalitions Creating Equity. (n.d.). *About*. Coalitions Creating Equity. **http://coalitionscreatingequity.ca/about/**

Coalitions Creating Equity. (2020, June). *CCE response model to hate incidents in Alberta*. Coalitions Creating Equity. **http://coalitionscreatingequity.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Hate-Incident-BookJuly2020_LO.pdf**

Corb, A. (2015). Hate and hate crime in Canada. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Cournoyer, D. (2016, July 21). *Anti-abortion activists stage an "invalid takeover" of Alberta's Social Credit Party*. daveberta.ca. **https://daveberta.ca/2016/07/anti-abortion-social-credit-party/**

Criminal Code, RSC, C-46 (1985). Retrieved from **http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/index.html**

Dauvergne, M., & Brennan, S. (2011). *Police-reported hate crime in Canada, 2009*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2011001/article/11469-eng.htm**

Erentzen, C., & Schuller, R. (2020). Exploring the dark figure of hate: Experiences with police bias and the under-reporting of hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 62*(2), 64-97. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2019-0035**

Facing Facts. (2012). *Facing facts! Hate crime monitoring guidelines*. Facing Facts.

https://www.facingfacts.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/02/Guidelines-for-monitoring-of-hate-crimes-and-hate-motivated-incidents-PROTECTED.pdf

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C., & Healy, J. (2022). Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors. *Safer Communities, 21*(3), 215-225. https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012

Gauthier, J., Medina, K., & Dierkhising, C. (2021). Analysis of hate crimes in transgender communities. *Journal of Hate Studies, 17(*2), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.158

Government of Alberta. (2022). *Residential school research and recognition*. Government of Alberta. https://www.alberta.ca/residential-school-research-and-recognition.aspx#:~:text=In%20Alberta%2C%20the%20Indian%20Residential,research%2C%20recognition%20and%20location%20support

Government of Wales. (2020). *Victim support hate crime toolkit.* Government of Wales. https://hwb.gov.wales/api/storage/a7fcb16a-7d4f-4450-be77-6885d3d943e7/Victim%20Support%20Hate%20Crime%20Toolkit.pdf

Hardy SJ., & Chakraborti, N. (2020). *Blood, threats and fears: The hidden worlds of hate crime victims*. Palgrave Hate Studies. Palgrave Pivot, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31997-7_3

Healy, SJ. (2020). 'It spreads like a creeping disease': Experiences of victims of disability hate crimes in austerity Britain. *Disability & Society, 35*(2), 176-200. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1624151

Iganski, P., & Lagou, S. (2015). The personal injuries of 'hate crime'. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 34-46). Routledge.

Janzen, R., & Ochocka, J. (2020). Assessing excellence in community-based research: Lessons from research with Syrian refugee newcomers. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 13*(1), 1-20. **https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v13i1.7037**

Kochar, H., McCoy, J., & Jones, D. (2019, August). *Responding to hate*. Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/publication/responding-to-hate/**

Lead Fund. (2019, February). *Toolkit on campus hate and bias strategies to create more inclusive campuses*. American Association for Access Equity and Diversity. **https://www.aaaed.org/images/aaaed/LEAD_Fund/LEAD-FUND-Toolkit.pdf**

Lund, D. (2006). Social justice activism in the heartland of hate: countering extremism in Alberta. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 52*(2), 181-194. **https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/ajer/article/view/55133/42185**

Mason-Bish, H. (2015). Beyond the silo: Rethinking hate crime and intersectionality. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 24-33). Routledge.

McCaslin, W. D. (2014). *Hate-motivated offences and Aboriginal Peoples: Sentencing provisions of Section 718.2(a)(i) of the Criminal Code of Canada* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Saskatchewan. **https://harvest.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/ETD-2014-06-1647/MCCASLIN-THESIS.pdf?sequence=4**

McCoy, J., Jones, D., & Hastings, Z. (2019). *Building awareness, seeking solutions: Extremism & hate motivated violence in Alberta*. The Organization for the Prevention of Violence.

https://preventviolence.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/June2019OPVPublicReport.pdf

Mercier-Dalphond, G., & Helly, D. (2021). Anti-Muslim violence, hate crime, and victimization in Canada: A study of five Canadian cities. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 53*(1), 1-22. **https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2021.0000**

Michelin, L. (2022, September 22). *Alberta government funds $250,000 study into hate crimes and how to prevent them*. Red Deer Advocate. **https://www.reddeeradvocate.com/news/alberta-government-funds-250000-study-into-hate-crimes-and-how-to-prevent-them/**

Moreau, G. (2021, March 29). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2019*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00002-eng.htm**

Moreau, G. (2022, August 3). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2021*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00013-eng.htm**

The Office of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. (2020). *Understanding the needs of hate crime victims*. The Office of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. **https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/0/5/463011.pdf**

OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. (2021). *Model guidance on sensitive and respectful treatment of hate crime victims in the criminal justice system.* OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. **https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/8/f/499513.pdf**

Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes* (1st. ed.). Routledge.

Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2011). 'We are all vulnerable': The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 57–71. **https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758011422475**

Perry, B. (2015). Exploring the community impacts of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 47-58). Routledge.

Perry, B. & Samuels-Wortley, K. (2021). "We're not where we should be": Enhancing law enforcement responses to hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 63*(2), 68-98. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2020-0057**

Provost-Yombo, K., Louden, C., & McDonald, S. (2020). *Hate as an aggravating factor at sentencing - A review of the case law from 2008 – 2020*. Department of Justice Canada. **https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2021/jus/J4-101-2020-eng.pdf**

Red Deer Advocate. (2022, May 27). *New community liaisons take on hate crime in Alberta*. Red Deer Advocate. **https://www.reddeeradvocate.com/news/new-community-liaisons-take-on-hate-crime-in-alberta/**

St-Amant, M., Jones, D., King, M., & McCoy, J. (2022). *Hate, extremism, and terrorism in Alberta, Canada, and beyond: The shift from 2019 to 2022*. The Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Hate-Extremism-and-Terrorism-in-Alberta-Canada-and-Beyond.pdf**

Statistics Canada. (2022, March 17). *Police-reported hate crime, 2020*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220317/dq220317a-eng.htm**

StopHateAB.ca. (2021). *StopHateAB.ca report*. Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. **https://sites.google.com/albertahatecrimes.org/ahcc/stophateab-ca-december-2021-update?authuser=0**

The Organization for the Prevention of Violence. (n.d.). *About the OPV*. The Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/about-the-opv/**

Wang, J., & Moreau, G. (2022, March 17). Police-reported hate crime in Canada, 2020. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00005-eng.htm**

Chapter 3: Methods

Positionality

Self-reflexivity and positioning myself concerning my research, in line with feminist research practices, intends to recognize and address power imbalances and biases that I hold (Nencel, 2013). I am a Registered Social Worker and City of Edmonton Community Social Worker who has worked for four years in public education, engagement, and research to prevent hate crimes, hate incidents, and violent extremism. I was recently appointed as a Hate Crimes Community Liaison by the Government of Alberta. Further, I am a non-binary white settler descendant on Treaty 6 territory with cis-passing privilege.

As a person with this positionality and experience, I find myself often critical of the structures and systems I engage with and the oppression they cause. I have experienced microaggressions and hurtful comments based on my gender identity and perceived sexuality. However, I have not directly experienced hate crimes or incidents. Further, many of my loved ones experience intimidation due to their identities. In fact, these fears are so ubiquitous that my loved ones regularly, half-jokingly, express concern about taking specific actions or visiting certain areas because they will be 'hate-crimed.' This close connection to discrimination, hate incidents, and hate crimes may, in some ways, have helped me to be sensitive to the lived experiences of my research participants. In other ways, it may bias me towards increased protectiveness of participants with similar experiences. As such, I may see weaknesses in systems that may not be evidence-based or be biased to portray survivors of hate crimes and incidents in the best light. At the same time, as a white person with male-passing privilege, I may be insufficiently critical of some of the systems I am associated with (i.e., the municipal government, the provincial government, non-profits). I have attempted to account for and

mitigate these biases by checking interpretations with Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton partners, research participants, my supervisor, and personal journaling.

The Role of a Researcher in Community-Based Participatory Research

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is grounded in using knowledge to achieve change in collaboration with communities marginalized by society (Bourke, 2013; Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). As such, researchers in this context often engage in advocacy, whether to pursue more truly engaged scholarship (Castleden et al., 2013) or social change (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). Feminist community-engaged scholars, like Van Deventer Iverson and James (2014), call for community engagement to move towards a justice orientation. However, they note that some scholars wish to see activism separate from formal study.

In 2017, the American College of Physicians (ACP) recognized hate crimes as a public health issue (Krieger, 2017). Schultz et al. (2019) state: “Public health practitioners are especially well-placed to speak forcefully on what is needed to mitigate the population health consequences of hate” (para. 10). Within the realm of public health, some suggest that researchers must advocate for societal health by adhering to evidence-based practice (Smith & Stewart, 2017). Smith and Stewart (2017) outline the variety of ways advocacy is understood within public health, with some seeking to influence behavioural change, systemic or policy change, and community conditions. However, it is crucial to understand and account for the risks associated with researchers as advocates in public health spaces. Smith and Stewart (2017) identify concerns such as ethical tensions around misrepresenting findings to support an advocacy goal, engaging in advocacy for ideological reasons, or undermining the credibility of their research.

There is tension between the responsibility of CBPR and public health research to pursue social change and traditional perceptions of the role of a researcher. As a professional, volunteer, and researcher in preventing and addressing hate crimes and incidents in Alberta, I regularly engage with this tension in critical and reflective ways. Of course, reflective practice and placing myself in the research means accepting that I bring my own biases to this work, as discussed earlier. Part of the way I seek to navigate this tension is through a practice of transparency, regularly clarifying the roles I work within and my limitations. At the same time, I continue to mitigate potential credibility concerns and misrepresentations of the data. I do this through the research rigour steps outlined in this chapter. I have further ensured that research participants verified the recommendations shared in Chapters 5 and 6 as fully representative of their perspectives rather than my personal biases and political ideology. It is likely that interpretations have been co-constructed by the research participants, partners, and I. However, the steps I have taken to ensure rigour in the findings and recommendations are nonetheless in place to help mitigate and recognize my own biases and ideology in this research and subsequent advocacy.

Setting

A consistent feature of CBPR is that an equitable partnership should exist between community partners impacted by the research issue, and researchers (Cargo & Mercer, 2008; Hacker, 2013; Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). Furthermore, CBPR should be in the service of community members. With this ethos in mind, I approached Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton (CCEE), a network of community organizations and stakeholders I have worked with for several years. Together, we discussed if there was any research that would benefit their work in anti-racism and responding to hate-motivated violence. Interest arose, and we struck an informal subcommittee. The members in our subcommittee had worked for years in anti-racism

and preventing hate crimes and incidents. Most also had lived experiences as members of communities affected by hate crimes and incidents, with some directly impacted by these crimes. This combination of lived experience and organizational involvement helps further satisfy the tenets of CBPR (Hacker, 2017).

CCEE partners were fundamental to this study's research design, bringing a pragmatic, trauma-informed, and culturally aware lens to the study while being grounded in the local context of Edmonton. Their perspectives also guided the interview guide's content, structure, and length. In addition, CCEE partners contributed significantly to recruiting participants for the study, coordinating interviews in some cases, accessing funding for participants' compensation, and providing translation for participants where necessary. Finally, CCEE partners provided feedback on research findings and recommendations while supporting knowledge mobilization.

Purpose

In collaboration with CCEE, this study describes a) the experiences of people who have reported hate crimes and/or incidents, and b) how survivors perceive the ways organizations respond to these reports. The research questions guiding this inquiry were: What are the experiences of people who report hate crimes and/or incidents to organizations in Edmonton? How do individuals who have reported hate crimes and/or incidents experience organizational responses to these reports? What are the policy and practice implications of these experiences for organizations that respond to hate crimes and/or incidents?

Description of Methods

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) aims to address social inequities concerning community members alongside them (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). As such, this approach is best suited to understanding and addressing issues like reporting hate crimes and

incidents to organizations in Edmonton. CCEE partners were paramount in informing and supporting all facets of this study.

In alignment with CBPR principles, we have also considered anti-oppressive research practice in this study. Anti-oppressive research aims to identify and understand oppression in individual, institutional, and systemic settings while providing ways to dismantle this oppression (Holley et al., as cited in Bilotta, 2020, p. 399). This research does not presuppose that organizational responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents are oppressive. However, factoring in an anti-oppressive lens, alongside CBPR principles, helps identify and provide avenues to address oppressive practices within existing organizational responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents. An anti-oppressive perspective further aligns with some understandings of the relationship between hate crimes and systemic oppression. Perry (2015) writes, "hate crimes are [not] individual responses to difference... [they are] violent acts that take place in the social and political context of structural inequality and hierarchies of power" (p. 100). This study may not be able to change these aforementioned systemic inequities. Nonetheless, it has the potential to provide more insight into the self-identified needs and experiences of survivors who report hate crimes and incidents.

A descriptive qualitative research method is the most appropriate to answer the stated research questions. A descriptive qualitative method may provide a basic summary and description of the studied phenomena (Sandalowski, as cited in Mayan, 2009, p. 52). Healy (2020) noted that a qualitative methodological approach captures hate crimes and incidents' emotional and psychological impacts.

Recruitment

As research partners, we prepared a recruitment social media graphic (see Appendix A), email, and recruitment script that CCEE used to recruit participants. Considering our research sample, the realities of the COVID-19 pandemic, and CCEE's extensive connections within communities and organizations interfacing with hate crimes and incidents, this was an appropriate recruitment strategy. Study participants also recommended additional participants with similar experiences, incorporating snowball sampling. We conducted two recruitment rounds to interview enough participants to explore concepts that arose during concurrent analysis and to achieve saturation. We recruited 18 participants who met the following criteria: over 18 years old; spoke English, spoke a language that CCEE partners could translate, or had access to someone to translate; and had reported hate crimes or incidents to organizations in Edmonton within the last five years.

Sample

Consistent with a descriptive qualitative method, we used purposeful sampling in this study (Sandalowski, as cited in Mayan, 2009, p. 52). Qualitative studies looking at the impacts of hate crimes and discrimination in Canada and the United Kingdom have sample sizes ranging from 10 to 15 participants (Bell & Perry, 2015; de Koninck & Lauridsen, 2018; Healy, 2020). The most similar academic study found in the literature review, Healy's (2020) UK study, involved 12 participants. In their 2018 Edmonton study, de Koninck and Lauridsen interviewed ten individuals who reported discrimination. Thus, our sample size of 18 is consistent with or larger than similar Canadian and UK studies.

Saturation

Morse (2000) outlined six factors to consider when determining if we have achieved saturation: "the quality of data, the scope of the study, the nature of the topic, the amount of useful information obtained from each participant, the number of interviews per participant, [and] the use of shadowed data" (p. 3).

Considering Morse's outlined factors and that our sample size was greater than comparable studies, I expected that our sample of 18 was sufficient to reach saturation. The transcribed interviews were of high quality, with limited unclear segments. All participants provided thorough information relevant to the study, albeit sometimes in unexpected ways. The emergence of unanticipated ideas through concurrent analysis encouraged me to pursue additional recruitment and adjust the interview guide. From there, I was able to further explore participant definitions of hate crimes and incidents, understandings of justice, and reporting behaviour regarding repeat experiences of hate crimes and incidents. One participant was interviewed three times throughout their reporting experience, providing additional insights as their experiences with various organizations developed over time.

The study's scope was limited to the experiences of survivors who reported hate crimes and incidents to organizations in Edmonton. This commonality among participants helped me to understand the phenomenon more rapidly. However, participants were heterogenous in their identities, the hate crimes and incidents they experienced, and the organizations that responded to their reports. People are often victimized by hate crimes based on the intersections of their identities (Erentzen & Schuller, 2020). Further, several local organizations supporting people reporting hate crimes and incidents do not necessarily specialize their services to one demographic group. As a result of these observations, we opted not to limit our sample to a

particular group, hate crime and incident type, or organization. As a result, we have developed thick descriptions of survivors' experiences reporting hate crimes and incidents. Further, participants shared insights about the reporting behaviours and experiences of others, which Morse (2001) called "shadowed data" (p. 291). These shadow data further clarify our understanding of participants' experiences reporting hate crimes and incidents and those of their communities.

Data Generation

I completed 20 semi-structured interviews with 18 participants over five months. Before each interview, we provided participants with a consent and information form (see Appendix B). I also gave them a list of organizations available to support people impacted by hate crimes and incidents (see Appendix C). An interview guide (see Appendix D) was provided to participants before the interview. We decided to provide the interview guide in advance of the interview because a research partner suggested that doing so may help create safety and facilitate choice for participants (Levenson, 2017), aligning with a trauma-informed approach discussed later in this chapter. We reviewed the consent form together before the interviews began in the pursuit of informed consent and voluntary participation. Because data collection occurred during COVID-19, all but one participant opted to conduct interviews virtually over a secure platform or on the phone. Interviews ranged from 15 to 50 minutes in length. Questions covered: how individuals became aware of organizations they reported their experiences to; what their expectations were when making the report; how organizations responded to these reports; the impact of these responses; and how an ideal response to a report of a hate crime or incident should look. Additional questioning explored how participants defined hate crimes and incidents, as well as their perceptions of justice. We used prompts and additional questions to clarify responses. To

compensate participants for their involvement in the study, we gave them each a $50 gift card. I contacted all participants within twenty-four hours after their interview to check in and make ourselves available to answer questions. We also offered participants opportunities to participate in follow-up interviews. Only one participant opted to do so, engaging in two brief additional interviews to update us about the status of the reporting process and provide additional insights.

Analysis

Consistent with a descriptive qualitative method, we decided that qualitative content analysis was a coherent approach to analyzing the data gathered in this study (Sandalowski, as cited in Mayan, 2009, p. 52). This form of qualitative content analysis involves identifying, coding, and categorizing the recurring, predominant elements of the data to then determine themes (Mayan, 2009). Finally, consistent with a CBPR approach (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020), I reviewed the overall themes and recommendations with research participants and partners.

Coding

I checked the transcripts after using Otter.AI transcription software. As Mayan (2009) describes, this form of coding first involved me reading and re-reading the transcribed interviews to become familiar with the data. I made comments on the transcripts and highlighted sections of the text, often memoing in my journal and discussing them with my thesis advisor. I then derived codes through subsequent re-readings by highlighting phrases of the text that seemed recurrent and significant (Mayan, 2009) using Dedoose software. I also double-coded excerpts belonging to more than one emerging category (Mayan, 2009).

Categorizing

After coding, I began to sort codes into categories using Dedoose. As Mayan (2009) writes, when analyzing semi-structured interviews such as the kind used in this study, questions

may each become a category. This categorization scheme was initially helpful. However, as I further engaged with the codes and categories, it became necessary to be flexible in organizing these data. Doing so allowed me to merge, delete, differentiate, or rename specific categories and subcategories (Mayan, 2009). I limited categories to twelve to ensure that data was manageable (Mayan, 2009).

I was sensitive to negative cases (Mayan, 2009). Analysis in this respect was initially challenging due to the inconsistent responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents from organizations, leading to challenges in determining appropriate categories. However, it eventually became clear that this inconsistency and unreliability in service delivery from organizations responding to reports of hate crimes and incidents was a key theme from the study. Even after I made this determination, I still found one negative case about the impacts of organizational responses. I first intended to consider it as an anomaly after comparing it against other data to look for similar cases (Mayan, 2009). However, this negative case seemed necessary to include in insights from this research because other research substantiated it. Chakraborti et al. (2014) reported that less impactful reported experiences seemed associated with more neutrality or satisfaction with the subsequent response from an organization. This negative case also more fully communicated the complex interplay between how organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents and the impacts of these responses on survivors.

I then evaluated the categories for internal and external homogeneity (Mayan, 2009). This evaluation ensured that categories adequately reflected the data they contained while being distinct from one another.

Forming Themes

Mayan (2009) writes that, in qualitative content analysis, "Themes are thoughts or processes that weave throughout and tie the categories together" (p. 97). Determining these themes was an iterative process reviewing the categories used in Dedoose and memos from my journal. Consistent with Mayan (2009), I arrived at three central themes that are discussed in Chapter 1, Chapter 5 (Paper Two), and Chapter 6 of this thesis.

Once I determined the initial themes, I prepared to share them with research participants and partners to ensure validity, accuracy, and clarity in alignment with a CBPR approach (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). Consistent with the online nature of my data collection, I contacted participants via email to ask for their input on the findings, recommendations, and knowledge mobilization tactics. Ten of 18 participants responded, and all shared a high degree of agreement with the themes as presented. Participants also shared input that led to clearer and more comprehensive theming. Once I received feedback on the themes from participants, I shared the updated themes with research partners to gain additional thematic clarity and specificity of the recommendations.

Rigour

Lincoln and Guba's concepts of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (as cited in Mayan, 2009, pp. 101-102) guided this study's adherence to rigour. According to Janzen and Ochocka (2020), we partially achieve research rigour in CBPR by selecting appropriate research methods. This observation is consistent with Mayan's (2009) discussions of methodological coherence as a method of research verification. Our research approach aligns with similar previous Canadian and UK studies (Healy, 2020; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021).

Credibility

There were three primary steps I took to ensure research credibility. Firstly, I have prolonged engagement in the setting. Considering my prolonged engagement with CCEE and the field of preventing hate-motivated violence, research rigour is strengthened through adherence to credibility (Lincoln and Guba, as cited in Mayan, 2009, pp. 101-102; Morse et al., 2002). This involvement has strengthened my familiarity with the context where the data were collected (Richards & Morse, 2013). Secondly, I discussed and verified findings and recommendations with research partners throughout the data analysis. Thirdly, participants provided feedback on these findings and recommendations after analysis. These approaches align with Janzen and Ochocka's (2020) recommendations for CBPR rigour and trustworthiness. The practice of member checking also aligns with Lincoln and Guba's concept of credibility and confirmability (as cited in Mayan, 2009, pp. 101-102).

Dependability

I maintained a journal to establish research rigour through critical reflection, while contributing to rigour through dependability (Mayan, 2009). Further, I regularly discussed my approach with my supervisor and research partners throughout data collection and analysis. This practice encouraged reflection on concurrent analysis and potential biases. It also facilitated transparency with CCEE partners throughout the research process. Journaling and regular discussions further allowed me to identify and explore additional lines of inquiry as they emerged.

Transferability

Transferability may be challenging to ensure because the specifics of Edmonton service experiences may not connect directly to services in different locales and cultural contexts.

However, a thick description of the setting and participants contributes to transferability and allows individuals in other settings to adopt or adapt the findings to their context, if appropriate (Mayan, 2009). Insights from this study are consistent with, or expand upon, other research findings in Canada and the United Kingdom (Canadian Race Relations Foundation, 2022; Chakraborti et al., 2014; de Koninck & Lauridsen, 2018; Healy, 2020).

Verification Strategies

Morse et al. (2002) describe verification strategies that guided my concurrent and concluding analysis. The following strategies were essential in guiding my identification of potential challenges to trustworthiness (Morse et al., 2002):

Researcher Responsiveness

To ensure I was responsive to the data, I had weekly discussions with my supervisor throughout data collection and maintained a journal. Both practices allowed me to stay close to the data and explore ideas further as they emerged from my concurrent analysis. I additionally updated research partners on the status of the study. I discussed emerging findings for clarification and reflection that later informed the development of themes.

Reflexivity

I maintained a journal throughout data collection and analysis. I also had weekly discussions with my thesis supervisor throughout the process. These practices were helpful during my concurrent analysis. This reflexive practice further allowed me to recognize my emotional reactions, assumptions, and biases, discussed earlier in this chapter, which had to be considered in my interpretation of the data.

Methodological Coherence

We partially achieve research rigour in CBPR by selecting appropriate research methods (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). Methodological coherence is a method of research verification Mayan, 2009). Our research approach aligns with similar Canadian and UK studies (Healy, 2020; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021). Nonetheless, methodological coherence demanded that we reflect upon sampling and data collection throughout the research process (Morse et al., 2002). I revisited concurrent data collection and analysis through the reflexive practices discussed earlier and through regular contact with CCEE partners and my thesis supervisor. Semi-structured interviews remained an appropriate data collection method throughout the study, along with qualitative content analysis. However, we updated the interview guide as we explored new ideas.

Ethical Considerations

A Trauma-Informed Research Approach

Hate crimes and incidents have significant, harmful impacts on people directly and indirectly (Bell & Perry, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011). Recognizing the sensitive nature of the study and the fact that it involves human participants, ethical practice was paramount at all points in this research. The University of Alberta Ethics Board reviewed this research proposal. CCEE research partners provided feedback on ethical approaches to the research that led to a more trauma-informed and culturally aware approach to the study.

Trauma-informed practice is typically applied in social work and social service settings (Levenson, 2017). However, we used a trauma-informed lens in this study. In this way, we recognized that research participants likely have lived experiences of trauma, defined as, "an

exposure to an extraordinary experience that presents a physical or psychological threat to oneself or others and generates a reaction of helplessness and fear" (American Psychological Association, as cited in Levenson, 2017, p. 105). Subsequently, our research design incorporated principles of trauma-informed practice like trust, safety, collaboration, choice, and empowerment (Levenson, 2017). Some of the approaches described below align with existing best practices in community-based and qualitative research. However, we should view and enact these practices through a trauma-informed lens when studying hate crimes and incidents.

We applied a trauma-informed lens to the development of the interview guide. This guide was created in collaboration with community partners to ensure questions were strengths-based and as minimally invasive or distressing as possible. Doing so aligns with Levenson's (2017) trauma-informed principle of empowerment. In addition, we worked to establish a sense of comfort and rapport with participants. Further, we followed typical informed consent protocol (e.g., discussing the research project with participants, outlining how their information would be used and how confidentiality would be maintained) (Canadian Institutes of Health Research et al., 2018), aligning with Levenson's (2017) principles of building safety and trust. We incorporated the trauma-informed principle of choice (Levenson, 2017) by ensuring that each participant knew participation was voluntary and that information from the study could be withdrawn at their request. Finally, we offered participants a role in interpreting data and knowledge mobilization, aligning with trauma-informed principles of collaboration and empowerment (Levenson, 2017), as well as CBPR practices (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020).

As per Gill et al. (2008), participants also had the opportunity to choose the interview location, with flexibility for online or in-person options due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. We offered participants the opportunity to have a support person present during the

interview due to its sensitive nature, aligning with the trauma-informed principle of safety (Levenson, 2017). However, no participant opted to have a support person present during their interview. We provided a brief list of local resources supporting people victimized by hate crimes and incidents to participants before the interview. We also followed up with participants within twenty-four hours after each interview. No participants expressed discomfort or distress following the interviews. Instead, they often appreciated being listened to while sharing their experiences.

Personal Ethical Considerations

There is a risk of vicarious trauma in conducting research on victimization and violence. This risk was identified and explored by Cullen et al. (2021) when studying femicide, family, and intimate partner homicide. There may not be a direct comparison of this type of research to research on hate crimes. However, my observation is that researchers of hate crimes should be mindful of the risk of vicarious trauma. This risk is something we anticipated while developing the research design.

I currently practice social work and have nearly a decade of experience in high-stress and potentially traumatic situations. I also possess more than four years of experience in public and education focusing on the prevention of hate crimes, hate incidents, and violent extremism. As such, I was prepared for the emotional nature of this research. Nonetheless, I had to plan diligently to ensure my well-being during the research process.

After completing each interview, I wrote in my research journal. Journaling allowed me to process my experiences immediately. I also identified questions and observations that informed my future approach to interviews. I typically limited interviews to two or three per week (and never on the same day) to prioritize emotional processing and concurrent analysis. I

often scheduled time for breaks immediately following each interview. I also had weekly check-ins with my thesis advisor during the data collection period, which provided opportunities to debrief the challenges I encountered with an experienced researcher. Finally, but perhaps most importantly, I took steps outside my role as a researcher to ensure I was personally well enough to engage in this challenging research space.

Knowledge Exchange and Mobilization

Community members impacted by and addressing hate crimes and incidents have played central roles in all elements of the research process, from research design to knowledge mobilization, in alignment with CBPR and knowledge translation approaches (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020; Jull et al., 2017). Traditional knowledge exchange options, including publishing research articles and conference presentations, continue to be pursued. We have submitted Paper One (Chapter 4) of this thesis to a community engagement journal. My thesis advisor and I are preparing Paper Two (Chapter 5) for submission to an academic journal focusing on hate crimes while acknowledging the contributions of CCEE partners. CCEE partners and research participants have been and will continue co-presenting at conferences. For example, I presented alongside CCEE partners at the Metropolis Summit Conference from October 19 to 21, 2022 in Winnipeg to discuss community responses to hate crimes, including the preliminary results of our CBPR study. I also presented independently at the International Association for Public Participation Conference in Banff in September 2022 on the subject of community engagement regarding hate crimes and incidents, as discussed in Paper One (Chapter 4). I have submitted a proposal to present findings from this study at the International Conference on Hate Studies hosted by Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington in spring 2023.

Multifaceted public knowledge mobilization strategies will also be used. These strategies align with strategies proposed by Wilson et al. (2010). Research participants would like the research findings disseminated using publicly accessible materials like posters and infographics that they can share on social media. In addition to social media graphics, we also plan to disseminate this study's insights in a user-friendly report with an executive summary that will be freely available on the CCEE website or the websites of CCEE partners. This report and executive summary may interest many stakeholders in Edmonton and across Canada. CCEE is well-connected to various stakeholders (e.g., police services, antiracism advisory councils, social services, researchers, etc.) across the province. We plan to share these documents in publicly accessible and online settings with audiences well-positioned to utilize them.

CCEE partners and I are submitting a grant proposal to support knowledge mobilization. CCEE partners offer frequent, free, and publicly accessible training on many topics, including *Understanding and Responding to Hate, Racism and Discrimination on the Front Lines*. We plan to develop a video and curriculum incorporating this existing training and our study's insights to build the capacity of organizations to support survivors of hate crimes and incidents. If approved, this grant will also fund a combined virtual and in-person event. We plan to use this event to launch this module and our research insights. We aim to involve and compensate research participants, coinciding with the practices of CBPR (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020).

I have worked alongside StopHateAB.ca to develop a guide and accompanying workshop called *Supporting Victims of Hate Crimes and Incidents: A Community Centered Approach* (Chaudhry et al., 2022). I also helped to develop Edmonton Police Service training modules on understanding and investigating hate crimes and incidents. I am exploring developing updates to the guide and modules incorporating findings from this study. Ultimately, we are working to

collaboratively develop resources that build the capacity of organizations to support survivors of hate crimes and incidents, directly informed by the lived experiences of survivors. These collaborations include organizations that support survivors of hate crimes and incidents.

Smith and Stewart (2017) note that public health researchers may sometimes advocate by presenting findings to policymakers and politicians and by distributing publicly accessible forms of the findings. I was appointed as one of two Hate Crimes Community Liaisons by the Government of Alberta in May 2022. In this role, I have the mandate to work alongside community members to make a recommendation report to the Ministry of Justice on improving their approach to addressing hate crimes and incidents in Alberta. As such, we will incorporate our study's findings in the literature review of the Hate Crimes Community Liaison report. These findings may complement the voices heard in our province-wide community engagements.

Strengths and Limitations

Canadian research is limited in the understanding of how organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents from the perspectives of those reporting. As such, this study is a first attempt at describing these experiences. At this point, the findings of this study provide sufficient information for organizations to begin informing and potentially adapting their approaches. This study also supports further inquiry into how hate crimes and incidents are perpetrated within institutions, and influences on reporting behaviour.

Due to the limited scope, time, finances and labour available for this study, it also has some limitations. For example, this study does not account for the experiences of people under 18 years of age. Further, it did not involve the perspectives of anyone targeted by a hate crime or incident motivated by antisemitism, hatred towards Catholics, or anti-Asian racism as no

participants recruited for the study had these experiences. Hate crimes due to these motivations are increasingly prevalent in Canada (Moreau, 2022).

The study did not explicitly include demographic data. As such, we cannot confidently determine or compare how members of different communities may experience responses to their reports of hate crimes or incidents. It is also unclear what their specific hopes or needs for responses may be. Additionally, this study had limited ability to accommodate those unprepared to communicate in English. However, we were able to interview one individual who wished to participate in another language, thanks to interpretation provided by a research partner.

Nonetheless, this initial study lays a foundation for other researchers to expand upon these findings. For example, researchers could explore how different demographic groups experience responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents. They may even compare experiences across municipalities, rural areas, First Nations, and Métis Nations.

References

Bell, J., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay, and bisexual hate crime. *Journal of Homosexuality, 62*(1), 98-120. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957133**

Bilotta, N. (2020). Anti-oppressive social work research: Prioritising refugee voices in Kakuma Refugee Camp. *Ethics and Social Welfare, 14*(4), 397-414. **https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2020.1822425**

Bourke, A. (2013). Universities, civil society and the global agenda of community-engaged research. *Globalization, Societies and Education, 11*(4), 498- 519. http://unescochair-cbrsr.org/unesco/pdf/article.pdf

Canadian Race Relations Foundation. (2022). *Reimagining a path to support all Canadians: A review of services for victims of hate in Canada*. Canadian Race Relations Foundation. **https://www.crrf-fcrr.ca/images/CRRF_-_A_review_of_services_for_victims_of_hate_in_Canada__Full_report.pdf**

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2018, December). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. Government of Canada. **https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html**

Canadian Public Health Association. (n.d.). *What are social determinants of health?* Canadian Public Health Association. **https://www.cpha.ca/what-are-social-determinants-health**

Cargo, M., & Mercer, S. L. (2008). The value and challenges of participatory research: strengthening its practice. *Annual review of public health, 29*, 325–350. **https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.29.09**

Castleden, H., Morgan, V. S., & Lamb, C. (2012). "I spent the first year drinking tea": Exploring Canadian university researchers' perspectives on community-based participatory research involving Indigenous peoples. *The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien, 56*(2), 160-179. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.2012.00432.x

Chakraborti, N., Garland, J., & Hardy, S. (2014). The Leicester hate crime project: Findings and conclusions. Leicester, UK: University of Leicester. **https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/fc-full-report**

Chaudhry, I., Turlock, L., Tyler, J., Pandher, G., & Johal, S. (2022). *Supporting victims of hate crimes and incidents: A community centered approach*. StopHateAB. **https://stophateab.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/31328.pdf**

Cullen, P., Dawson, M., Price, J., & Rowlands, J. (2021). Intersectionality and invisible victims: Reflections on data challenges and vicarious trauma in femicide, family and intimate partner homicide research. *Journal of Family Violence, 36*, 619-628. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-020-00243-4**

Erentzen, C., & Schuller, R. (2020). Exploring the dark figure of hate: Experiences with police bias and the under-reporting of hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 62*(2), 64-97. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2019-0035**

Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews and focus groups. *British Dental Journal, 204*(6), 291-

295. https://www-nature-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/articles/bdj.2008.192

Hacker, K. (2013). *Community based participatory research*. Sage Publications.

Healy, SJ. (2020). 'It spreads like a creeping disease': Experiences of victims of disability hate crimes in austerity Britain. *Disability & Society, 35*(2), 176-200. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1624151

Janzen, R., & Ochocka, J. (2020). Assessing excellence in community-based research: Lessons from research with Syrian refugee newcomers. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 13*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v13i1.7037

Jull, J., Giles, A., & Graham, I. D. (2017). Community-based participatory research and integrated knowledge translation: Advancing the co-creation of knowledge. *Implementation Science, 12*(150), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0696-3

Krieger, N. (2017, August 24). *Nancy Krieger: Are hate crimes a public health issue?* The BMJ Opinion. https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2017/08/24/nancy-krieger-are-hate-crimes-a-public-health-issue/

Levenson, J. (2018). Trauma-informed social work practice. *Social Work, 62*(2), 105–113, https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx001

Mayan, M. J. (2009). *Essentials of qualitative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Mercier-Dalphond, G., & Helly, D. (2021). Anti-Muslim violence, hate crime, and victimization in Canada: A study of five Canadian cities. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 53*(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2021.0000

Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Qualitative Health Research, 10*(1), 3-5. **https://doi.org/10.1177/104973200129118183**

Morse, J. M. (2001). Using shadowed data. *Qualitative Health Research, 11*(3), 291-292. **https://doi.org/10.1177/104973201129119091**

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2), 1-19. Retrieved from: **https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/ijqm/index.php/IJQM/issu e/view/384**

Nencel, L. (2014). Situating reflexivity: Voices, positionalities and representations in feminist ethnographic texts. *Women's Studies International Forum, 43*, 75-83. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2013.07.018**

Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2011). 'We are all vulnerable': The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 57–71. **https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758011422475**

Perry, B. (2015). Exploring the community impacts of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 47-58). Routledge.

Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2013). *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Shultz, J., Zakrison, T., & Galea, S. (2019). *Hate and the health of populations*. The Milbank Quarterly. **https://www.milbank.org/quarterly/articles/hate-and-the-health-of-populations/**

Smith, K.E., & Stewart, E.A. (2017). Academic advocacy in public health: Disciplinary 'duty' or political 'propaganda'? *Social Science & Medicine, 189*, 35-43, **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.07.014**

Van Deventer Iverson, S., & Hauver James, J. (2014). Feminism and community engagement: An overview. In S. Van Deventer Iverson & J. Hauver James (Eds.), *Feminist Community Engagement Achieving Praxis* (pp. 9-27). Palgrave MacMillian. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137441102

Wilson, M.G., Lavis, J. N., Travers, R., & Rourke, S. B. (2010). Community-based knowledge transfer and exchange: Helping community-based organizations link research to action. *Implementation Science, 5*(33), 33-46. **https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-33**

Chapter 4: How can Community-Based Participatory Research address hate crimes and incidents?

Landon J. Turlock and Maria J. Mayan

lturlock@ualberta.ca

mmayan@ualberta.ca

School of Public Health, University of Alberta

3-381 Edmonton Clinic Health Academy

University of Alberta

Edmonton, Alberta

Potential Peer Reviewers: Irfan Chaudhry (MacEwan University), Mary Beckie (University of Alberta), Rebecca Gokiert (University of Alberta), Kate Storey (University of Alberta)

Author Biographies:

Landon Turlock is a Master of Arts in Community Engagement candidate at the University of Alberta. They have professional experience as a Registered Social Worker in addressing hate crimes, preventing violent extremism, municipal government, non-profit leadership, community development, crime prevention, restorative justice, youth work, public education, and public engagement.

Maria Mayan is a professor in the School of Public Health at the University of Alberta and an Associate Director of the Community-University Partnership. She is an engaged scholar who grounds her work in the policy environment and situates her work at the intersection of government, not-for-profit, and disadvantaged communities.

Abstract

Reports of hate crimes in Canada have increased by 72% from 2019 to 2021 (Moreau, 2022). Hate crimes harm those directly victimized and members of targeted communities (Erentzen & Schuller, 2020; Perry & Alvi, 2011). Many Canadian stakeholders advocate for increased community engagement in preventative and responsive interventions to this increasing concern. This article advocates that Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is an appropriate approach for exploring hate crimes and incidents further and suggests strategies for this area of study, including: building community partnerships; advocating for trauma-informed practices; prioritizing cultural humility and intersectionality; preparing for lengthy pre-participation communication with potential participants; anticipating out-of-scope volunteer participants; and accounting for unanticipated actions of participants.

Keywords: community-based participatory research, hate crimes, hate incidents, community-based research, Canada

How can Community-Based Participatory Research address hate crimes and incidents?

Reports of hate crimes to police in Canada have increased by 72% from 2019 to 2021 (Moreau, 2022). Hate crimes harm both those directly victimized as well as members of targeted communities (Erentzen & Schuller, 2020; Perry & Alvi, 2011; Perry, 2015). Many Canadian stakeholders advocate for increased community engagement in preventative and responsive interventions to this increasing concern. Considering this advocacy and the impacts of hate crimes and incidents on communities, there is a space for Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) to address hate crimes and hate incidents. However, there is little guidance or discussion on conducting CBPR in this field of research. This article advocates that CBPR is well-positioned to further explore hate crimes and incidents while offering strategies to approach this area of study.

Definitions and Impacts of Hate Crimes and Incidents on Communities

It is challenging to define hate crimes (Chakraborti, 2015). Although there is no shared definition of hate crime in Canada or elsewhere, Perry (2001) offered this definition:

> ... acts of violence and intimidation, usually directed toward already stigmatized and marginalized groups. As such, [a hate crimes is] a mechanism of power, intended to reaffirm the precarious hierarchies that characterize a given social order. It attempts to recreate simultaneously the threatened (real or imagined) hegemony of the perpetrator's group and the appropriate subordinate identity of the victim's group. (p. 10)

However, Perry's definition is not a legal definition. Some scholars point out the weaknesses of a legal definition in Canada by suggesting that legal definitions of hate crimes individualize these behaviours instead of locating them socio-politically in contexts of power imbalances and inequality (Bell & Perry, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry, 2001).

Mercier-Dalphond and Helly (2021) suggest that hate crime definitions fail to recognize the cumulative impacts of repeated, often daily, exposure to harassment for individuals and communities, and do not adequately address online hate crimes. Chakraborti's (2015) and Mason-Bish's (2015) observations of the intersectional nature of hate crimes reveal a potential deficit in how hate crimes are currently defined legally, in policy, and in research. There are further criticisms of Canadian definitions of hate crime for not directly addressing "the complex, layered, and historical issues that affect Aboriginal people, distinct as these issues are from those facing any other population living in Canada" (McCaslin, 2014, p. 22).

While there is no central legal definition of hate crimes in Canada (Camp, 2021), four specific charges in the Criminal Code of Canada are often associated with hate: Section 318(1): Advocating genocide; Section 319(1): Public incitement of hatred; Section 319(2): Willful promotion of hatred; and Section 430(4.1): Mischief relating to religious property, educational institutions, etc. There is also the 718.2ai sentencing principle, which facilitates a court's ability to increase sentencing if the prosecution can prove that an offence was motivated by hate or bias.

In addition to hate crimes, Bell and Perry (2015) observe that many noncriminal acts motivated by hate also cause significant harm and should be taken seriously. These noncriminal acts are defined as hate incidents, as articulated by Chaudhry (2021) and Facing Facts (2012):

> …an act that involves prejudice and bias-motivated by hate, based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or any other similar factor but which does not amount to a crime. (p. 9)

The direct impacts of hate crimes and incidents on victimized individuals have received considerable attention in research (Perry & Alvi, 2011). However, in addition to the effects on individuals, hate crimes and incidents can also severely impact members of the affected

community (Perry & Alvi, 2011). In this way, hate crimes send an exclusionary message to members of communities that experience marginalization (Perry, 2001).

When hearing about hate crimes targeting a member of their community, research participants in earlier studies indicated feeling emotional and psychological harm, reduced safety, fear, vulnerability, suspicion, shame, a sense of being unwelcome, a lack of trust in the community of the perpetrator, concern that people did not intervene to stop the incident, and fear that a similar incident could happen to themselves or other community members (Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011). Many felt fearful of other people in the perpetrator's community, a lack of belonging, a desire for revenge, that they did not have the same rights as others, and doubts about Canada's multiculturalism and tolerance (Perry & Alvi, 2011). As a result, people from communities targeted by hate may engage in behavioural change, including altering their appearance, their schedule, where they spend their time, how they travel (with others as opposed to alone), to whom they disclose their identity, and with whom they associate (Bell & Perry, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011). At the same time, many felt motivated to become involved in stopping harassment and discrimination (Perry & Alvi, 2011).

Community-Based Participatory Research as a Way to Address Hate Crimes and Incidents

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is a collaborative and equitable research approach that brings researchers and community stakeholders together to address social inequities facing community members (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). Alternative but comparable terms like “community-engaged scholarship,” “community-based research,” “action research,” and “participatory action research” are also used (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020, p. 5). Janzen and Ochocka (2020) note that unifying elements of these types of research include being action-

oriented, community-driven, and participatory. Considering the community impacts of hate crimes and incidents, CBPR seems well-suited to exploring and identifying various ways to address the harms resulting from these issues.

The scholarly CBPR literature on hate crimes and incidents is minimal. Gauthier et al. (2021) identified using a CBPR approach to understand the experiences of victimization and reasons for underreporting hate crimes amongst members of the transgender community in Los Angeles. They created an advisory board of service providers serving transgender people who co-developed the research design, supported participant recruitment, provided venues for focus groups, offered context and recommendations based on the study's outcomes, and assisted in disseminating findings. The available paper did not provide a significant discussion of using a CBPR approach to study hate crimes, but researchers did note that theirs was the first study they were aware of that used CBPR to study hate crimes.

Burch (2022) worked with six organizations in England to research disability hate crime. Burch explored the importance of relationship building, informed consent, flexibility, and arts-based "mood boards" to facilitate participants being treated as experts on their own experiences. Burch (2022) reflects upon this methodological approach to support meaning-making and facilitate more collaborative, participatory research processes while using the mood boards to disseminate knowledge in meaningful ways.

Although there is a lack of scholarly CBPR literature on hate crimes and incidents, several community organizations have worked to fill this gap. For example, some Canadian reports discuss victim support and referrals, university campus responses, media appearances, community dialogues, vigils, restorative justice, and peer-to-peer support (Archway Community Services, 2019; Coalitions Creating Equity, 2020; Kochar et al., 2019; The Lead Fund, 2019,).

However, roles for community engagement to respond to hate crimes and incidents are not limited to community organizations. Perry and Samuels-Wortley (2021) identified that police must build relationships and trust with diverse communities to respond to hate crimes effectively. To do this, Perry and Samuels-Wortley (2021) recommend that police commit to inclusivity while understanding and recognizing the harm caused to individuals and communities victimized by hate crimes. The researchers further recommend that police practice increased awareness building, public education, outreach, and transparency.

Considering the ways communities and institutions in Canada call for community engagement to respond to hate crimes and some emerging scholarship in this area, there is a clear space for the application of more CPBR to address hate crimes.

Community-Based Research Strategies for Studying Hate Crimes and Incidents

One of the two authors has dedicated much of their professional and volunteer work and research career to preventing and responding to hate-motivated violence, while the other has pursued engaged scholarship at the intersection of government, not-for-profit, and disadvantaged communities. Together, alongside research partners, we used a CBPR approach to answer the following research questions: What are the experiences of people who report hate crimes and/or incidents to organizations in Edmonton? How do individuals who have reported hate crimes and/or incidents experience organizational responses to these reports? What are the policy and practice implications of these experiences for organizations that respond to hate crimes and/or incidents?

We have learned a number of lessons about how to approach CBPR and qualitative research as it pertains to hate crimes and incidents while conducting this study. Some align with existing best practices in the field, such as determining appropriate compensation for participants

(Canadian Institutes of Health Research et al., 2018), practicing reflexivity and concurrent data analysis (Mayan, 2009), planning for appropriate knowledge mobilization (Gauthier et al., 2021), and accounting for the emotional nature of researching acts of violence (Cullen et al., 2021). However, the following section outlines learning that will advance CPBR in the area of hate crimes and incidents and possibly other related emerging areas, including: building community partnerships; advocating for trauma-informed practices; prioritizing cultural humility and intersectionality; preparing for lengthy pre-participation communication with potential participants; anticipating out-of-scope volunteer participants; and accounting for unanticipated actions of participants.

Building Community Partnerships Prior to the Research

A consistent feature of CBPR is that an equitable partnership should exist between community partners impacted by the research issue and researchers, with a further understanding that such research should be in the service of community members (Cargo & Mercer, 2008; Hacker, 2013; Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). To begin, we approached a network of community organizations and stakeholders that one author has been involved with for several years to discuss if there was any research that would benefit their work in anti-racism and responding to hate-motivated violence. Interest arose, and we struck an informal subcommittee. This group of partners assisted with defining the scope of the study, developing the research design and data collection materials, providing compensation, recruiting participants, and reviewing research themes and recommendations. The members in our partnership had worked for years in anti-racism and preventing hate crimes and incidents. Most also had lived experiences as members of communities affected by hate crimes and incidents, with some having lived experiences of hate crimes and incidents.

One author was a member of this network of organizations for nearly three years in a professional capacity before their role changed to a researcher. As such, by the time the initial conversations about this research began, meaningful relationships had been established among participating research partners. It may not always be possible for community-engaged researchers to build multi-year working relationships with community partners prior to conducting research. However, a meaningful working relationship will likely be needed for research on a sensitive topic such as hate crimes and incidents.

Incorporating Trauma-Informed Research Practices

Trauma-informed practice is typically applied in social work and social service settings (Levenson, 2017). However, recognizing that research participants likely have lived experiences of trauma, defined as, "an exposure to an extraordinary experience that presents a physical or psychological threat to oneself or others and generates a reaction of helplessness and fear" (American Psychological Association, as cited in Levenson, 2017, p. 105), it was necessary to apply a trauma-informed lens to this research. Our research design incorporated principles of trauma-informed practice like trust, safety, collaboration, choice, and empowerment (Levenson, 2017). While some of the approaches described below align with existing best practices in community-based and qualitative research, we suggest that these practices should be viewed and enacted through a trauma-informed lens when studying hate crimes and incidents. Similar trauma-informed practices have been previously utilized in Ahmad's (2019) study with Muslim women regarding their experiences of Islamophobic violence.

We applied a trauma-informed lens to the development of the interview guide. This guide was created in collaboration with community partners to ensure questions were strengths-based and as minimally invasive or distressing as possible, aligning with Levenson's (2017) trauma-

informed principle of empowerment. In addition to establishing a sense of comfort and rapport, we followed typical informed consent protocols (e.g., discussing the research project with participants, outlining how their information would be used and how confidentiality would be maintained) (Canadian Institutes of Health Research et al., 2018), aligning with Levenson's (2017) principles of building safety and trust. Furthermore, ensuring each participant knew participation was voluntary, that they could skip any questions they chose to, and that they could withdraw their information from the study upon request, incorporated the trauma-informed principle of choice (Ahmad, 2019; Levenson, 2017). Finally, we offered participants a role in interpreting data and knowledge mobilization, aligning with trauma-informed principles of collaboration and empowerment (Levenson, 2017).

As per Gill et al. (2008), participants also had the opportunity to choose the interview location, with flexibility for online or in-person options due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. We also offered participants the opportunity to have a support person present during the interview due to its sensitive nature, aligning with the trauma-informed principle of safety (Levenson, 2017). However, no participant opted to have a support person present during their interview. We provided a brief list of local resources that support people victimized by hate crimes and incidents to participants in advance of the interview and checked in with participants within twenty-four hours after each interview.

While the above-established research practices mirror trauma-informed practice, we encourage further training and professional development for researchers in this area. However, a trauma-informed lens does not just apply to interactions with participants. We suggest that a trauma-informed lens be brought to bear on the overall purpose of the research. We do not need more research on the existence – or prevalence and incidence – of, for example, domestic

violence, houselessness, or substance dependency for the sole purpose of knowledge creation. Continuing to ask groups who are marginalized about their experiences of marginalization, without working alongside them to remedy their concerns, can be exploitive, voyeuristic, and retraumatizing. What we do need is research with built-in knowledge mobilization or action so we can learn about the processes that will work to address these issues. This is why CBPR is a promising approach to hate crimes and incidents research, as well as other research that may involve participants with lived experiences of trauma. Since CBPR aims to address social issues affecting participating communities, we have a responsibility to conduct trauma-informed research to support the people impacted by hate crimes and incidents in meaningful, tangible ways. Researching this way means prioritizing practical and applicable research that is victim-centred.

Prioritizing Cultural Humility and Intersectionality

Cultural humility can be understood as, "[the] ability to maintain an interpersonal stance that is other-oriented (or open to the other) in relation to aspects of cultural identity that are most important to the [person]" (Hook et al., 2013, p. 2). Study participants experienced hate crimes and incidents due to their identities and may have lacked confidence in institutions or research (Canadian Institutes of Health Research et al., 2018).

Recent Canadian studies on hate crimes regularly focus on the experiences of a specific demographic group concerning the phenomenon (Angeles & Roberton, 2020; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021). In the proposal stage of the research, an academic committee encouraged us, for methodological purposes, to narrow our focus to a particular demographic group. However, because people are often victimized by hate crimes based on the intersections of their identities (Erentzen & Schuller, 2020), our partner organization research subcommittee opted not to limit

our research to one particular group. This decision was further supported by the observation that several local organizations supporting people who report hate crimes and incidents do not necessarily specialize their services to one demographic group. Indeed, this study involved participants who reported hate crimes and incidents related to transphobia, homophobia, Islamophobia, anti-Black racism, anti-Indigenous racism, ableism, and sexism, as well as intersections of these motivations. When cultural or linguistic interpretation was required, partner organizations were available to support. Future CBPR on hate crimes and incidents should be guided by culturally informed and intersectional research practices developed alongside community partners.

Anticipating Out-Of-Scope Potential Participants

There is no widespread awareness or agreement on what hate crimes are. Inconsistent understandings of the concept, and a lack of legal definition, have led to various interpretations and applications across countries (Chakraborti, 2015) and local jurisdictions (Alberta Hate Crimes Committee, 2009). Even among police officers who ultimately need to assess and charge individuals with hate crimes, there is a lack of familiarity or confidence with these concepts (Perry & Samuels-Wortley, 2021).

When conducting CBPR on hate crimes and hate incidents, it is vital to anticipate how the ambiguity of these terms can impact the research. In developing our study, we were guided by Perry's (2001) definition of hate crimes and the four entries in the Canadian Criminal Code pertaining to hate crime (see above). We were also informed by definitions of hate incidents as discussed earlier in this paper (Chaudhry, 2021; Facing Facts, 2012), especially recognizing that many harmful acts motivated by hate are not necessarily criminal (Bell & Perry, 2015). However, we did not opt to provide these definitions in our recruitment materials. As a result of

this decision, research participants were recruited based on their self-definition of their experience as a hate crime or incident.

While the decision not to define hate crimes or incidents for prospective research participants was intentional, a complication that arose from this decision was that it was occasionally challenging to screen potential participants for inclusion in the study. It was clear that many of the potential research participants who contacted us to participate had encountered some very challenging and traumatic experiences. Many expressed a passion for sharing their stories. However, not all potential participants fit the study's criteria (in this case, having reported a hate crime or incident to an organization in Edmonton over the past five years). There were three issues.

First, some individuals had made reports outside of Edmonton, made a report more than five years ago, or had not reported their experience at all. Second, others had experienced crimes while being a member of a community often targeted by hate crimes but did not believe their victimization was hate-motivated. For example, an individual whom another member of their same community had assaulted was unsure whether or not such an assault, because it involved two members of the same community, would be considered hate-motivated. This observation suggests a lack of certainty about how hate crimes are defined. Third, there was significant interest from individuals who encountered self-defined hate crimes while in foster care, considering the foster care system the perpetrator of the crime. While we had not considered a system in the context of our research, there is an opportunity here to reconceptualize who or what may be considered capable of committing a hate crime or incident. This observation has the potential to generate new scholarly discussion about hate crimes perpetrated in other systems or institutions.

If a study is proposed on a sensitive topic, it is advised to work alongside community partners to discern whether a definition is appropriate to provide to participants and agree upon a working definition of the phenomenon. If research partners decide to provide participants with a definition, recruitment and data collection tools should then clearly communicate that definition while also clarifying inclusion and exclusion criteria. For example, in their CBPR study to understand experiences of hate crime victimization and underreporting among the transgender community in Los Angeles, Gauthier et al. (2021) provided research participants with a definition of a hate crime before participants completed a survey.

Planning for Extensive Communication Prior to Data Collection

Because our study occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic when in-person contact was limited, we exclusively communicated with potential research participants in advance of data collection via email or phone. Much like Burch's (2022) study, it was a priority that potential participants were well-informed about the study in advance of their participation, with opportunities to ask questions. Many potential participants emailed a great deal of information before their interviews, including excerpts from memoirs or screenshots of communications related to their experiences. Further, some communication with potential participants involved research partners who assisted in coordinating the interview, providing a venue for the interview, and acting as an interpreter. Lessons learned from these experiences include that it is crucial to anticipate lengthy communication in advance of data collection, approach these communications in a trauma-informed way, include permission in ethics to use these materials (e.g., screenshots) as data, and ensure informed consent both before and throughout participation in the research.

Recognizing Potential Unanticipated Actions and Responses of Participants

CBPR research participants are co-creators of knowledge (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). In this way, how participants choose to act or respond throughout the research process is meaningful to consider. For example, participants had several unanticipated responses to the research process in our study. One participant asked a researcher to attend court with them and validate the participants' experience. Another participant shared their experience being interviewed for this study through a video they posted on social media to an audience of over one thousand followers. Others expressed that participating in the interview motivated them to move forward on a complaint process related to their experience or start a book about their lives. In situations where we were unsure how to navigate these situations, we sought advice from fellow research partners and debriefed the situation while identifying potential next steps. These internal discussions helped us to identify that a priority in addressing these situations was open communication and transparency with research participants about the research and the confines of our roles as researchers. While none of these actions have directly impacted the research study, they certainly have the potential to, and additionally illustrate ways knowledge co-creators can engage with the research process.

Conclusion

Hate crimes and incidents can cause significant harm to individuals and communities (Bell & Perry, 2015; Iganski & Lagou, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011). Further, the reporting of hate crimes in Canada has been increasing (Moreau, 2022). Academic, community, and institutional actors have called for community engagement as one vehicle for addressing hate crimes in preventative and responsive ways. However, there is limited CBPR on hate crimes and incidents, and even less available literature on how to approach

CBPR on these topics. As literature in this area develops, more researchers may recognize the importance of applying CBPR to hate crimes and incidents and pursue this research, while considering the above-mentioned issues and practices. Considering the complex community impacts of hate crimes and incidents, as well as the ability of CBPR to address social inequities, CBPR is a research approach well-suited to exploring and addressing hate crimes and incidents.

References

Ahmad, S. (2019). Islamophobic violence as a form of gender-based violence: a qualitative study with Muslim women in Canada. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence, 3*(1), 45-66. **https://doi.org/10.1332/239868019X15492770695379**

Alberta Hate Crime Committee. (2009). *Alberta hate/bias crime report*. Alberta Hate Crime Committee. **https://cfrac.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Alberta-Hate-Bias-Crime-Report-2.pdf**

Angeles, L. & Roberton, J. (2020). Empathy and inclusive public safety in the city: Examining LGBTQ2+ voices and experiences of intersectional discrimination. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 78, 1-12. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2019.102313**

Archway Community Services. (2019, August). *Abbotsford community protocol: A response to critical incidents of discrimination and hate crime*. Archway Community Services. **https://archway.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Community-Protocol-2019-updated.pdf**

Bell, J., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay, and bisexual hate crime. *Journal of Homosexuality, 62*(1), 98-120. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957133**

Burch, L. (2022). 'We shouldn't be told to shut up, we should be told we can speak out': Reflections on using arts-based methods to research disability hate crime. *Qualitative Social Work, 21*(2), 393-412. **https://doi.org/10.1177/14733250211002888**

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2018, December). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving*

Humans. Government of Canada. **https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html**

Camp, S. (2021). *Incorporating a standalone hate crime section into the Criminal Code of Canada*. Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. **https://sites.google.com/albertahatecrimes.org/ahcc/projects?authuser=0**

Cargo, M., & Mercer, S. L. (2008). The value and challenges of participatory research: strengthening its practice. *Annual review of public health, 29*, 325–350. **https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.29.09**

Chaudhry, I. (2021). Making hate visible: Online hate incident reporting tools. *Journal of Hate Studies*, *17*(1), 64–73. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.188**

Chakraborti, N. (2015). Framing the boundaries of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Coalitions Creating Equity. (2020, June). *CCE response model to hate incidents in Alberta*. Coalitions Creating Equity. **http://coalitionscreatingequity.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Hate-Incident-BookJuly2020_LO.pdf**

Criminal Code, RSC, C-46 (1985). Retrieved from **http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/index.html**

Cullen, P., Dawson, M., Price, J., & Rowlands, J. (2021). Intersectionality and invisible victims: Reflections on data challenges and vicarious trauma in femicide, family and intimate partner homicide research. *Journal of Family Violence, 36*, 619-628. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-020-00243-4**

Erentzen, C., & Schuller, R. (2020). Exploring the dark figure of hate: Experiences with police bias and the under-reporting of hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 62*(2), 64-97. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2019-0035**

Facing Facts. (2012). *Facing facts! Hate crime monitoring guidelines*. Facing Facts. Retrieved from: **https://www.facingfacts.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/02/Guidelines-for-monitoring-of-hate-crimes-and-hate-motivated-incidents-PROTECTED.pdf**

Gauthier, J., Medina, K., & Dierkhising, C. (2021). Analysis of hate crimes in transgender communities. *Journal of Hate Studies, 17(*2), 4–14. **https://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.158**

Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews and focus groups. *British Dental Journal, 204*(6), 291-295. **https://www-nature-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/articles/bdj.2008.192**

Hacker, K. (2013). *Community based participatory research*. Sage Publications.

Hook, J.N., Davis, D.E., Owen, J., Worthington, E.L., & Utsey, S,O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 60*(3), 353-366. **https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032595**

Iganski, P., & Lagou, S. (2015). The personal injuries of 'hate crime'. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 34-46). Routledge.

Janzen, R., & Ochocka, J. (2020). Assessing excellence in community-based research: Lessons from research with Syrian refugee newcomers. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 13*(1), 1-20. **https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v13i1.7037**

Kochar, H., McCoy, J., & Jones, D. (2019, August). *Responding to hate*. Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/publication/responding-to-hate/**

Lead Fund. (2019, February). *Toolkit on campus hate and bias strategies to create more inclusive campuses*. American Association for Access Equity and Diversity. **https://www.aaaed.org/images/aaaed/LEAD_Fund/LEAD-FUND-Toolkit.pdf**

Levenson, J. (2018). Trauma-informed social work practice. *Social Work, 62*(2), 105–113, **https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx001**

Mayan, M. J. (2009). *Essentials of qualitative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Mason-Bish, H. (2015). Beyond the silo: Rethinking hate crime and intersectionality. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 24-33). Routledge.

McCaslin, W. D. (2014). *Hate-motivated offences and Aboriginal Peoples: Sentencing provisions of Section 718.2(a)(i) of the Criminal Code of Canada* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Saskatchewan. **https://harvest.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/ETD-2014-06-1647/MCCASLIN-THESIS.pdf?sequence=4**

Mercier-Dalphond, G., & Helly, D. (2021). Anti-Muslim violence, hate crime, and victimization in Canada: A study of five Canadian cities. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 53*(1), 1-22. **https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2021.0000**

Moreau, G. (2022, August 3). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2021*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00013-eng.htm**

Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes* (1st. ed.). Routledge.

Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2011). 'We are all vulnerable': The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 57–71. **https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758011422475**

Perry, B. (2015). Exploring the community impacts of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 47-58). Routledge.

Statistics Canada. (2021, July 27). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2020*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved August 13, 2021 from **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00013-eng.htm**

Chapter 5: What happens when a survivor reports a hate crime or incident to an organization?

Landon J. Turlock and Maria J. Mayan

lturlock@ualberta.ca

mmayan@ualberta.ca

School of Public Health, University of Alberta

3-381 Edmonton Clinic Health Academy

University of Alberta

Edmonton, Alberta

Potential Peer Reviewers: Barbara Perry (Ontario Tech University), Irfan Chaudhry (MacEwan University), Kawser Ahmed (University of Winnipeg)

Author Biographies:

Landon Turlock is a Master of Arts in Community Engagement candidate at the University of Alberta. They have professional experience as a Registered Social Worker in addressing hate crimes, preventing violent extremism, municipal government, non-profit leadership, community development, crime prevention, restorative justice, youth work, public education, and public engagement.

Maria Mayan is a professor in the School of Public Health at the University of Alberta and an Associate Director of the Community-University Partnership. She is an engaged scholar who grounds her work in the policy environment and situates her work at the intersection of government, not-for-profit, and disadvantaged communities.

Abstract

The reporting of hate crimes and incidents in Canada increased by 72% from 2019 to 2021 (Moreau, 2022). Research reveals the significant harm caused by experiencing hate crimes and incidents for survivors of hate crimes and incidents and their communities. While underreporting of hate crimes and incidents is also well documented in research, what is less understood are the experiences of survivors who report hate crimes and incidents to organizations. Through Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR), we sought to understand individuals' experiences reporting hate crimes and incidents to organizations in Edmonton, Alberta. Eighteen people who had reported hate crimes and incidents to organizations in Edmonton over the past five years participated in 20 semi-structured interviews during this qualitative descriptive study. They shared several insights. Firstly, how organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents does not reliably meet the needs of people victimized by these occurrences and can significantly impact survivors. Secondly, understandings and experiences of hate crimes and incidents and how organizations respond to them are based in lived experiences of historical and ongoing systemic and societal discrimination. Thirdly, interpersonal relationships, existing knowledge and beliefs, and previous experiences influence people's choices to report a hate crime or incident. These insights have implications for organizations and governments supporting survivors of hate crimes and incidents. Timely, consistent, victim-centred, and evidence-based services that address systemic gaps must be a priority.

Keywords: hate crimes, hate incidents, reporting hate crimes, reporting hate incidents, supporting victims of hate crimes, community-based participatory research

Background

Limited Canadian Research on Hate Crimes and Incidents

Hate crime legislation emerged in Canada in 1970 (Corb, 2015). A cursory review of various databases suggests that hate crimes and incidents were hardly researched in Canada before 1988, primarily associated with the conviction of Albertan high school teacher James Keegstra for teaching antisemitic conspiracy theories and holocaust denial in his classroom (McCoy et al., 2019). As a relatively new crime type in Canadian legislation and an underreported phenomenon (Canadian Race Relations Foundation, 2022; Erentzen & Schuller, 2020), much research is yet to be completed on the unique context of hate crimes and incidents in Canada. This relative paucity is evident throughout this paper in the repeated references to a small number of studies.

Definitions and Impacts of Hate Crimes and Incidents on Communities

Hate crimes are challenging to describe and definitions vary internationally and among local jurisdictions (Alberta Hate Crimes Committee, 2009; Chakraborti, 2015). Even among police officers who ultimately need to assess and charge individuals with hate crimes, there is a lack of familiarity or confidence with this concept (Perry & Samuels-Wortley, 2021). Perry (2001) offers this definition:

> ... acts of violence and intimidation, usually directed toward already stigmatized and marginalized groups. As such, [hate crimes are] a mechanism of power, intended to reaffirm the precarious hierarchies that characterize a given social order. It attempts to recreate simultaneously the threatened (real or imagined) hegemony of the perpetrator's group and the appropriate subordinate identity of the victim's group (p. 10).

This definition highlights the interconnection between the perpetration of hate crimes and the societal context from which they emerge. However, Perry's definition is not a legal definition. Some scholars point out the weaknesses of a legal definition of hate crimes in Canada. They suggest that legal definitions of hate crimes individualize these behaviours instead of locating them socio-politically in contexts of power imbalances and inequality (Bell & Perry, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry, 2001). Mercier-Dalphond and Helly (2021) argue that hate crime definitions fail to recognize the cumulative impacts of repeated, often daily, exposure to harassment for individuals and communities. Further, they do not adequately address online hate crimes. Chakraborti's (2015) and Mason-Bish's (2015) observations of the intersectional nature of hate crimes reveal a potential deficit in how hate crimes are currently defined. McCaslin (2014) critiques Canadian definitions of hate crimes for not addressing "the complex, layered, and historical issues that affect Aboriginal people, distinct as these issues are from those facing any other population living in Canada" (p. 22).

Four charges in the Criminal Code of Canada are associated with hate crimes: Section 318(1): Advocating genocide; Section 319(1): Public incitement of hatred; Section 319(2): Willful promotion of hatred; and Section 430(4.1): Mischief relating to religious property, educational institutions, etc. Further, the 718.2ai sentencing principle allows the court to increase sentencing if the prosecution proves that an offense was motivated by hate or bias.

In addition to hate crimes, Bell and Perry (2015) observe that many noncriminal acts motivated by hate still cause significant harm and should be taken seriously. These noncriminal acts are defined as hate incidents, as articulated by Chaudhry (2021) and Facing Facts (2012):

> …an act that involves prejudice and bias-motivated by hate, based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or any other similar factor but which does not amount to a crime. (p. 9)

Impacts of Hate Crimes and Incidents on Individuals and Communities

The impacts of hate crimes and incidents on directly victimized individuals have recently received attention in research (Perry & Alvi, 2011). A UK study on this topic identifies impacts of hate crime that include more intensive physical, psychological, and behavioural injuries compared to other crimes (Iganski & Lagou, 2015). Chaudhry et al. (2022), the Government of Wales (2020), and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (2021) explicate the emotional and psychological injuries associated with hate crimes on individuals. These can include Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, anger, annoyance, depression, panic attacks, trouble sleeping, and loss of confidence at higher rates than crimes not motivated by hate (Iganski & Lagou, 2015). Behavioural change is also a common impact of hate crimes. Survivors may move homes, distrust others, be highly alert, remove religious garb and symbols, no longer express affection with partners in public, and stop attending places of worship or speaking in public (Chaudhry et al., 2022; Government of Wales, 2020; Iganski & Lagou, 2015).

Hate crimes and incidents can also severely impact members of the affected community (Perry & Alvi, 2011). Hate crimes send an exclusionary message to communities that experience marginalization (Perry, 2001). When hearing about hate crimes targeting a member of their community, study participants experienced emotional and psychological harm, reduced safety, fear, vulnerability, suspicion, shame, a sense of being unwelcome, a lack of trust in the community of the perpetrator, concern that people did not intervene to stop the incident, and fear

that a similar incident could happen to themselves or other community members (Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011). Participants identified fear of other people in the perpetrator's community, a lack of belonging, a desire for revenge, that they did not have the same rights as others, and doubts about Canada's multiculturalism and tolerance (Perry & Alvi, 2011). People from communities targeted by hate may engage in behavioural change. Such adaptive behaviour may include altering their appearance, their schedule, where they spend their time, how they travel, to whom they disclose their identity, and with whom they associate (Bell & Perry, 2015; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021; Perry & Alvi, 2011). At the same time, many felt motivated to become involved in stopping harassment and discrimination (Perry & Alvi, 2011).

Underreporting of Hate Crimes and Incidents

Underreporting of hate crimes is another area of inquiry within research on hate crimes in Canada. The Statistics Canada General Social Survey found that there were 223 000 self-reported hate-motivated incidents in Canada in 2019 (as cited in Canada Race Relations Foundation, 2022, p. 7). This is extraordinarily significant compared with the 1,946 police-reported criminal incidents motivated by hate in the same year (Moreau, 2021). When speaking to 21 Muslim women who disclosed 30 incidents of Islamophobic violence, Ahmad (2019) found only three occurrences were reported to police.

The reasons that people do not report hate crimes vary. They include fear of retaliation, concerns about experiencing racism from police, past traumatic experiences of police discrimination and police distrust, a feeling that their concern was not serious enough to report, as well as a lack of faith in the efficacy of police or that the perpetrator would be prosecuted (Angeles & Roberton, 2020; Erentzen & Schuller, 2020). When survivors of hate crimes and

incidents do not turn to the police, they may instead connect with friends, family, partners, social media, mental health services, community organizations, and local businesses (Angeles & Roberton, 2020; Chakraborti et al., 2014).

Policing and Legal Approaches to Hate Crimes and Incidents in Canada

Other Canadian research and public sources of information reveal additional policing realities addressing hate crimes in Canada. For example, Canadian police officers have to obtain written consent from the attorney general before proceeding with hate crime charges, leading to delays in cases and low prosecutions (Corb, as cited in Hardy & Chakraborti, 2019, p. 29). The ways that police in Canada address hate crimes are affected by the ambiguousness of existing hate crime legislation and challenges in prosecution. Further, a lack of trust between police and communities may limit the kind of collaboration, dialogue, and information-sharing necessary for police to address hate crimes in a way that reflects the voices of community members (Perry & Samuels-Wortley, 2021). Organizational factors, including leadership, policy, responsibility, hate crime portfolios, and communication further impact their responses to hate crimes. Cultural and enforcement-oriented biases held by police, lack of understanding of hate crimes, and training limitations impacted responses to hate crimes at the individual level. This complexity in policing and understanding hate crimes is also evidenced when noting that police services across Canada are not united in their definitions of hate crimes (Alberta Hate Crimes Committee, 2009; Camp, 2021). Further, Bryan and Trickett (2021) suggest that there are distinct differences between how police services approach hate crimes in their policies and their actual responses. They suggest that police apply a policing lens over a victim-centered one in practice, despite their policies.

Meyers (2019) argues that Canadian hate crime laws fail to address right-wing extremist movements adequately. Further, Swiffen (2018) argues that hate crime laws in Canada and the United States are ambiguous, which makes proving a hate motivation difficult. Swiffen (2018) also criticizes Section 718.2(a)(i) for being applied too narrowly. These legal challenges are evident when observing that one of the Criminal Codes that considers hate motivation at sentencing was successfully applied 31 times across the nation between 2008 and 2020 (Provost-Yombo, et al., 2020). While Section 718.2(a)(i) would not apply to all reported hate crimes, 31 applications over 12 years is an extremely small number when considering that 2669 hate crimes were reported to police in Canada in 2020 alone (Wang & Moreau, 2022). Some call for a standalone hate crime definition to respond to some of these challenges (Camp, 2021; Swiffen, 2018). Nonetheless, Ashley (2018) suggests that anti-discrimination and hate crime laws may not effectively prevent hate crimes or improve the lives of transgender people in Canada.

Addressing the Needs of Survivors of Hate Crimes and Incidents in Canada

Considering that policing and hate crimes legislation may not effectively prevent hate crimes or support the well-being of people targeted by them (Ashley, 2018; Bryan & Trickett, 2021), it is crucial to understand the experiences of survivors of hate crimes and incidents in Canada. In 2018, the Edmonton Centre for Race and Culture (CFRAC) reported on the experiences of racialized and Indigenous individuals after they had encountered racial or cultural discrimination, or harassment. Researchers focused on these individuals' attempts to document the incidents or access support (de Koninck & Lauridsen, 2018). While not explicitly based on experiences of hate crimes and incidents, the report revealed that impacts of racism and discrimination were present throughout individuals' experiences of seeking support from organizations. Individuals struggled to reach appropriate and effective services and rarely encountered empathy when

reporting. They also often felt reduced to their ethnic, cultural, or racial identities and encountered bureaucratic responses. In 2022, the Canadian Race Relations Foundation (CRRF) independently assessed services for survivors of hate crimes and incidents across the nation. They observed that services are not proportionate in terms of consistency, quality, or quantity to survivors' needs. Siloing, fragmentation, and inconsistent services can result in unaddressed trauma, retraumatization, and secondary victimization.

Understanding Responses to Reports of Hate Crimes and Incidents in the United Kingdom

Research from the United Kingdom (UK) also investigated the experiences of those who report hate crimes. The Leicester Hate Crime Project (Chakraborti et al., 2014) engaged with over 4000 participants to understand people's experiences of hate crimes, the harms caused by these experiences, and ways to improve support for people victimized by hate crimes. Only a quarter of participants had reported their victimization to the police, and only half had reported it to anyone. Just over half (55%) of respondents were fairly satisfied with the police response. Over a third (35%) were dissatisfied. Participants most significantly affected by a hate crime or who experienced hate-motivated violence were more likely to be dissatisfied with a police response. Participants who expressed satisfaction with their responses valued the police's follow-up and support. Dissatisfied participants noted that police did not take their concerns seriously, did not follow-up and that officers were rude. In another UK study, Healy (2020) examined the victimization of 12 people due to their experiences of disability and how the criminal justice system responded to them. Reporting to the police resulted in a variety of police responses. These included dismissive or uninterested responses, delayed processes, difficulty in achieving convictions, discouragement from pressing charges, discriminatory assumptions, and the need to escalate reports to senior police leadership before action was taken. In their evaluation of third-

party reporting services for victims of hate crimes in the UK, Fitch-Bartlett and Healy (2022) found that these services helped increase awareness of hate crimes in the community. However, these services still required further promotion, and trained volunteer advisors lacked understanding and knowledge about hate crimes.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this inquiry were: What are the experiences of people who report hate crimes and/or incidents to organizations in Edmonton, Alberta? How do individuals who have reported hate crimes and/or incidents experience organizational responses to these reports? What are the policy and practice implications of these experiences for organizations that respond to hate crimes and/or incidents?

Methods

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is a collaborative and equitable research approach (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). It brings researchers and community stakeholders together to address social inequities concerning community members (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020). As such, this approach is well suited to investigate the reporting of hate crimes and incidents to organizations in Edmonton. We collaborated with Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton (CCEE), a local group of organizations active in furthering equity and human rights, for years prior to the study. CCEE partners guided the development of the research purpose and design. They were instrumental in the recruitment and compensation of participants. Partners engaged with the research and insights throughout its duration. In addition, we incorporated an anti-oppressive and trauma-informed research practice in this study.

A descriptive qualitative research method is the most appropriate to answer the stated research questions. A descriptive qualitative method may provide a basic summary and

description of the studied phenomenon (Sandalowski, as cited in Mayan, 2009, p. 52). Healy (2020) noted that a qualitative methodological approach better captures hate crimes and incidents' emotional and psychological impacts.

Recruitment

As research partners, we prepared a recruitment social media graphic, email, and recruitment script that were used by CCEE to recruit participants. Considering our research sample, the realities of the COVID-19 pandemic, and CCEE's extensive connections within communities and organizations interfacing with hate crimes and incidents, this was an appropriate recruitment strategy. Study participants also recommended additional participants with similar experiences, incorporating snowball sampling. We conducted two recruitment rounds to interview enough participants to explore concepts that arose during concurrent analysis and achieve saturation. We recruited 18 participants who met the following criteria: participants were 18 years old or older; spoke English, or spoke a language that CCEE partners could translate, or had access to someone to translate; and had reported hate crimes or incidents to organizations in Edmonton within the last five years.

Sampling

Consistent with a descriptive qualitative method, sampling in this study was purposeful (Sandalowski, as cited in Mayan, 2009, p. 53). Participants were heterogenous in their identities, the hate crimes and incidents they experienced, and the organizations they reported to. However, their shared experience of experiencing and reporting hate crimes and incidents helped us achieve saturation and understand the phenomenon. Qualitative studies looking at the impacts of hate crimes and discrimination in Canada and the United Kingdom have sample sizes ranging from 10 to 15 participants (Bell & Perry, 2015; de Koninck & Lauridsen, 2018; Healy, 2020).

The most similar academic study found in the literature review, Healy's (2020) UK study, involved 12 participants. In their 2018 Edmonton study, de Koninck and Lauridsen interviewed ten individuals who reported discrimination. Thus, our sample size of 18 is consistent with similar Canadian and UK studies.

Data Generation

We completed 20 semi-structured interviews with 18 participants over five months. Before each interview, we provided participants with a consent and information form, a resource list of organizations available to support people impacted by hate crimes and incidents, and the interview guide. We reviewed the consent form together before the interviews began to ensure informed consent and voluntary participation. Because data collection occurred during COVID-19, all but one participant opted to conduct interviews virtually over a secure platform or on the phone. Interviews ranged from 15 to 50 minutes in length. Questions covered: how individuals became aware of organizations they reported their experiences to; what their expectations were when making the report; how organizations responded to these reports; the impact of these responses; and how an ideal response to a report of a hate crime or incident should look. Additional questioning explored how participants defined hate crimes and incidents. We used prompts and additional questions to clarify responses. To compensate participants for their involvement in the study, we gave them each a $50 gift card. I contacted all participants within 24 hours after their interview to check in and make ourselves available to answer questions. We also offered participants opportunities to participate in follow-up interviews. Only one participant opted to do so, engaging in two additional brief interviews to update us about the status of the reporting process and additional insights.

Analysis

Consistent with a descriptive qualitative method, we decided that qualitative content analysis was a coherent approach to analyzing the data gathered in this study (Sandalowski, as cited in Mayan, 2009, p. 53). This form of content analysis involves identifying, coding, categorizing, and theming the recurring or predominant elements of the data (Mayan, 2009). As Mayan (2009) described, coding first involved in-depth reading and re-reading of the transcribed interviews to identify recurring or underlying patterns. We then highlighted sections of the text related to patterns, which we then categorized while looking out for negative cases (Morse et al., 2002; Mayan, 2009). Finally, consistent with a CBPR approach (Janzen & Ochocka, 2020), we reviewed draft findings and recommendations with participants and research partners to ensure validity and accuracy.

Ethics and Rigour

Hate crimes and incidents have significant, harmful direct and indirect impacts on people (Bell & Perry, 2015; Iganski & Lagou, 2015; Mercier-Dalphon & Helly, 2021). Recognizing the sensitive nature of the study and the fact that it involves human participants, an ethical approach was paramount at all points in this research. The University of Alberta Ethics Board reviewed a proposal for this study before it began. Research partners provided feedback on ethical approaches to the research that led to a more trauma-informed and culturally aware approach to the study.

Lincoln and Guba's concepts of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (as cited in Mayan, 2009, pp. 101-102) guided this study's adherence to rigour. According to Janzen and Ochocka (2020), research rigour is partially achieved in CBPR by selecting appropriate research methods. This observation is consistent with Mayan’s (2009) discussions of

methodological coherence as a method of research verification. Our study's research approach aligns with similar previous Canadian and UK studies (Healy, 2020; Mercier-Dalphond & Helly, 2021). Further, considering our prolonged engagement with CCEE and the field of preventing hate-motivated violence, we strengthened our research rigour through adherence to credibility (Lincoln and Guba, as cited in Mayan, 2009, pp. 101-102; Morse et al., 2002). Research partners discussed and verified findings and recommendations throughout the data analysis. Participants also provided feedback on these findings and recommendations after analysis. This approach aligns with Janzen and Ochocka's (2020) recommendations for CBPR rigour and trustworthiness. The practice of member checking also aligns with Lincoln and Guba's concept of credibility and confirmability (as cited in Mayan, 2009, pp. 101-102). We maintained a journal to establish research rigour through critical reflection, while contributing to rigour through dependability (Mayan, 2009). This approach and discussions of methodological coherence and data collection alongside research partners contributed to reflective practice (Nencel, 2013). This process also allowed the research to adopt additional lines of inquiry as they emerged. Transferability may be difficult to ensure because the specifics of Edmonton service experiences may not transfer directly to different services in different locales and cultural contexts. However, a thick description of the setting and participants will contribute to transferability and allow individuals in other settings to adopt the findings, if appropriate (Mayan, 2009).

Findings

Unreliable Responses from Organizations to Survivors' Reports of Hate Crimes and Incidents

The ways in which organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents do not reliably meet the needs of people victimized by these occurrences and can significantly impact these individuals. Participants reported a range of hate crimes and incidents, including assault,

doxing, online and in-person harassment, death threats, discriminatory insults and slurs, neglect and abuse in healthcare and foster care, police intimidation and profiling, rape, sexual assault, and stalking. While demographic information on participants was not collected, participants reported hate crimes and incidents related to transphobia, homophobia, Islamophobia, anti-Black racism, anti-Indigenous racism, ableism, and sexism, as well as intersections of these motivations.

Participants had different hopes when they first decided to report their experience of a hate crime or incident. These hopes included stopping the harm facing themselves or others, seeking justice, and raising awareness about the issue so it could be documented and addressed. When reporting to the police, police professional standards branch, or a professional regulatory body, participants hoped perpetrators would be investigated, held accountable, and recognize the harm caused by their actions. Participants who reported to these and other organizations identified hoping for advocacy, support reporting to the police, guidance, financial aid, and assistance with mental, physical, and housing needs.

The responses participants hoped for were often different from the ones they received. These responses are summarized below, with services that met survivors' needs discussed separately from those that did not. The actual responses to these reports of hate crimes and incidents that participants received were more complicated than simply positive or negative interactions. Organizations often responded in ways that did and did not meet survivors' needs. Sometimes, a participant reported to multiple organizations and staff before their needs were met at a minimal level, if at all.

In scenarios where participants were most satisfied with the organization's response, participants were listened to, believed, taken seriously, and not judged or shamed. The

organization had addressed the matter promptly and was victim-centered. Organizations gave participants encouragement, guidance, and support while providing regular and ongoing follow-up. Responding organizations provided participants access to safety planning and appropriate services or referrals, including mental and physical healthcare, housing and relocation, identification, and legal assistance. Non-police organizations assisted participants in reporting to the police when requested. Still, they did not pressure participants to make further reports if they did not wish to. Police responded promptly, took statements, and believed the participant. They worked to find the perpetrator, made decisions in collaboration with the participant, provided regular follow-up, and made referrals to internal supports like victim services. In some cases, perpetrators were apprehended and held accountable in ways that incorporated the participant's wishes.

When responses like these happened, participants identified feeling satisfied, grateful, hopeful, listened to, relieved, and increased confidence in responses from organizations and the reporting process. In addition, they felt safety for themselves and others, that they were not alone, and that they could keep going.

However, many organizational responses also had negative impacts on participants. Such experiences included being ignored or disbelieved, being discouraged from reporting, and facing discrimination and disrespect in a culturally unsafe environment. Participants shared that responding organizations had laughed at and victim-blamed them for the incident. Organizations had also told them their experience was not serious enough to justify a response or that what they had experienced was not a crime. Participants often received no or little follow-up, or delayed responses that took months or years. Reporting procedures were sometimes complex, demanding, and inaccessible. Some organizations were unaware of appropriate referrals.

Participants faced confusing staffing changes, mistakes, disorganization, being sent back and forth between services, and decisions that did not align with their wishes. Due to responses from organizations that did not ensure their safety, some participants faced harassment from those they had filed complaints against. Perpetrators were not investigated or apprehended. When participants filed complaints about professional conduct, organizations seemed to protect the subject(s) of the complaint as opposed to the survivor.

These negative responses had a range of emotional impacts on participants, including anger, anxiety, confusion, defeat, depression, disappointment, doubt, and frustration.

Negative responses impacted participants' beliefs, including a loss of faith in authorities and the reporting process, and a loss of pride in being an Edmontonian. Others developed beliefs that Canada is unjust, they are not valued, and that justice is not available to them. They further began to perceive that they continued to be unsafe, and that those who perpetrated hate crimes or incidents could do so without facing the consequences of their actions. One participant shared the experience of being disbelieved and deprioritized, stating:

> You're playing with hope in a system and hope in humanity when you fuck stuff like that up and we're talking about faith in humanity for people who just lost it all because of a hate crime. You're trying to restore broken things with care and being gentle and tons and tons of love and understanding, like none of these organizations know what that is. This is a people problem… To do it differently, remember that there's fucking people at the end of your phone call.

Negative responses also resulted in behavioural and psychological impacts. Some participants abandoned their reports altogether. Physical and psychological impacts from the

original crime or incident remained untreated. Participants experienced retraumatization, financial losses, online harassment, and suicidality.

A participant shared their experience and hopes for how organizations can improve: "I'd like them to know what it feels like…. when people feel just disappointed…I want them to know that like, 'Yo, we don't feel heard.' We just feel defeated. And like it's just a huge disappointment. Like, who cares about us?"

The vast majority of participants experienced significant impacts from how organizations responded to their reports of a hate crime or incident. However, in one case, the participant identified that they were not particularly impacted by the hate incident they had reported. Further, they had neither significant expectations or concerns related to the responding organization's lack of response.

Hate Crimes and Incidents in a Context of Historical and Ongoing Discrimination

When asked how they defined hate crimes and incidents, most participants answered in ways that are similar to definitions of hate crimes and incidents often used in Canada. However, one participant understood hate crimes and incidents to mean being harmed because of interpersonal conflict and not hatred based on their identity. This understanding is different from most definitions used.

Almost all participants situated their experiences of hate crimes and incidents within a social and systemic context of discrimination. Participants connected historical, intergenerational, and ongoing discriminatory practices and beliefs within Canada to the hate they experienced when victimized by a hate crime or incident. For example, a participant shared: "So hate … was given to me as a child."

At the same time, participants connected these practices and beliefs to how organizations uphold and respond to discrimination and hate. One participant shared:

> … we can do a lot of a lot of conversations and all these different discussions, but there's no follow through… as I'm talking to hate victims or people who have lost loved ones to violence of racism… the buck is being passed around, even on their mental health, on supports, there's a lot of talk about helping people, but there's no real action. It looks good on paper. But that's not the real life.

Many individuals in the same systems to which participants reported hate crimes or incidents, such as police, healthcare workers, the child welfare system, transit operators, and supportive housing organizations, were also named as perpetrators of hate crimes and incidents in this study. At the same time, participants reflected on how their negative experiences of reporting a hate crime or incident sometimes felt connected to discriminatory attitudes held by those responding to their reports. This challenging dichotomy was observed by a participant: “It's super disappointing, because this organization is like specifically to help people… and they, I hate to say that they targeted me, but that's kind of what it felt like.”

Further, many participants identified having regular experiences of hate crimes and incidents, as well as microaggressions and other forms of discrimination, throughout their everyday interactions and when in contact with various public services. For example, participants were often victimized by strangers and acquaintances during daily activities while walking in public areas, riding public transit, participating in social activities, and with sexual partners. A participant noted: “… they're quick to call the cops on a homeless person on the bus but if something racist happens they're like, ‘I have a schedule to keep.’”

Factors Influencing the Decision to Report a Hate Crime or Incident

Interpersonal relationships, existing knowledge and beliefs, and previous experiences influence the choice to report a hate crime or incident. Participants and their supports reported hate crimes and incidents to community organizations, community leaders, healthcare providers, lawyers, media, ombudsperson and human rights offices, the police, the police's professional standards branch, politicians, psychologists, professional regulatory bodies, religious leaders, social media, and support groups. Despite the many organizations they reported to, participants often conveyed that whoever they had contacted was the only option available. Participants were aware of the organizations to which they had reported for a few reasons. First, the organization was a widely accessed public service or platform (i.e., police, public transit, healthcare, media, social media). Second, they were already familiar or previously involved with the organization. Third, they were aware of the organization due to a referral by a trusted person, such as a friend, family member, co-worker, or professional.

Participants detailed repeated experiences of hate crimes and incidents throughout their lives and often had to decide which ones to report. Several factors motivated participants not to report the crime or incident. These included a lack of awareness about reporting processes, a trusted person discouraging them from reporting, or a need to focus on recovery from the occurrence or other commitments. Others did not report because they believed they would not receive an effective response, that organizations handling these reports are racist, or that what they had experienced was not serious enough to report. For example, a participant stated:

> I don't like to report everything because wait till I get like, shot or stabbed up then maybe they'll take me seriously… but if they're just name calling I'm not gonna report a concern. I don't want to like, I'm scared that after a while, they won't take me seriously.

Another participant observed the lack of faith community members have in the efficacy of reporting a hate crime or incident:

> I feel for the … women that I've kind of … stood up for because when I'm like, 'Let's go do something about it.' They're like, 'Why? They're not going to do anything.' And it's like … for like those women to feel defeated like that. It's… discouraging to be an Edmontonian. Because, like, people don't feel safe or like they don't feel like anything's going to get done about this racism that happens.

When participants chose to report a hate crime or incident, this choice was influenced by a number of factors. These included: the seriousness or frequency of the occurrence (for example, someone was harmed, a weapon was involved, and/or the situation was recurring), a pre-existing connection with the organization, encouragement from a trusted person, and a desire to protect others.

Discussion

Previous Canadian research helps us understand why people do not report hate crimes (Angeles & Roberton, 2020; Erentzen & Schuller, 2020), but is limited in helping us understand what happens from survivors' perspectives when they do choose to report. This study is unique among Canadian hate crimes studies, and relatively novel internationally, for focusing on how survivors of hate crimes and incidents experience responses to their reports of being victimized. Our study provides insights into how survivors conceptualize hate crimes and incidents, their decisions to report these experiences, how organizations do and do not respond to these reports, and the impacts of these responses on survivors. Importantly, it has implications for governments and organizations that receive reports of hate crimes and incidents in informing their service delivery to survivors. Considering the inconsistent and unreliable responses from organizations,

it is not especially surprising that these insights, while novel in research, are not new to communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents. Such stories may impact communities' and individuals' faith in organizations that respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents. As such, there is an imperative to effectively and consistently support those who report hate crimes and incidents in an evidence-based, victim-centred, and reliable way.

Consistencies With and Expansions Upon Existing Research on Reporting Hate Crimes and Incidents

The insights provided by this study are consistent with existing studies in a Canadian context about decisions to report hate crimes and incidents. However, our study also deepens and broadens our understanding of the factors that survivors consider when deciding to report their experiences. Concerns about racism and a lack of adequate response when reporting a hate crime or incident resonate with findings from Angeles and Robertson (2020), Erentzen and Schuller (2020), and Walfield et al. (2016). However, this study also explored how social connections inform decisions to report hate crimes and incidents in the context of survivors' recovery and other priorities. Further, while other studies help us understand why survivors do not report hate crimes and incidents, this research provides insights into why survivors sometimes choose to report. It reveals that interpersonal relationships, existing knowledge and beliefs, and previous experiences influence the choice~~s~~ to report a hate crime or incident. This understanding could inform ways to improve reporting rates among communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents. For example, it seems apparent that organizations should focus on building meaningful relationships and offering programming (even outside of the realm of hate crimes and incidents) within communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents.

Angeles and Roberton (2020) found that participants did not generally report to the police, relying instead on supports like friends, family, partners, social media, mental health services, community centres, and local businesses. Our study expands our understanding of the breadth of organizations to which survivors report hate crimes and incidents. Participants and their supports reported hate crimes and incidents to community organizations, community leaders, healthcare providers, lawyers, media, ombudsperson and human rights offices, the police, the police's professional standards branch, politicians, psychologists, professional regulatory bodies, religious leaders, social media, and support groups. At the same time, we gained more insight into how these organizations respond to survivors of hate crimes and incidents. These responses have the potential to meet survivors' needs but are still inconsistent. Services external to police may seem safer or more approachable to some survivors of hate crimes and incidents. However, there is still an identified need to ensure that all formal supports for survivors of hate crimes and incidents have the capacity to either provide reliable, evidence-based, and victim-centered services, or facilitate informed referrals to organizations that can provide consistent, quality services.

Our study shares consistencies with similar Canadian and UK studies on the experiences of individuals who report hate crimes and incidents. While not explicitly examining hate crimes and incidents, de Koninck and Lauridsen's (2018) findings are consistent with ours within the same locale, despite data collection taking place six years apart. For example, both studies show that service access is complicated, may involve survivors facing discrimination and racism, and may lack empathetic responses to survivors. Our study is in alignment with the Canadian Race Relations Foundation’s (2022) observations about a lack of consistency and quality in services supporting survivors of hate crimes and incidents. These shared findings among studies indicate

concerning recurring and unaddressed needs for survivors of hate crimes and incidents in Canada that require an immediate response proportional to the scope and impact of these occurrences.

In the UK, Chakraborti et al.'s (2014) and Healy's (2020) findings resonate with insights from our study, despite differences in the time, locale, and types of organizations receiving reports of hate crimes and incidents. In insights from our study and Chakraborti et al.'s (2014), participants valued police follow-up and support. In work by Chakraborti et al. (2014), Healy (2020), and our research team, it has been found that survivors of hate crimes and incidents have not had their reports taken seriously, saw a lack of follow-up, and faced unprofessional behaviour. Further, participants in Healy's (2020) study and ours faced complex reporting processes that often involved more than one staff member or organization, dismissive responses, discouragement from reporting, and discrimination. These consistencies across Canada and the UK potentially indicate a recurring, widespread lack of appropriate preparation to address reports of hate crimes and incidents across organizations and countries, as well as similarities in the needs of survivors in different parts of the world.

Finally, our study shares commonalities with community and government guides on supporting survivors of hate crimes and incidents. These documents identify shared needs for personal safety; practical, emotional, financial, and psychological help; and a need to be listened to, believed, taken seriously, and receive guidance (Chaudhry et al., 2022; The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2020;). However, our study is unique in research for beginning to identify the financial and housing needs that survivors may need to have addressed with support from responding organizations, especially considering the financial losses participants sometimes reported and needs to relocate and find new housing. This insight reveals a need for service providers to be more fully prepared and resourced to anticipate and meet these

needs for survivors. Further, these findings support Camp's (2022) call for a transdisciplinary approach to support survivors of hate crimes. This approach is especially appropriate considering the needs for justice, mental and physical healthcare, and financial and housing support identified by participants in this study.

Impacts of Responses to Hate Crimes and Incidents

A wide array of studies and guides capture the impacts of hate crimes and incidents (Chaudhry et al., 2022; Iganski & Lagou, 2015; The Government of Wales, 2020; The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2020; Perry & Alvi, 2011). Comparatively, participants in our study offer novel insights into the impacts of the ways organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents in the Canadian context. The impacts of hate crimes and incidents on individuals and communities (Iganski & Lagou, 2015; Perry & Alvi, 2011) are similar to the impacts of responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents that do not meet the needs of survivors. As such, ineffective or otherwise unsatisfactory responses from organizations recreate or fail to mitigate the harms caused by hate crimes and incidents. This phenomenon is described by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (2020) as 'secondary victimization':

> …victimization that occurs not as a direct result of the criminal act but through the response of institutions and individuals to the victim. This includes, but is not limited to, not recognizing and treating the victim in a respectful manner, an insensitive and unprofessional manner of approaching the victim and discrimination of the victim in any kind. (pp. 13-14)

Based on the above definition, survivors in our study regularly experienced secondary victimization due to the inconsistent and, at times, harmful responses from organizations meant

to support them. This same observation is shared by the Canadian Race Relations Foundation (2022). However, our study is unique in Canada for demonstrating both that secondary victimization occurs for some survivors and the significant impacts of such experiences on survivors' emotions, beliefs, and behaviours.

Hate Crimes and Incidents in a Context of Everyday and Systemic Discrimination

Perry (2001) defines hate crimes and incidents as, "a mechanism of power, intended to reaffirm the precarious hierarchies that characterize a given social order" (p. 10). This understanding seems tied to the participants' views in our study. For example, the same discriminatory beliefs encountered during participants' experiences of hate crimes and incidents were also sometimes encountered when organizations responded to reports of these occurrences. Mercier-Dalphond and Helly (2021) critique hate crime definitions for not recognizing the cumulative impacts of repeated exposure to harassment for individuals and communities. Our study further demonstrates that hate crimes and incidents are experienced amidst recurring social and systemic discrimination.

Interpreting hate crimes and incidents as mechanisms of power (Perry, 2001) is furthered in the recognition that some perpetrators of hate crimes and incidents identified in this study are parts of institutions like policing, healthcare, transit, and social services. This observation demonstrates that these mechanisms of power can be upheld in implicit and explicit social and systemic interactions. This insight has several implications. Most importantly, institutions must recognize and take steps to prevent the reality that their members can and do perpetrate hate crimes and incidents. Secondly, organizations need to empathize with this lived context of discrimination, and take steps to further prevent it in their responses to reports of hate crimes and

incidents. Finally, research is needed to better understand how institutions and their members carry out hate crimes and incidents, and how to address these realities.

Responses to Hate Crimes and Incidents in the Context of Human Rights and Anti-Oppression

This study is contextualized within an anti-oppressive approach. Anti-oppressive research aims to identify and understand oppression in individual, institutional, and systemic circumstances while providing ways to dismantle this oppression (Holley et al., as cited in Bilotta, 2020, p. 399). The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1981) states that people have fundamental freedom of conscience and religion, equality before the law, equal protection, and equal benefit of the law without discrimination. However, inconsistent, unreliable, and potentially discriminatory responses to hate crimes and incidents, especially within a legal context, can suggest that survivors of hate crimes are not always afforded equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination. The fact that members of institutions were alleged to have perpetrated hate crimes and incidents towards participants in this study suggests that systems are not fully successful in preventing these harms from occurring. This study is a preliminary examination that supports the need for responses to survivors of hate crimes and incidents to have their rights upheld in this process.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015) calls for a number of parties in Canada to address neglect in child welfare; strengthen cultural competency and Indigenous awareness training for healthcare professionals, lawyers, public servants, and the public; collect and publish data on criminal victimization of Indigenous peoples; and create Indigenous-specific victim programs. All of these Calls to Action are echoed in the recommendations that survivors of hate crimes and incidents shared in this study, despite the seven years between them. This observation

demonstrates a need for timely and systemic change at a national level to move towards reconciliation and simultaneously support survivors of hate crimes and incidents.

A Need to Understand Indigenous Peoples' Experiences Pertaining to Hate Crimes and Incidents in Canada

As far as we are aware, there is no recent and specific research in Canada on the experiences of Indigenous peoples as they pertain to hate crimes and incidents outside of McCaslin (2014). McCaslin (2014) observed that Indigenous people were rarely found to be victims of hate crimes. Further, Indigenous peoples, and Indigenous women specifically, do not have categories of protection in legislation or case law. Our study gathered insights from a number of participants who reported hate crimes and incidents motivated by anti-Indigenous racism. However, since our study did not explicitly include demographic data, it cannot offer confident insights into the experiences of Indigenous peoples as they pertain to hate crimes and incidents, or experiences with reporting them. This observation is significant, however, and may merit further investigation.

Strengths and Limitations

Earlier Canadian research has offered a limited understanding of how organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents from the perspectives of those reporting. As such, this study is a first attempt at describing these experiences. Further, it is essential to inform the services that respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents to ensure that they properly and promptly meet survivors' needs, especially considering the potential for severe harm caused by hate crimes and incidents and responses to reporting. At this point, the findings of this study provide sufficient information for organizations to begin informing and adapting their

approaches. This study supports further inquiry into how hate crimes and incidents may be perpetrated within institutions.

The study also has some limitations. First, it did not account for the experiences of people under 18 years of age and did not involve the perspectives of anyone targeted by a hate crime or incident motivated by antisemitism, hatred towards Catholics, or anti-Asian racism. Hate crimes due to these motivations are increasingly prevalent in Canada (Moreau, 2022). Further, the study did not explicitly include demographic data. As such, we cannot confidently determine or compare how members of different communities experience responses to their reports of hate crimes or incidents and what their specific hopes or needs for responses may be. Additionally, this study had limited ability to accommodate those uncomfortable communicating in English. However, it should be noted that the one individual who wished to participate in another language was interviewed thanks to translation provided by a research partner. Nonetheless, future studies may be able to expand upon our findings. They could explore how different demographic groups experience responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents, perhaps even comparing experiences across different municipalities, rural areas, First Nations, and Métis Nations.

Recommendations

We offer the following recommendations based directly on interviews with people who have reported hate crimes and incidents to organizations in Edmonton. Recommendations were checked with research partners and participants. Many also share consistencies with the Canadian Race Relations Foundation's (2022) report.

Table 1

Recommendations for Organizations

1. Ensure that first points of contact (i.e., frontline staff, 911 operators, transit operators and security, patrol officers) reliably establish the immediate safety of the survivor. These points of contact must further respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents with seriousness and immediacy while practicing empathic and active listening in a trauma-informed, culturally safe and cost-free environment. Ensuring these responses may involve training staff about understanding and responding to hate crimes and incidents, bias awareness, trauma-informed practice, and intercultural practice. Policies to provide such responses should be developed and implemented in full.
2. Regularly evaluate and update responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents to ensure a consistent, high level of service while prioritizing the perspectives of people who have made these reports.
3. Provide timely, reliable client-centered services or referrals that appropriately address the physical, psychological, and financial impacts of being victimized by a hate crime or incident.
4. Do not make services contingent on survivor behaviour, such as signing non-disclosure agreements or dismissing complaints.
5. Make accessible emergency support and safety planning available to survivors who have reported a hate crime or incident, potentially through a hotline or other 24/7 option.
6. Provide regular, timely feedback to survivors while being available to field questions, provide guidance, and respond to emerging situations.
7. Accurately guide and inform survivors about the services, options, and processes they can expect while upholding the survivor's autonomy.
8. Enact policies, training, and hiring practices to ensure that service providers are culturally humble and represent the diversity of communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents.
9. Recognize that hate crimes and incidents may be perpetrated by members of their organizations, and take steps to prevent these behaviours. Strategies should be regularly evaluated and updated.
10. Take complaints filed against members of their organizations seriously, investigate them promptly, and hold perpetrators accountable while respecting the wishes of the person who was victimized.
11. Ensure the survivor's safety by limiting access to their identifying and personal information to prevent harassment of the person submitting the report.
12. Collaborate with organizations that regularly receive reports of hate crimes and incidents (i.e., police, healthcare, social services), community groups, and specialized supports for those victimized by hate crimes and incidents (e.g., victims services, non-profits, etc.) to ensure that survivors are connected to appropriate supports and that services are aware of, and support, one another. This could involve creating partnerships, communities of

practice, or interagency groups that further facilitate collaboration, effective referrals, and cross-training.
13. Raise awareness of services through an accessible online presence and by building proactive relationships with communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents through programming, education, engagement, capacity-building, and other efforts developed in collaboration with these communities.
14. Prepare those who have been victimized by hate crimes and incidents for the potential risks they may face if their story is publicized by the media.
15. Ensure that internal complaint processes are easily accessible and straightforward. Complaints should be received in spaces managed by staff who are arms-length from the organization and do not cause additional exposure for survivors to organizations that feel unsafe.
16. Ensure regulatory bodies and police investigations are coordinated when responding to complaints.

Table 2

Additional Recommendations for Police

1. Have a coordinating body (i.e., Hate Crimes Unit or Coordinator) to ensure that responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents offer a high level of consistent service while prioritizing the perspectives of people who have made these reports. These services need to be accountable to Police Executive Leadership and internal policy with supported infrastructure and resources. When a report to police is received, they should provide timely, reliable client-centered services or referrals (e.g. Reassurance Protocol) that address the impacts of being victimized by a hate crime or incident. This contact should involve offering safety planning and a referral to Victims Services, regardless of whether charges are laid.
2. Ensure police-based Victims Services are trained to support survivors of hate crimes and incidents effectively. These police-based Victims Services should also implement recommendations for organizations listed above.
3. Take statements seriously, investigate the matter, provide regular feedback, guidance, and referrals to survivors, and work to hold perpetrators accountable in alignment with the survivor's wishes while practicing procedural justice.

Table 3

Additional Recommendations for Municipal, Provincial, and Federal Governments

1. Develop and implement practical, evaluated, transparent, evidence-based, community-guided and sustained strategies and legislation to prevent and effectively respond to hate crimes and incidents in urban spaces, rural areas, First Nations, and Métis Nations.
2. Build meaningful and ongoing relationships with individuals and communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents while responding to and prioritizing their needs. This could be accomplished through staff positions dedicated to community engagement, consultation, and capacity building at municipal and provincial levels.
3. Take concrete steps towards reconciliation, addressing and preventing systemic discrimination while supporting widespread anti-racism education along with Indigenous awareness, education, and practices. This could be the purview of provincial education, children's services, justice, and Indigenous relations ministries, among others.
4. Provide appropriate, ongoing funding to new and existing organizations that support people victimized by hate crimes and incidents, while evaluating these organizations to ensure a reliably high quality of service for those who report hate crimes and incidents. This funding and evaluation could be the purview of municipal and provincial governments.
5. Develop information sharing, coordination, and collaboration (potentially through a provincial Hate Crimes Coordination Unit) between organizations that respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents, including municipal and federal law enforcement.
6. Ensure ongoing adherence of public services to the above recommendations, making these evaluations transparent and available to the public. Doing so could be enshrined in provincial legislation.
7. Ensure consistency within federal and provincial courts so that perpetrators are held accountable and required to participate in programming that helps them to understand the harm caused by their actions and prevent future harm.

Conclusion

This Community-Based Participatory Research study helps us understand how individuals conceptualize and choose to report hate crimes and incidents, the inconsistent responses individuals face when they do so, and the impacts of these responses on survivors. It is essential that organizations that respond to hate crimes and incidents reports listen to, value, and believe those who report to them. At the same time, these services need to be consistent, reliable, timely, trauma-informed, and victim-centred. This is especially imperative in a society that, in its systems and social discourse, continues to uphold hate and discrimination.

References

Ahmad, S. (2019). Islamophobic violence as a form of gender-based violence: a qualitative study with Muslim women in Canada. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence, 3*(1), 45-66. **https://doi.org/10.1332/239868019X15492770695379**

Alberta Hate Crime Committee. (2009). *Alberta hate/bias crime report*. Alberta Hate Crime Committee. **https://cfrac.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Alberta-Hate-Bias-Crime-Report-2.pdf**

Ashley, F. (2018). Don't be so hateful: The insufficiency of anti-discrimination and hate crime laws in improving trans well-being. *The University of Toronto Law Journal, 68*(1), 1–36. **https://www.jstor.org/stable/90019657**

Angeles, L. & Roberton, J. (2020). Empathy and inclusive public safety in the city: Examining LGBTQ2+ voices and experiences of intersectional discrimination. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 78, 1-12. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2019.102313**

Bell, J., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay, and bisexual hate crime. *Journal of Homosexuality, 62*(1), 98-120. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957133**

Bilotta, N. (2020). Anti-oppressive social work research: Prioritising refugee voices in Kakuma Refugee Camp. *Ethics and Social Welfare, 14*(4), 397-414. **https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2020.1822425**

Bryan, T., & Trickett, L. (2021). "It's not Really Hate Crime" – Reframing Hate Crime as not Police Business" – Police Narratives of Resistance and Denial. *Journal of Hate Studies, 17*(1), 74–84. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.206**

Camp, S. (2021). *Incorporating a standalone hate crime section into the Criminal Code of Canada*. Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. **https://sites.google.com/albertahatecrimes.org/ahcc/projects?authuser=0**

Camp, S. (2022). *Hate crime trauma informed care: A transdisciplinary approach*. [Unpublished Master's paper]. Royal Roads University.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. (1981). *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Government of Canada. **https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/pch/documents/services/download-order-charter-bill/canadian-charter-rights-freedoms-eng.pdf**

Canadian Race Relations Foundation. (2022). *Reimagining a path to support all Canadians: A review of services for victims of hate in Canada*. Canadian Race Relations Foundation. **https://www.crrf-fcrr.ca/images/CRRF_-_A_review_of_services_for_victims_of_hate_in_Canada__Full_report.pdf**

Chaudhry, I. (2021). Making hate visible: Online hate incident reporting tools. *Journal of Hate Studies*, *17*(1), 64–73. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.188**

Chaudhry, I., Turlock, L., Tyler, J., Pandher, G., & Johal, S. (2022). *Supporting victims of hate crimes and incidents: A community centered approach*. StopHateAB. **https://stophateab.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/31328.pdf**

Chakraborti, N., Garland, J., & Hardy, S. (2014). The Leicester hate crime project: Findings and conclusions. Leicester, UK: University of Leicester. **https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/fc-full-report**

Chakraborti, N. (2015). Framing the boundaries of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Coalitions Creating Equity. (2020, June). *CCE response model to hate incidents in Alberta*. Coalitions Creating Equity. **http://coalitionscreatingequity.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Hate-Incident-BookJuly2020_LO.pdf**

Corb, A. (2015). Hate and hate crime in Canada. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Criminal Code, RSC, C-46 (1985). Retrieved from **http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/index.html**

Dauvergne, M., & Brennan, S. (2011). *Police-reported hate crime in Canada, 2009*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2011001/article/11469-eng.htm**

Erentzen, C., & Schuller, R. (2020). Exploring the dark figure of hate: Experiences with police bias and the under-reporting of hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 62*(2), 64-97. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2019-0035**

Facing Facts. (2012). *Facing facts! Hate crime monitoring guidelines*. Facing Facts. **https://www.facingfacts.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/02/Guidelines-for-monitoring-of-hate-crimes-and-hate-motivated-incidents-PROTECTED.pdf**

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C., & Healy, J. (2022). Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors. *Safer Communities, 21*(3), 215-225. **https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012**

Government of Wales. (2020). *Victim support hate crime toolkit.* Government of Wales. **https://hwb.gov.wales/api/storage/a7fcb16a-7d4f-4450-be77-6885d3d943e7/Victim%20Support%20Hate%20Crime%20Toolkit.pdf**

Hardy SJ., & Chakraborti, N. (2020). *Blood, threats and fears: The hidden worlds of hate crime victims*. Palgrave Hate Studies. Palgrave Pivot, Cham. **https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31997-7_3**

Healy, SJ. (2020). 'It spreads like a creeping disease': Experiences of victims of disability hate crimes in austerity Britain. *Disability & Society, 35*(2), 176-200. **https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1624151**

Iganski, P., & Lagou, S. (2015). The personal injuries of 'hate crime'. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 34-46). Routledge.

Janzen, R., & Ochocka, J. (2020). Assessing excellence in community-based research: Lessons from research with Syrian refugee newcomers. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 13*(1), 1-20. **https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v13i1.7037**

Levenson, J. (2018). Trauma-informed social work practice. *Social Work, 62*(2), 105–113, **https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx001**

Mayan, M. J. (2009). *Essentials of qualitative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Mason-Bish, H. (2015). Beyond the silo: Rethinking hate crime and intersectionality. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 24-33). Routledge.

McCaslin, W. D. (2014). *Hate-motivated offences and Aboriginal Peoples: Sentencing provisions of Section 718.2(a)(i) of the Criminal Code of Canada* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Saskatchewan. **https://harvest.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/ETD-2014-06-1647/MCCASLIN-THESIS.pdf?sequence=4**

McCoy, J., Jones, D., & Hastings, Z. (2019). *Building awareness, seeking solutions: Extremism & hate motivated violence in Alberta*. The Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/June2019OPVPublicReport.pdf**

Mercier-Dalphond, G., & Helly, D. (2021). Anti-Muslim violence, hate crime, and victimization in Canada: A study of five Canadian cities. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 53*(1), 1-22. **https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2021.0000**

Moreau, G. (2021, March 29). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2019*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00002-eng.htm**

Moreau, G. (2022, August 3). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2021*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00013-eng.htm**

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2), 1-19. Retrieved from: **https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/ijqm/index.php/IJQM/issu e/view/384**

The Office of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. (2020). *Understanding the needs of hate crime victims*. The Office of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. **https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/0/5/463011.pdf**

OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. (2021). *Model guidance on sensitive and respectful treatment of hate crime victims in the criminal justice system.* OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. **https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/8/f/499513.pdf**

Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes* (1st. ed.). Routledge.

Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2011). 'We are all vulnerable': The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 57–71. **https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758011422475**

Perry, B. (2015). Exploring the community impacts of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 47-58). Routledge.

Perry, B. & Samuels-Wortley, K. (2021). "We're not where we should be": Enhancing law enforcement responses to hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 63*(2), 68-98. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2020-0057**

Provost-Yombo, K., Louden, C., & McDonald, S. (2020). *Hate as an aggravating factor at sentencing - A review of the case law from 2008 – 2020*. Department of Justice Canada. **https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2021/jus/J4-101-2020-eng.pdf**

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.

https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/indigenous-people/aboriginal-peoples-documents/calls_to_action_english2.pdf

Walfield, S., Socia, K., & Powers, R. (2017). Religious motivated hate crimes: Reporting to law enforcement and case outcomes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*, 148-169. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-016-9349-3**

Chapter 6: Discussion, recommendations, and conclusions

Statement of Principle Findings

In collaboration with Coalitions Creating Equity Edmonton, we used a Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) approach to understand individuals' experiences reporting hate crimes and incidents to organizations in Edmonton. Eighteen people who reported hate crimes and incidents to organizations in Edmonton over the past five years participated in 20 semi-structured interviews during this qualitative descriptive study. Participants shared several insights. Firstly, how organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents does not reliably meet the needs of people victimized by these occurrences and can significantly impact survivors. Secondly, understandings and experiences of hate crimes and incidents and how organizations respond to them are based on lived experiences of historical and ongoing systemic and societal discrimination. Thirdly, interpersonal relationships, existing knowledge and beliefs, and previous experiences influence the choices to report a hate crime or incident.

This chapter discusses these insights in the context of existing research in this field, and through an anti-oppressive lens. I then delineate areas for further study. This chapter also identifies participants' recommendations to inform services supporting survivors of hate crimes and incidents. Finally, I offer concluding thoughts on this work.

Discussion

Canadian research helps us understand why people do not report hate crimes (Angeles & Roberton, 2020; Erentzen & Schuller, 2020). There is a scarcity of research on survivors' perspectives and experiences of what happens when they choose to report. This study is unique among Canadian hate crimes studies and relatively novel internationally in focusing on how survivors of hate crimes and incidents experience responses to their reports of victimization. Our

study provides insights into how survivors conceptualize hate crimes and incidents. It further reveals what shapes their decisions to report these experiences, their experiences of how organizations do and do not respond to these reports, and the impacts of these responses on survivors. Importantly, the findings have implications for governments and organizations that receive reports of hate crimes and incidents in informing their service delivery to survivors.

Considering the inconsistent and unreliable responses from organizations, it is not especially surprising that these insights, while novel in research, are not new to communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents. Such lived experiences may impact communities' and individuals' faith in organizations that respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents. As such, it is imperative to effectively and consistently support those who report hate crimes and incidents in an evidence-based, victim-centred, and reliable way.

Finally, Community-Based Participatory Research proved to be an appropriate and effective way to study survivors' experiences of reporting hate crimes and incidents.

Consistencies With and Expansions Upon Existing Research on Reporting Hate Crimes and Incidents

The insights provided by this study are consistent with existing studies in a Canadian context about decisions to report hate crimes and incidents. However, our study deepens and broadens understanding of what shapes survivors' decisions to report their experiences. Concerns about racism and a lack of adequate response resonate with findings of other studies (Angeles & Robertson, 2020; Erentzen & Schuller, 2020; Walfield et al., 2016). Our study expands on these studies by exploring how social connections inform decisions to report hate crimes and incidents in the context of survivors' recovery and other priorities.

Further, while existing studies help us understand why survivors do not report hate crimes and incidents, our research provides insight into why survivors sometimes choose to report. It reveals that interpersonal relationships, existing knowledge and beliefs, and previous experiences of reporting influence the choice to report a hate crime or incident. This understanding could inform ways to improve reporting rates among communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents. To increase reporting and awareness, organizations should consider prioritizing building meaningful relationships and offering programming within communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents.

Angeles and Roberton (2020) found that study participants did not generally report to the police. Instead, they relied on friends, family, partners, social media, mental health services, community centres, and local businesses. Our study expands our understanding of the breadth of organizations to which survivors report hate crimes and incidents, including community organizations, community leaders, healthcare providers, lawyers, media, ombudsperson and human rights offices, the police, the police's professional standards branch, politicians, psychologists, professional regulatory bodies, religious leaders, social media, and support groups. At the same time, we gained more insight into the ways that these organizations respond to survivors' reports of hate crimes and incidents. These responses have the potential to meet survivors' needs but are still inconsistent. Services external to police may seem safer or more approachable to some survivors. However, there is still an identified need to ensure that all formal supports to which survivors may report provide reliable, evidence-based, and victim-centred services, or facilitate informed referrals to organizations that can provide consistent, high-quality services.

Our study shares consistencies with similar Canadian studies on the experiences of individuals who report hate crimes and incidents. These studies show that service access is complicated, may involve survivors facing discrimination and racism, and may lack empathetic responses to survivors. While not explicitly examining hate crimes and incidents, de Koninck and Lauridsen's (2018) findings are consistent with ours within the same locale, despite data collection taking place six years apart. For example, both studies show that service access is complicated, may involve survivors facing discrimination and racism, and may lack empathetic responses to survivors. In addition, our findings align with the Canadian Race Relations Foundation's (2022) observations of a lack of consistency and quality in services supporting survivors of hate crimes and incidents. These shared findings across studies indicate recurring and persistent unaddressed needs for survivors of hate crimes and incidents in Canada that require an immediate response proportional to the scope and impact of these occurrences.

In the UK, Chakraborti et al.'s (2014) and Healy's (2020) findings resonate with insights from our study, despite differences in the time, locale, and types of organizations receiving reports of hate crimes and incidents. For example, survivors of hate crimes and incidents valued police follow-up and support; faced reports that were not taken seriously, a lack of follow-up, and unprofessional behaviour (Chakraborti et al., 2014; Healy, 2020). Further, participants faced complex reporting processes (Healy, 2020), often involving more than one staff member or organization, dismissive responses, discouragement from reporting, and discrimination. These consistencies across Canada and the UK potentially indicate a recurring, widespread lack of appropriate preparation to address reports of hate crimes and incidents across organizations and countries, as well as similarities in the needs of survivors of hate crimes and incidents throughout parts of the world.

Finally, our study shares similarities with community and government guides on supporting survivors of hate crimes and incidents, which identify needs for personal safety; practical, emotional, financial, and psychological help; and to be listened to, believed, taken seriously, and receive guidance (The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2020; Chaudhry et al., 2022). However, our study is unique in beginning to identify the financial and housing needs that survivors may need to have addressed with support from responding organizations, especially considering the financial losses participants sometimes reported and needs to relocate and find new housing. These findings reveal a need for service providers to be more fully prepared and resourced to anticipate and meet the needs of survivors. Further, our findings support Camp's (2022) call for a transdisciplinary approach to supporting survivors of hate crimes and incidents. This approach is especially appropriate considering the needs for justice, mental and physical healthcare, and financial and housing support identified by participants.

Impacts of Responses to Hate Crimes and Incidents

Several studies and guides capture the impacts of hate crimes and incidents (Chaudhry et al., 2022; Iganski & Lagou, 2015; The Government of Wales, 2020; The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2020; Perry & Alvi, 2011). Comparatively, participants in our study offer novel insights into the impacts of how organizations respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents in Canada. These impacts are similar to the impacts of responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents that do not meet the needs of survivors reported in other studies (Iganski & Lagou, 2015; Perry & Alvi, 2011). As such, ineffective or otherwise unsatisfactory responses from organizations recreate or fail to mitigate the harms caused by hate crimes and incidents.

The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (2020) described this phenomenon as "secondary victimization" (pp. 13-14).

Survivors in our study regularly experienced secondary victimization due to the inconsistent and, at times, harmful responses from organizations meant to support them. The Canadian Race Relations Foundation (2022) shared this same observation. However, our study is unique in Canada for illuminating both that secondary victimization occurs for some survivors, and its significant negative impacts on survivors' emotions, beliefs, and behaviours.

Hate Crimes and Incidents in a Context of Everyday and Systemic Discrimination

Perry (2001) defines hate crimes and incidents as, "a mechanism of power, intended to reaffirm the precarious hierarchies that characterize a given social order" (p. 10). This understanding seems tied to the participants' views in our study. This alignment is evident when recognizing that discriminatory beliefs that led perpetrators of hate crimes and incidents to target survivors are also perceived in how organizations respond to survivors. Mercier-Dalphond and Helly (2021) critique hate crime definitions for not recognizing the cumulative impacts of repeated exposure to harassment of individuals and communities. Our study demonstrates that survivors experience hate crimes and incidents amidst ongoing social and systemic discrimination.

Interpreting hate crimes and incidents as mechanisms of power (Perry, 2001) is also substantiated in survivors' reports that some perpetrators of hate crimes and incidents are employees of institutions like policing, healthcare, transit, and social services. This observation demonstrates that systems can uphold these mechanisms of power in implicit and explicit interactions. This insight has several implications. Most importantly, institutions must recognize and take steps to prevent the reality that their members can and do perpetrate hate crimes.

Secondly, organizations need to empathize with and understand survivors' lived context of discrimination and take steps to further prevent it in their responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents. Finally, research is needed to better understand how institutions and their members carry out hate crimes and incidents, even when they intend to support survivors, and how to address these realities.

Responses to Hate Crimes and Incidents in the Context of Human Rights and Anti-Oppression

This study is contextualized within an anti-oppressive approach. Anti-oppressive research aims to identify and understand oppression in individual, institutional, and systemic circumstances while providing ways to dismantle this oppression (Holley et al., as cited in Bilotta, 2020, p. 399). The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1981) states that people have fundamental freedom of conscience and religion, equality before the law, equal protection, and equal benefit of the law without discrimination. However, inconsistent, unreliable, and potentially discriminatory responses to hate crimes and incidents, especially within a legal context, suggest that survivors of hate crimes are not always afforded equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination. The fact that survivors reported that members of institutions perpetrate hate crimes and incidents is further evidence that systems are not fully successful in preventing these harms. This study is a preliminary examination that supports the need for responses to survivors of hate crimes and incidents to have their rights upheld throughout the process of reporting hate crimes and incidents.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015) calls for a number of parties in Canada to address the neglect of Indigenous children in child welfare; strengthen cultural competency and Indigenous awareness training for healthcare professionals, lawyers, public servants, and the public; collect and publish data on criminal victimization of Indigenous peoples; and create

Indigenous-specific victim programs. All of these Calls to Action are echoed in the recommendations that survivors of hate crimes and incidents shared in this study, despite the seven years between them. This observation underscores a need for timely and systemic change at national, provincial, and local levels to move towards reconciliation and simultaneously support survivors of hate crimes and incidents.

A Need to Understand Indigenous Peoples' Experiences Pertaining to Hate Crimes and Incidents in Canada

As far as we know, there is no recent and specific research in Canada on the experiences of Indigenous peoples as they pertain to hate crimes and incidents since McCaslin (2014) observed that Indigenous people are rarely found to be victims of hate crimes in Canadian case law. Further, Indigenous peoples and Indigenous women specifically do not have categories of protection against hate crimes and incidents in legislation or case law. Participants in our study reported experiences of hate crimes and incidents motivated by anti-Indigenous racism. While participants shared what kind of hate motivated the crime or incident they experienced, our study did not explicitly include demographic data. As such, it cannot offer confident insights into the experiences of Indigenous peoples or any other demographic groups specifically as they pertain to hate crimes and incidents, or experiences reporting them. This observation is significant, however, and may require further investigation.

The Value of Community-Based Participatory Research Studying Hate Crimes and Incidents

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) has been used to study hate crimes and incidents in the past (Burch, 2022; Gauthier et al., 2021). Further, Canadian organizations and researchers support community-engaged approaches as a way to address hate crimes and incidents (Archway Community Services, 2019; Coalitions Creating Equity, 2020; Kochar et al.,

2019; The Lead Fund, 2019; Perry & Samuels-Wortley, 2021). Because of the community impacts of hate crimes, CBPR is an appropriate but emerging research approach to address hate crimes and hate incidents. The effectiveness of our CBPR study suggests that this approach is well-positioned to explore hate crimes and incidents. It seems especially successful in meaningfully involving survivors of hate crimes and incidents. However, as discussed in Chapter 4, emerging practices should be considered in future CBPR studies on hate crimes and incidents, such as building community partnerships, advocating for trauma-informed practices, prioritizing cultural humility and intersectionality, preparing for lengthy pre-participation communication with potential participants, anticipating out-of-scope volunteer participants; and accounting for unanticipated actions of participants.

Areas for Further Study

As discussed, it is clear that the phenomenon of hate crimes and incidents is relatively understudied in Canada. Understandings of survivor perspectives are even less explored, as is CBPR as a vehicle for addressing this topic. As such, several areas for further study emerged. First, there is value in expanding the scope of our initial investigation, perhaps considering a national scale. A study could explicitly explore how different demographic groups experience responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents across different jurisdictions. It could also compare experiences across jurisdictions including municipalities, rural areas, First Nations, and Métis Nations. Second, research is needed to better understand how institutions and their members carry out hate crimes and incidents, and how to address these realities. Thirdly, and related to the first, could be a CBPR study to understand the specific experiences of Indigenous peoples in Canada related to hate crimes and incidents. Fourth, two participants in this study discussed how media attention on their experiences impacted them both positively and

negatively. Further research in this area could inform how media sources cover hate crimes and incidents. Fifth, there is a distinct lack of available guidance on conducting qualitative and CBPR research on hate crimes and incidents. A study with community and community-based academic researchers who have studied hate crimes and incidents could further inform effective research practices on these topics.

Participant Recommendations

Following from the findings of our study, we offer the following recommendations which we verified with research partners and participants. We further refined them alongside community partners to ensure that they are specific, realistic, and actionable. Many of our recommendations also share consistencies with those in the Canadian Race Relations Foundation's (2022) report.

Table 1

Recommendations for Organizations

1. Ensure that first points of contact (i.e., frontline staff, 911 operators, transit operators and security, patrol officers) reliably establish the immediate safety of the survivor. These points of contact must further respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents with seriousness and immediacy while practicing empathic and active listening in a trauma-informed, culturally safe and cost-free environment. Ensuring these responses may involve training staff about understanding and responding to hate crimes and incidents, bias awareness, trauma-informed practice, and intercultural practice. Policies to provide such responses should be developed and implemented in full.
2. Regularly evaluate and update responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents to ensure a consistent, high level of service while prioritizing the perspectives of people who have made these reports.
3. Provide timely, reliable client-centered services or referrals that appropriately address the physical, psychological, and financial impacts of being victimized by a hate crime or incident.
4. Do not make services contingent on survivor behaviour, such as signing non-disclosure agreements or dismissing complaints.

5. Make accessible emergency support and safety planning available to survivors who have reported a hate crime or incident, potentially through a hotline or other 24/7 option.
6. Provide regular, timely feedback to survivors while being available to field questions, provide guidance, and respond to emerging situations.
7. Accurately guide and inform survivors about the services, options, and processes they can expect while upholding the survivor's autonomy.
8. Enact policies, training, and hiring practices to ensure that service providers are culturally humble and represent the diversity of communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents.
9. Recognize that hate crimes and incidents may be perpetrated by members of their organizations, and take steps to prevent these behaviours. Strategies should be regularly evaluated and updated.
10. Take complaints filed against members of their organizations seriously, investigate them promptly, and hold perpetrators accountable while respecting the wishes of the person who was victimized.
11. Ensure the survivor's safety by limiting access to their identifying and personal information to prevent harassment of the person submitting the report.
12. Collaborate with organizations that regularly receive reports of hate crimes and incidents (i.e., police, healthcare, social services), community groups, and specialized supports for those victimized by hate crimes and incidents (e.g., victims services, non-profits, etc.) to ensure that survivors are connected to appropriate supports and that services are aware of, and support, one another. This could involve creating partnerships, communities of practice, or interagency groups that further facilitate collaboration, effective referrals, and cross-training.
13. Raise awareness of services through an accessible online presence and by building proactive relationships with communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents through programming, education, engagement, capacity-building, and other efforts developed in collaboration with these communities.
14. Prepare those who have been victimized by hate crimes and incidents for the potential risks they may face if their story is publicized by the media.
15. Ensure that internal complaint processes are easily accessible and straightforward. Complaints should be received in spaces managed by staff who are arms-length from the organization and do not cause additional exposure for survivors to organizations that feel unsafe.
16. Ensure regulatory bodies and police investigations are coordinated when responding to complaints.

Table 2

Additional Recommendations for Police

1. Have a coordinating body (i.e., Hate Crimes Unit or Coordinator) to ensure that responses to reports of hate crimes and incidents offer a high level of consistent service while prioritizing the perspectives of people who have made these reports. These services need to be accountable to Police Executive Leadership and internal policy with supported infrastructure and resources. When a report to police is received, they should provide timely, reliable client-centered services or referrals (e.g. Reassurance Protocol) that address the impacts of being victimized by a hate crime or incident. This contact should involve offering safety planning and a referral to Victims Services, regardless of whether charges are laid.
2. Ensure police-based Victims Services are trained to support survivors of hate crimes and incidents effectively. These police-based Victims Services should also implement recommendations for organizations listed above.
3. Take statements seriously, investigate the matter, provide regular feedback, guidance, and referrals to survivors, and work to hold perpetrators accountable in alignment with the survivor's wishes while practicing procedural justice.

Table 3

Additional Recommendations for Municipal, Provincial, and Federal Governments

1. Develop and implement practical, evaluated, transparent, evidence-based, community-guided and sustained strategies and legislation to prevent and effectively respond to hate crimes and incidents in urban spaces, rural areas, First Nations, and Métis Nations.
2. Build meaningful and ongoing relationships with individuals and communities impacted by hate crimes and incidents while responding to and prioritizing their needs. This could be accomplished through staff positions dedicated to community engagement, consultation, and capacity building at municipal and provincial levels.
3. Take concrete steps towards reconciliation, addressing and preventing systemic discrimination while supporting widespread anti-racism education along with Indigenous awareness, education, and practices. This could be the purview of provincial education, children’s services, justice, and Indigenous relations ministries, among others.
4. Provide appropriate, ongoing funding to new and existing organizations that support people victimized by hate crimes and incidents, while evaluating these organizations to ensure a reliably high quality of service for those who report hate crimes and incidents. This funding and evaluation could be the purview of municipal and provincial governments.

5. Develop information sharing, coordination, and collaboration (potentially through a provincial Hate Crimes Coordination Unit) between organizations that respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents, including municipal and federal law enforcement.
6. Ensure ongoing adherence of public services to the above recommendations, making these evaluations transparent and available to the public. Doing so could be enshrined in provincial legislation.
7. Ensure consistency within federal and provincial courts so that perpetrators are held accountable and required to participate in programming that helps them to understand the harm caused by their actions and prevent future harm.

Conclusion

This Community-Based Participatory Research study provides an in-depth description of how individuals understand and choose to report hate crimes and incidents, their experiences of inconsistent responses when doing so, and the impacts of these responses on them and their communities. These insights support the conclusion that it is essential that organizations that respond to reports of hate crimes and incidents listen to, value, and believe those who report to them. At the same time, these services need to provide consistent, reliable, timely, trauma-informed, and victim-centred support. These actions are especially imperative in a society that, in its systems and social discourse, continues to uphold hate and discrimination.

Throughout my work in public education and engagement on hate crimes and hate incidents, a recurring refrain is, "Be sure to report." Of course, there are understandable reasons to encourage the reporting of hate crimes and incidents. First, doing so is intended to ensure people receive the support they need. Second, reporting hate crimes and incidents theoretically increases the chances that justice is served. Third, reporting these occurrences can help ensure that these problems are understood so that they can be addressed. However, the underreporting of hate crimes and incidents (Erentzen & Schuller, 2020) makes it difficult to address these occurrences effectively. Further, several scholars have critiqued the Canadian legal system for

being ill-prepared to consistently ensure justice or safety for survivors of hate crimes and incidents (Ashley, 2018; Bryan & Trickett, 2021; Corb, 2015). Our study documents what community members have likely understood for a long time - namely, that reporting a hate crime or incident does not result in reliable responses from organizations meant to help survivors.

Hate crimes are a crime type that causes significant harm to individuals and communities (Chaudhry et al., 2022; The Government of Wales, 2020; Iganski & Lagou, 2015; The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2020; Perry & Alvi, 2011). There was a 72% increase in reporting of hate crimes and incidents in Canada from 2019 to 2021 (Moreau, 2022). Both observations justify an argument for effective prevention of and intervention in hate crimes and incidents. However, our study provides compelling evidence that survivors experience inconsistent service delivery from organizations that receive reports of hate crimes and incidents. Some responses were helpful and met survivors' needs. However, inconsistencies and ineffective responses can cause significant harm. These insights prompt a call for an urgent, thorough, and informed collective response. Survivors make it clear that they and their communities need to be able to trust in the services they will receive when they report traumatic events. They need assurance that services will meet their needs and will not further traumatize them.

We sincerely hope that this study is one step among the many needed to ensure that survivors of hate crimes and incidents receive consistent, high-quality, empathetic, and evidence-based practices that meet their needs when they choose to report a hate crime or incident.

References

Ashley, F. (2018). Don't be so hateful: The insufficiency of anti-discrimination and hate crime laws in improving trans well-being. *The University of Toronto Law Journal, 68*(1), 1–36. **https://www.jstor.org/stable/90019657**

Angeles, L. & Roberton, J. (2020). Empathy and inclusive public safety in the city: Examining LGBTQ2+ voices and experiences of intersectional discrimination. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 78, 1-12. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2019.102313**

Bilotta, N. (2020). Anti-oppressive social work research: Prioritising refugee voices in Kakuma Refugee Camp. *Ethics and Social Welfare, 14*(4), 397-414. **https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2020.1822425**

Bryan, T., & Trickett, L. (2021). "It's not Really Hate Crime" – Reframing Hate Crime as not Police Business" – Police Narratives of Resistance and Denial. *Journal of Hate Studies, 17*(1), 74–84. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.206**

Camp, S. (2022). *Hate crime trauma informed care: A transdisciplinary approach*. [Unpublished Master's paper]. Royal Roads University.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. (1981). *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Government of Canada. **https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/pch/documents/services/download-order-charter-bill/canadian-charter-rights-freedoms-eng.pdf**

Canadian Race Relations Foundation. (2022). *Reimagining a path to support all Canadians: A review of services for victims of hate in Canada*. Canadian Race Relations Foundation. **https://www.crrf-fcrr.ca/images/CRRF_-_A_review_of_services_for_victims_of_hate_in_Canada__Full_report.pdf**

Chaudhry, I. (2021). Making hate visible: Online hate incident reporting tools. *Journal of Hate Studies*, *17*(1), 64–73. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.188**

Chaudhry, I., Turlock, L., Tyler, J., Pandher, G., & Johal, S. (2022). *Supporting victims of hate crimes and incidents: A community centered approach*. StopHateAB. **https://stophateab.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/31328.pdf**

Chakraborti, N., Garland, J., & Hardy, S. (2014). The Leicester hate crime project: Findings and conclusions. Leicester, UK: University of Leicester. **https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/fc-full-report**

Chakraborti, N. (2015). Framing the boundaries of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Corb, A. (2015). Hate and hate crime in Canada. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Criminal Code, RSC, C-46 (1985). Retrieved from **http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/index.html**

Erentzen, C., & Schuller, R. (2020). Exploring the dark figure of hate: Experiences with police bias and the under-reporting of hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 62*(2), 64-97. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2019-0035**

Facing Facts. (2012). *Facing facts! Hate crime monitoring guidelines*. Facing Facts. **https://www.facingfacts.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/02/Guidelines-for-monitoring-of-hate-crimes-and-hate-motivated-incidents-PROTECTED.pdf**

Government of Wales. (2020). *Victim support hate crime toolkit.* Government of Wales. **https://hwb.gov.wales/api/storage/a7fcb16a-7d4f-4450-be77-6885d3d943e7/Victim%20Support%20Hate%20Crime%20Toolkit.pdf**

Healy, SJ. (2020). 'It spreads like a creeping disease': Experiences of victims of disability hate crimes in austerity Britain. *Disability & Society, 35*(2), 176-200. **https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1624151**

Iganski, P., & Lagou, S. (2015). The personal injuries of 'hate crime'. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 34-46). Routledge.

Janzen, R., & Ochocka, J. (2020). Assessing excellence in community-based research: Lessons from research with Syrian refugee newcomers. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 13*(1), 1-20. **https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v13i1.7037**

Levenson, J. (2018). Trauma-informed social work practice. *Social Work, 62*(2), 105–113, **https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx001**

Mayan, M. J. (2009). *Essentials of qualitative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

McCaslin, W. D. (2014). *Hate-motivated offences and Aboriginal Peoples: Sentencing provisions of Section 718.2(a)(i) of the Criminal Code of Canada* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Saskatchewan. **https://harvest.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/ETD-2014-06-1647/MCCASLIN-THESIS.pdf?sequence=4**

McCoy, J., Jones, D., & Hastings, Z. (2019). *Building awareness, seeking solutions: Extremism & hate motivated violence in Alberta*. The Organization for the Prevention of Violence.

https://preventviolence.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/June2019OPVPublicReport.pdf

Mercier-Dalphond, G., & Helly, D. (2021). Anti-Muslim violence, hate crime, and victimization in Canada: A study of five Canadian cities. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 53*(1), 1-22. **https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2021.0000**

Moreau, G. (2022, August 3). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2021*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00013-eng.htm**

The Office of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. (2020). *Understanding the needs of hate crime victims*. The Office of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. **https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/0/5/463011.pdf**

OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. (2021). *Model guidance on sensitive and respectful treatment of hate crime victims in the criminal justice system.* OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. **https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/8/f/499513.pdf**

Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes* (1st. ed.). Routledge.

Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2011). 'We are all vulnerable': The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 57–71. **https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758011422475**

Perry, B. (2015). Exploring the community impacts of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 47-58). Routledge.

Perry, B. & Samuels-Wortley, K. (2021). “We’re not where we should be”: Enhancing law enforcement responses to hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 63*(2), 68-98. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2020-0057**

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. **https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/indigenous-people/aboriginal-peoples-documents/calls_to_action_english2.pdf**

Walfield, S., Socia, K., & Powers, R. (2017). Religious motivated hate crimes: Reporting to law enforcement and case outcomes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*, 148-169. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-016-9349-3**

References: Complete Thesis

Ahmad, S. (2019). Islamophobic violence as a form of gender-based violence: a qualitative study with Muslim women in Canada. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence, 3*(1), 45-66. **https://doi.org/10.1332/239868019X15492770695379**

Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. (n.d.). *About*. Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. **https://sites.google.com/albertahatecrimes.org/ahcc**

Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. (2009). *Alberta hate/bias crime report*. Alberta Hate Crime Committee. **https://cfrac.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Alberta-Hate-Bias-Crime-Report-2.pdf**

Angeles, L. & Roberton, J. (2020). Empathy and inclusive public safety in the city: Examining LGBTQ2+ voices and experiences of intersectional discrimination. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 78, 1-12. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2019.102313**

Archway Community Services. (2019, August). *Abbotsford community protocol: A response to critical incidents of discrimination and hate crime*. Archway Community Services. **https://archway.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Community-Protocol-2019-updated.pdf**

Ashley, F. (2018). Don't be so hateful: The insufficiency of anti-discrimination and hate crime laws in improving trans well-being. *The University of Toronto Law Journal, 68*(1), 1–36. **https://www.jstor.org/stable/90019657**

Bell, J., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay, and bisexual hate crime. *Journal of Homosexuality, 62*(1), 98-120. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957133**

Bell, J., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay, and bisexual hate crime. *Journal of Homosexuality, 62*(1), 98-120. **https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957133**

Bilotta, N. (2020). Anti-oppressive social work research: Prioritising refugee voices in Kakuma Refugee Camp. *Ethics and Social Welfare, 14*(4), 397-414. **https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2020.1822425**

Bourke, A. (2013). Universities, civil society and the global agenda of community-engaged research. *Globalization, Societies and Education, 11*(4), 498- 519. http://unescochair-cbrsr.org/unesco/pdf/article.pdf

Braat, T. (2019, February 12). *Edmonton man shines light on Alberta's racist past with interactive archive.* Global News. **https://globalnews.ca/news/4949847/black-history-month-alberta-racism-history-twitter/**

Bryan, T., & Trickett, L. (2021). "It's not Really Hate Crime" – Reframing Hate Crime as not Police Business" – Police Narratives of Resistance and Denial. *Journal of Hate Studies, 17*(1), 74–84. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.206**

Burch, L. (2022). 'We shouldn't be told to shut up, we should be told we can speak out': Reflections on using arts-based methods to research disability hate crime. *Qualitative Social Work, 21*(2), 393-412. **https://doi.org/10.1177/14733250211002888**

Camp, S. (2022). *Hate crime trauma informed care: A transdisciplinary approach*. [Unpublished Master's paper]. Royal Roads University.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. (1981). *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Government of Canada.

https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/pch/documents/services/download-order-charter-bill/canadian-charter-rights-freedoms-eng.pdf

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2018, December). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. Government of Canada. https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2018, December). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. Government of Canada. https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html

Canadian Public Health Association. (n.d.). *What are social determinants of health?* Canadian Public Health Association. https://www.cpha.ca/what-are-social-determinants-health

Canadian Race Relations Foundation. (2022). *Reimagining a path to support all Canadians: A review of services for victims of hate in Canada*. Canadian Race Relations Foundation. https://www.crrf-fcrr.ca/images/CRRF_-_A_review_of_services_for_victims_of_hate_in_Canada__Full_report.pdf

Camp, S. (2021). *Incorporating a standalone hate crime section into the Criminal Code of Canada*. Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. https://sites.google.com/albertahatecrimes.org/ahcc/projects?authuser=0

Camp, S. (2022). *Hate crime trauma informed care: A transdisciplinary approach*. [Unpublished Master's paper]. Royal Roads University.

Cargo, M., & Mercer, S. L. (2008). The value and challenges of participatory research: strengthening its practice. *Annual review of public health, 29*, 325–350. **https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.29.09**

Castleden, H., Morgan, V. S., & Lamb, C. (2012). "I spent the first year drinking tea": Exploring Canadian university researchers' perspectives on community-based participatory research involving Indigenous peoples. *The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien, 56*(2), 160-179. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.2012.00432.x

Chakraborti, N. (2015). Framing the boundaries of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Chakraborti, N., Garland, J., & Hardy, S. (2014). The Leicester hate crime project: Findings and conclusions. Leicester, UK: University of Leicester. **https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/fc-full-report**

Chaudhry, I. (2021). Making hate visible: Online hate incident reporting tools. *Journal of Hate Studies*, *17*(1), 64–73. **http://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.188**

Chaudhry, I., Turlock, L., Tyler, J., Pandher, G., & Johal, S. (2022). *Supporting victims of hate crimes and incidents: A community centered approach*. StopHateAB. **https://stophateab.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/31328.pdf**

Coalitions Creating Equity. (2020, June). *CCE response model to hate incidents in Alberta*. Coalitions Creating Equity. **http://coalitionscreatingequity.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Hate-Incident-BookJuly2020_LO.pdf**

Coalitions Creating Equity. (n.d.). *About*. Coalitions Creating Equity. **http://coalitionscreatingequity.ca/about/**

Corb, A. (2015). Hate and hate crime in Canada. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 13-23). Routledge.

Cournoyer, D. (2016, July 21). *Anti-abortion activists stage an "invalid takeover" of Alberta's Social Credit Party*. daveberta.ca. **https://daveberta.ca/2016/07/anti-abortion-social-credit-party/**

Criminal Code, RSC, C-46 (1985). Retrieved from **http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/index.html**

Cullen, P., Dawson, M., Price, J., & Rowlands, J. (2021). Intersectionality and invisible victims: Reflections on data challenges and vicarious trauma in femicide, family and intimate partner homicide research. *Journal of Family Violence, 36*, 619-628. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-020-00243-4**

Dauvergne, M., & Brennan, S. (2011). *Police-reported hate crime in Canada, 2009*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2011001/article/11469-eng.htm**

Erentzen, C., & Schuller, R. (2020). Exploring the dark figure of hate: Experiences with police bias and the under-reporting of hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 62*(2), 64-97. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2019-0035**

Facing Facts. (2012). *Facing facts! Hate crime monitoring guidelines*. Facing Facts. **https://www.facingfacts.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/02/Guidelines-for-monitoring-of-hate-crimes-and-hate-motivated-incidents-PROTECTED.pdf**

Fitch-Bartlett, H.C., & Healy, J. (2022). Evaluating hate crime third party reporting services: perspectives from voluntary advisors. *Safer Communities, 21*(3), 215-225. **https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-04-2021-0012**

Gauthier, J., Medina, K., & Dierkhising, C. (2021). Analysis of hate crimes in transgender communities. *Journal of Hate Studies, 17(*2), 4–14. **https://doi.org/10.33972/jhs.158**

Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews and focus groups. *British Dental Journal, 204*(6), 291-295. **https://www-nature-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/articles/bdj.2008.192**

Government of Alberta. (2022). *Residential school research and recognition*. Government of Alberta. **https://www.alberta.ca/residential-school-research-and-recognition.aspx#:~:text=In%20Alberta%2C%20the%20Indian%20Residential,research%2C%20recognition%20and%20location%20support**

Government of Wales. (2020). *Victim support hate crime toolkit.* Government of Wales. **https://hwb.gov.wales/api/storage/a7fcb16a-7d4f-4450-be77-6885d3d943e7/Victim%20Support%20Hate%20Crime%20Toolkit.pdf**

Hacker, K. (2013). *Community based participatory research*. Sage Publications.

Hardy SJ., & Chakraborti, N. (2020). *Blood, threats and fears: The hidden worlds of hate crime victims*. Palgrave Hate Studies. Palgrave Pivot, Cham. **https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31997-7_3**

Healy, SJ. (2020). 'It spreads like a creeping disease': Experiences of victims of disability hate crimes in austerity Britain. *Disability & Society, 35*(2), 176-200. **https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1624151**

Hook, J.N., Davis, D.E., Owen, J., Worthington, E.L., & Utsey, S,O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 60*(3), 353-366. **https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032595**

Iganski, P., & Lagou, S. (2015). The personal injuries of 'hate crime'. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 34-46). Routledge.

Janzen, R., & Ochocka, J. (2020). Assessing excellence in community-based research: Lessons from research with Syrian refugee newcomers. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 13*(1), 1-20. **https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v13i1.7037**

Jull, J., Giles, A., & Graham, I. D. (2017). Community-based participatory research and integrated knowledge translation: Advancing the co-creation of knowledge. *Implementation Science, 12*(150), 1-9. **https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0696-3**

Kochar, H., McCoy, J., & Jones, D. (2019, August). *Responding to hate*. Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/publication/responding-to-hate/**

Krieger, N. (2017, August 24). *Nancy Krieger: Are hate crimes a public health issue?* The BMJ Opinion. **https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2017/08/24/nancy-krieger-are-hate-crimes-a-public-health-issue/**

Lead Fund. (2019, February). *Toolkit on campus hate and bias strategies to create more inclusive campuses*. American Association for Access Equity and Diversity. **https://www.aaaed.org/images/aaaed/LEAD_Fund/LEAD-FUND-Toolkit.pdf**

Levenson, J. (2018). Trauma-informed social work practice. *Social Work, 62*(2), 105–113, **https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx001**

Lund, D. (2006). Social justice activism in the heartland of hate: countering extremism in Alberta. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 52*(2), 181-194. **https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/ajer/article/view/55133/42185**

Mason-Bish, H. (2015). Beyond the silo: Rethinking hate crime and intersectionality. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 24-33). Routledge.

Mayan, M. J. (2009). *Essentials of qualitative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

McCaslin, W. D. (2014). *Hate-motivated offences and Aboriginal Peoples: Sentencing provisions of Section 718.2(a)(i) of the Criminal Code of Canada* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Saskatchewan. **https://harvest.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/ETD-2014-06-1647/MCCASLIN-THESIS.pdf?sequence=4**

McCoy, J., Jones, D., & Hastings, Z. (2019). *Building awareness, seeking solutions: Extremism & hate motivated violence in Alberta*. The Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/June2019OPVPublicReport.pdf**

Mercier-Dalphond, G., & Helly, D. (2021). Anti-Muslim violence, hate crime, and victimization in Canada: A study of five Canadian cities. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 53*(1), 1-22. **https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2021.0000**

Michelin, L. (2022, September 22). *Alberta government funds $250,000 study into hate crimes and how to prevent them*. Red Deer Advocate. **https://www.reddeeradvocate.com/news/alberta-government-funds-250000-study-into-hate-crimes-and-how-to-prevent-them/**

Moreau, G. (2021, March 29). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2019*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00002-eng.htm**

Moreau, G. (2022, August 3). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2021*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00013-eng.htm**

Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Qualitative Health Research, 10*(1), 3-5. **https://doi.org/10.1177/104973200129118183**

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2), 1-19. Retrieved from: **https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/ijqm/index.php/IJQM/issu e/view/384**

Nencel, L. (2014). Situating reflexivity: Voices, positionalities and representations in feminist ethnographic texts. *Women's Studies International Forum, 43*, 75-83. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2013.07.018**

OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. (2021). *Model guidance on sensitive and respectful treatment of hate crime victims in the criminal justice system.* OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. **https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/8/f/499513.pdf**

Perry, B. & Samuels-Wortley, K. (2021). "We're not where we should be": Enhancing law enforcement responses to hate crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 63*(2), 68-98. **https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2020-0057**

Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes* (1st. ed.). Routledge.

Perry, B. (2015). Exploring the community impacts of hate crime. In Hall, N., Corb, A., Giannasi, P., & Grieve, J. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 47-58). Routledge.

Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2011). 'We are all vulnerable': The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 57–71. **https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758011422475**

Provost-Yombo, K., Louden, C., & McDonald, S. (2020). *Hate as an aggravating factor at sentencing - A review of the case law from 2008 – 2020*. Department of Justice Canada. **https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2021/jus/J4-101-2020-eng.pdf**

Red Deer Advocate. (2022, May 27). *New community liaisons take on hate crime in Alberta*. Red Deer Advocate. **https://www.reddeeradvocate.com/news/new-community-liaisons-take-on-hate-crime-in-alberta/**

Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2013). *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative methods.* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Shultz, J., Zakrison, T., & Galea, S. (2019). *Hate and the health of populations*. The Milbank Quarterly. **https://www.milbank.org/quarterly/articles/hate-and-the-health-of-populations/**

Smith, K.E., & Stewart, E.A. (2017). Academic advocacy in public health: Disciplinary 'duty' or political 'propaganda'? *Social Science & Medicine, 189*, 35-43, **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.07.014**

St-Amant, M., Jones, D., King, M., & McCoy, J. (2022). *Hate, extremism, and terrorism in Alberta, Canada, and beyond: The shift from 2019 to 2022*. The Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Hate-Extremism-and-Terrorism-in-Alberta-Canada-and-Beyond.pdf**

Statistics Canada. (2021, July 27). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2020*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved August 13, 2021 from **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00013-eng.htm**

Statistics Canada. (2022, March 17). *Police-reported hate crime, 2020*. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220317/dq220317a-eng.htm**

StopHateAB.ca. (2021). *StopHateAB.ca report*. Alberta Hate Crimes Committee. **https://sites.google.com/albertahatecrimes.org/ahcc/stophateab-ca-december-2021-update?authuser=0**

The Office of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. (2020). *Understanding the needs of hate crime victims*. The Office of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. **https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/0/5/463011.pdf**

The Organization for the Prevention of Violence. (n.d.). *About the OPV*. The Organization for the Prevention of Violence. **https://preventviolence.ca/about-the-opv/**

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. **https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/indigenous-people/aboriginal-peoples-documents/calls_to_action_english2.pdf**

Van Deventer Iverson, S., & Hauver James, J. (2014). Feminism and community engagement: An overview. In S. Van Deventer Iverson & J. Hauver James (Eds.), *Feminist Community Engagement Achieving Praxis* (pp. 9-27). Palgrave MacMillian. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137441102

Walfield, S., Socia, K., & Powers, R. (2017). Religious motivated hate crimes: Reporting to law enforcement and case outcomes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*, 148-169. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-016-9349-3**

Wang, J., & Moreau, G. (2022, March 17). Police-reported hate crime in Canada, 2020. Statistics Canada. **https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2022001/article/00005-eng.htm**

Wilson, M.G., Lavis, J. N., Travers, R., & Rourke, S. B. (2010). Community-based knowledge transfer and exchange: Helping community-based organizations link research to action. *Implementation Science, 5*(33), 33-46. **https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-33**

Appendix A

Social Media Recruitment Graphic

Appendix B

Key Informant Information Letter and Consent Form

Study title: Understanding organizational responses in Edmonton to reports of hate crimes and/or incidents from the perspective of those reporting

Researcher Name and Affiliation:
Landon Turlock, MA Student
Department of Public Health,
University of Alberta
Phone:
Email: lturlock@ualberta.ca

Research Supervisor:
Dr. Maria Mayan, Professor,
School of Public Health
University of Alberta
Email: mmayan@ualberta.ca

Background and Purpose of the Study

Thank you for speaking with me today. I am conducting research about how people in Edmonton who have been targeted by hate crimes and incidents feel about their experience reporting hate crimes and/or incidents to an organization, and the organization's response. My hope is that the information gathered from interviewing you and other people who have reported hate crimes and/or incidents can be used to inform the ways that organizations respond to reports of hate in Edmonton.

Study Procedures

Would you be willing to be interviewed about your experience reporting hate crimes and/or incidents to an Edmonton organization? To understand your experience reporting hate crimes and/or incidents to an organization, I would like to ask you some questions. They should take about an hour to answer, but we can take as much or as little time as you would like. As you answer the questions, you can tell me as much as you would like about the topic and mention anything else you would like me to know. I might ask you some additional questions in case there is something I do not understand. Please do not feel rushed; we can take as much time as you would like. If there are some questions you would prefer not to answer, please let me know, and we can skip them. We can also schedule follow-up interviews if you need to take breaks or want to clarify what you said later.

Would you allow me to record our conversation? Recording this interview will help me to make sure I accurately capture what you tell me. If you would rather I not record the conversation, would it be alright if I take notes?

If you would like to see the oral consent form that I have read to you asking for your consent in the study, for any reason, and at any time, I will show it to you and provide you with a copy.

Do you have any interest in being invited to review the materials that result from this study? If so, what is the best way for me to send you more information?_____

Do you have any interest in being invited to share about your experiences and insights in presentations or webinars? If so, what is the best way for me to send you this information?_____

Benefits
You may appreciate knowing that sharing your experiences may help improve future organizational responses to reports of hate crimes and/or incidents in Edmonton or other places.

Risks
It may be stressful to talk about your experiences of reporting hate crimes and/or incidents. If you feel upset at any point, please let me know, and we can stop or pause the interview. In addition, I have prepared a list of resources that should be able to support you if needed. You are also welcome to have a support person with you during this conversation.

In-person interviews during the COVID-19 may expose you to risk of COVID-19. I am fully vaccinated, will wear a mask during the interview, and will stay 2 meters away in compliance with social distancing requirements. I would also ask you to wear a mask during the interview.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this interview today is completely voluntary. You can stop the interview at any time. You also do not have to discuss anything that you do not want to. We can skip any questions you would like. If any questions arise for me while the interview progresses, you are more than welcome to ask them. If you decide you do not want your answers to be used after the interview, you can let me know anytime within the next 14 days.

You will receive a $50 gift certificate to compensate you for your expertise, insights, and time spent with me today. You will receive the gift certificate even if you choose not to answer every question.

Confidentiality
- The information that you share with me today will be kept strictly confidential. While I may use some short quotes throughout the final research paper, your answers will be used in combination with others, so no one will know that it was you who shared information with me. No one but me, the researcher, will have access to this information.
- This research will be used for my Master's thesis project and possible future research publications, conference presentations, and teaching.
- I will not record your name for any of the data or reports that result from this project. Instead of doing that, I will use a code name to link you to your data and keep your information confidential. That is one of the things I will do to make sure no one from outside of the study will know who you are.
- I will not share your information with anyone else.
- As mentioned before, I will ask you if I can record your interview. However, I will not ask you to say your name on the recording to protect your confidentiality further.
- Voice recordings are not anonymous, but I will do everything that I mentioned to de-identify the recordings as much as possible. Like I said before, I will be the only person who listens to the recordings.

- I will store the information from this study for a minimum of five years in a safe location using encrypted software.

Further Information

If you have more questions about this study, you can reach out to my supervisor or me. The plan for this study has been reviewed by a Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant or how the research is being conducted you may contact the Research Ethics Office at 780-492-2615 or reoffice@ualberta.ca.

Consent Statement

I would like to make sure that we talked about the research process and keep track of your agreement to participate. I will ask you some quick 'yes' or 'no' questions, circle them, and then sign my name to prove that I asked the questions. I will not write down your name or ask you to sign anything, but you can keep a copy of this Information Letter and Consent Form.

1. Is it clear that you have been asked to be interviewed for a research study?	Yes	No
2. Do you understand the potential benefits and risks involved in participating in an interview for this research study?	Yes	No
3. Have you been able to ask questions and discuss this research study with the researcher?	Yes	No
4. Is it clear that you are free to refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time, without consequence, and that your information will be withdrawn at your request?	Yes	No
5. Is the issue of confidentiality, and who has access to your information clear to you?	Yes	No
6. Do you agree to participate as an interviewee for this study?	Yes	No
7. Do you agree to have our interview recorded?	Yes	No

I, Landon Turlock, have read this form to the participant, offered opportunities to ask questions, and answered all questions that arose.

Signed:_____ Date: _____

Appendix C

Resource List

Discussing your experiences of hate may be difficult. If you feel distressed, you can call the Canadian Mental Health Association 24/7 Distress Line (CMHA) at 780-482-4357. In addition, the following resources are available in Edmonton to support you if you have experienced hate or discrimination and wish to seek additional support or report experiences of hate:

- **Act2EndRacism Network** - The ACT2endracism network is a national coalition working to address COVID-19 related racism and provide support to targets of racism. Their online and text message reporting is available now in English, Traditional/Simplified Chinese, French, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Tagalog.
    - Text "hi" to 1-587-507-3838
- **Alberta Human Rights Commission** - People can lodge human rights complaints that can be addressed through resolutions, tribunals, court hearings, and settlement.
    - Phone: 780-427-7661.
- **B'nai Brith Canada** - People who have observed or experienced antisemitism, racism, or discrimination can report their experience and receive personalized support or advocacy.
    - Reports can be made online at https://www.bnaibrith.ca/report-an-incident/
    - Phone: 1-844-218-2624
    - Email: reportanincident@bnaibrith.ca
- **Edmonton Police Service** - The Hate Crimes and Violent Extremism Unit will investigate hate crimes and incidents while conducting follow-up. The Crime and Trauma-Informed Support Services Unit offers client-led, trauma-informed support and navigation through the criminal justice system.
    - Emergency Line: 911
    - Non-Emergency Line: 780-423-4567
- **Organization for the Prevention of Violence** – Their intervention team provides free, voluntary, and confidential services to individuals and families affected by hate.
    - Phone: 1-780-782-8070
    - Email: refer@preventviolence.ca
- **RARICANow** – This organization provides counseling and advocacy support to LGBTQ2S+ newcomers and refugees.
    - Phone: 1-587-778-6178
- **Stride Advocacy** - Stride Advocacy provides direct support to community members seeking a remedy to human rights violations and concerns. Advocates support by helping write letters, filling out complaints, quietly witnessing meetings/events/court proceedings, and supporting with research.
    - Email: stride@jhcentre.org
- **National Council of Canadian Muslims** - People who have observed or experienced Islamophobia or other forms of harassment can report their experience and receive personalized support or advocacy.
    - Reports can be at: https://www.nccm.ca/programs/incident-report-form/

Appendix D

Interview Guide

1) How did you become aware of the organization you reported to?
2) What led you to report to that organization?
3) What were your hopes from the organization when you reported your experience of a hate crime or hate incident?
4) How would you define a hate crime or hate incident?
5) Can you briefly describe the hate crime or hate incident you reported or attempted to report? Please keep in mind that you do not need to provide any information you do not want to.
6) Please tell me about your experience reporting a hate crime or hate incident to an organization and what organization you reported to.
7) What, if any, was the response from the organization after you reported your experience of a hate crime or hate incident (i.e., the investigation, connecting to Victim's Services, involvement with the court or lawyers, social service provision)?
8) What were your feelings throughout reporting a hate crime or hate incident to the organization?
9) What do you think organizations could learn from your experience of reporting a hate crime or hate incident to them?
10) What would be your ideal response from an organization you report a hate crime or hate incident to?
11) Thank you for your time. Do you have anything you'd like to add on this topic that we may have missed throughout the interview?