Designing hate crime reporting devices: an exploration of young LGBT+ people's report needs

PICKLES, James

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

https://shura.shu.ac.uk/25308/

Citation:

Copyright and re-use policy

Title: Designing hate crime reporting devices: an exploration of young LGBT+ people's report needs

Abstract

This paper reports on an exploratory study, which gathered LGBT+ young people's (aged 15-22) experiences and perceptions of hate crime. Two design-led workshops were conducted in the North East of England, with the aim of identifying the reporting needs of LGBT+ young people. Participants in the first workshop were asked what types of 'hate' scenarios they would report to the police. Participants in the second workshop were asked to design hate crime reporting devices. Young people were ambivalent about reporting their experiences to the police as their victimization was intimately tied to people they were connected with (parents, school peers, acquaintances). They highlighted a variety of response needs when reporting victimization. This article argues that acts of bullying and acts of anti-LGBT+ hate crime are symmetrical in their tangibility. LGBT+ youth victimization is currently framed, within scholarly discourse, as a bullying issue involving peer victimization. However, the criminological discourse on LGBT+ adult victimization is framed as hate crime. The data provided bridges this gap by conceptualizing youth victimization as a form of hate crime, an important contribution in recognizing the report needs of young LGBT+ people.

Key words: *bullying, hate crime. LGBT youth, sexuality, victimization, violence, youth work*

Introduction

Within criminological discourse, 'hate', and more specifically hate crime, is conceptualized in terms of its impact (the harms associated), tangibility (what it constitutes), and legislative application (who is protected under hate crime legislation). The latter is under continuous dispute within scholarly discourse with many advocating for an inclusive hate crime framework (Chakraborti and Garland, 2009, 2015; Hall, 2013; Perry, 2003; Perry, 2009). The

law in England and Wales protects against violence "motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on race or perceived race; religion or perceived religion sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation; disability or…a person who is transgender or perceived to be transgender" (Crown Prosecution Service, 2012, p. 8). Currently, the Crime and Disorder Act of 1999, the Race Relations Acts of 1965 and 1976 - amended in 2006 to offer protections against the incitement of religious hatred - and Section 146 of the Criminal Justice Act (2003), affords enhanced legal protections against violence towards the above protected strands. The law also prohibits incitement or the stirring up of violence against these protected groups. Examples of incitement outlined by the Metropolitan Police (2019, n.p.) include: "messages calling for violence against a specific person or group; web pages that show pictures, videos or descriptions of violence against anyone due to their perceived differences; chat forums where people ask other people to commit hate crimes against a specific person or group."

Recently, the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 created offences against the incitement of hatred towards sexual orientation, under a similar threshold as the Racial and Religious Hatred Act. This article looks specifically at hate towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people (anti-LGBT+ hate). Attempts have been made to include homeless people (Chakraborti and Garland, 2015; Garland, 2012), members of marginalized subcultures such as goths (Garland, 2010), and sex workers (Campbell, 2014) within hate crime frameworks. Very few have noted the intersection between age and these protected groups however, with the current focus - legislative and scholarly - drawn on adult-centric terms.

This article draws on data produced from two focus group 'workshops' conducted with LGBT+ young people[1] (aged 15-22) and criminal justice professionals in the North East of England. The project focused on young people's perceptions and experiences of anti-LGBT+

---

[1] LGBT+ is the acronym adopted throughout this article, as an umbrella term for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and other sexualities and genders that are not straight

hate crime in order to a) bridge the fissures in understanding hate crime from the perspectives of young people, b) provide a socio-criminological understanding of how protective legal frameworks accommodate young people, and c) facilitate a dialogue between criminal justice workers and young people. The purpose of this paper is to examine the reporting needs of young LGBT+ people from a criminological perspective. Workshop 1 explored participants' (n=10) perceptions and understandings of hate crime, focusing on what types of 'hate' they would report to criminal justice agencies. Workshop 2 followed up on the initial findings gathered, with the researchers asking participants (n=8) to 'design' hate crime reporting devices. The project was exploratory given such research paucity, employing an innovative design-led methodological approach. Thus, its scope is limited to LGBT+ youth and community services in the North East of England. However, the findings are beneficial to youth and community workers and criminologists interested in the study of victimization of young people, who may work in tandem with police forces and social work services to consider the safeguarding needs of the young people in their care. This article presents a unique critique of scholarly hate crime frameworks by arguing that their adult-centric scope does not consider the victimization of young people. Further, the methodological approach taken by the researchers offers significant originality within the study of youth victimization. This project is therefore novel in its suggestion to viewing the victimization of young LGBT+ people as a hate crime.

Victimization towards the gender identities and sexualities of young people is often framed as peer victimization, contained within the school setting (Aragon, Poteat, Espelage, and Koenig, 2014; Hatchel, Gabriel, and Espelage, 2018; Russell, Ryan, Toomey, Diaz, and Sanchez, 2011; Toomey, McGuire, and Russell, 2012; Ybarra, Mitchell, Palmer, and Reisner, 2015). The victimization of LGBT+ youth, in this context, is disregarded as meeting the criminal threshold in England and Wales, despite age between the only distinctive variable.

Following an overview of contemporary hate crime scholarship and LGBT+ youth literature, this article proceeds by justifying the definitions and acronyms adopted. The methodological approach underpinning this paper is then outlined, highlighting the creative ways that young people were engaged with throughout this project. I present two significant findings from each workshop in order to examine the reporting and response needs of young LGBT+ people.

Literature

Research exploring the victimization, perpetration, and impact of hate crime - specifically anti-LGBT+ hate crime - has solely focused on adults. I therefore proceed to examine current hate crime literature before moving on to outline the victimization of LGBT+ young people, in order to bridge this fissure.

Hate and Hate Crime

Colloquially known as the 'five strands' of hate crime (Duggan and Heap, 2014), race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, and transgender identity are protected from violence aggravated by hostility. Section 146 of the Criminal Justice Act (2003) empowers courts to give extended or enhanced sentences to criminal acts that are motivated by hostility towards transgender identity and sexual orientation. Operationally, 'hate' is bifurcated into two strands by police agencies - hate *crimes* and hate *incidents* - for recording and reporting purposes. Hate *crimes* are activities that meet a criminal threshold in law, such as violence against the person, harassment, public order offences etc. Hate *incidents* are activities that do not meet the criminal threshold but are aggravated by hostility towards one of the five strands

(Clayton, Donovan, and Macdonald, 2016). For example, some public order offences are only criminal if they occur in public and not within a dwelling. Most polices forces in England and Wales monitor hate incidents as The College of Policing (2014) recognise that, for example in the case of public order offences, "a victim is likely to suffer the same harm by the incident, regardless of the location" (p. 60).

There are 43 regional police forces within England and Wales, all of which, despite having differential models and operational practices, follow the College of Police 2014 Hate Crime Operational Guidance. Chakraborti & Garland (2015, p. 122) caution that criminologists have historically "unwittitngly conveyed the midleading assumption that police practice is informed by a culture that is singular, monolithic and unchanging." It is now commonly understood that there are culutral variations between police forces who respond to crime differentially. For example, in terms of hate crimes, Merseyside Police force treat violence against sex workers as a hate crime whilst Nottinghamshire Police recognise misogyny as a hate crime; whereas most other forces do not. It is beyond the scope of this article to detail every force's regional practice. However, research on policing in the North East of England confirms that there are dedicated LGB&T liaison police officers who specialize in anti-LGBT+ crimes and try to liaise, regularly, with voluntary sector LGBT+ community and youth groups (Pickles, 2019). The police response to hate crime is of course contextual and varies from country to country.

Despite its phraseology, acts of 'hate' are not necessarily motivated by hatred. Hate crimes are traditionally conceptualized as crimes of power between perpetrators - who usually but not always belong to a majority identity group - and victims, who usually but not always belong to a minority identity group (Hall, 2013). Chakraborti and Garland (2015) posit that hate crimes are "an extension of the types of prejudice, marginalization and oppression experienced by minority groups within the structure of everyday life" (p. 4). Hate

crime is therefore part of a wider fabric of labelling, othering, and subordinating an oppressed group within society. For instance, certain crimes towards gay men may not be motivated by hatred *per se*, but by a bias that they are inherently weaker or inferior to straight men. This article specifically focuses on and refers to anti-LGBT+ 'hate' as an umbrella term for all acts motivated by hate, prejudice, and bias.

There is wide acknowledgement that both hate *crimes* and hate *incidents* against LGBT+ people occur in a variety of intimate and public settings. Consequently, they are often viewed as 'part of the package' of being LGBT+ (Chakraborti and Hardy, 2015; Moran, 2008). Further, there is evidence that hate crimes 'hurt more' emotionally than non-hate crimes, due to the implicitly personal nature of a victim's identity being targeted (for an overview see Iganski and Lagou, 2015). Victims of hate crime often experience heightened emotional stress, anxiety, elevated levels of fear, and a plethora of mental health issues (Chakraborti and Garland, 2015; Hall, 2013; Iganski, 2001; Iganski and Lagou, 2015; Mizock and Lewis, 2008; Moran, 2004, 2018; Walters and Hoyle, 2010; Walters, Wiedlitzka, Owusu-Bempah, and Goodall, 2017).

According to Stonewall's research (see Bachmann and Gooch, 2017), one in five LGBT+ people between the years 2016-17 experienced a hate crime (21%). Participants received verbal abuse, unwanted sexual contact, threats of violence, physical violence, and damage to property. Hate crime against sexual orientation is the second most recorded instance of hate crime behind racially aggravated offences (Home Office, 2018). Browne, Bakshi, and Lim (2011) find that many LGBT+ people normalize and downplay their abuse or simply do not recognize it as abuse. Indeed, most participants in their study did not report their experiences, as they did not consider it criminal; to them it was a regular part of everyday life. Browne, et al. (2011) term this a problematization of the criminality paradigm, where

6

> "if an incident is not considered 'serious' by those who experience it and is considered to be just part of the fabric of everyday life, reporting and recourse to legal intervention may be seen as not worth the effort" (p. 749).

The framing of anti-LGBT+ hate victimization towards young people parallels this problematization. Chakraborti and Hardy (2015) found that when asking LGBT+ participants if they had experienced a hate crime, the overwhelming response was no. However, when asked if they had received any homophobic or transphobic abuse, the majority identified with these experiences. Arguably, it is difficult for LGBT+ people to recognize or conceptualize their experiences of abuse as a) criminal and b) a form of hate crime. As hate crime frameworks operate on an adult-centric assumption, the victimization of young LGBT+ people goes unrecognized. Consequently, there is both an intellectual and a practical schism in understanding the victimization of young LGBT+ people.

Victimization of LGBT+ young people

There is an abundance of literature evidencing that LGBT+ young people experience levels of emotional distress on a daily basis, that are significantly higher than their straight counterparts (Almeida, Johnson, Corliss, Molnar, and Azrael, 2009). A substantial portion of this stems from peer victimization within the school setting (bullying). Cooper and Blumenfeld (2012) define bullying as

> "…a specific type of aggression in which (1) the behavior is intended to harm or disturb, (2) the behavior occurs repeatedly over time, and (3) there is an imbalance of power, with a more powerful person or group attacking a less powerful one…it involves deliberate and repeated aggressive and hostile behaviors by an individual or group of individuals intended to humiliate, harm, and/or control another individual or group of individuals of lesser power or social status" (p. 153).

7

Thus, it is an umbrella term for a variety of abusive and aggressive behaviors. Prejudiced based bullying such as anti-LGBT+ victimization often carries higher risk of emotional harm than non-prejudicial bullying (Russell, Sinclair, Poteat, and Koenig, 2012). Similar to hate crime, the direction of violence targeted towards a personal identity means that homo-bi-transphobic bullying often 'hurts' more (see Iganski, 2001; Iganski and Lagou, 2015).

Stonewall's School Report for 2017 found that 45% of lesbian, gay, and bisexual young people, and 64% of trans young people, experience bullying. 47% of reported bullying is verbal abuse, 24% ignored or isolated, 23% intimidation, 7% physical abuse, and 4% death threats (see Bradlow, Bartram, Guasp, and Jadva 2017). The acts of bullying outlined in the report are tangibly symmetrical to acts of hate. The age of criminal responsibility in England and Wales is 10. Thus, there is no legislative or legal rationale for why these acts are not perceived by policy makers, schools, youth organizations, and scholars as hate crimes. However, it is important to affirm that I am not advocating for the criminalization of young people here.

Despite seeing a 10% decrease in instances of bullying, this figure is still significantly high. Further, schools continue to be heteronormative environments as 40% of LGBT+ students surveyed are not taught anything about LGBT+ issues at school. Minton, Dahl, O'Moore, and Tuck (2008) stress the importance of heteronormative school environments in shaping the victimization of young people. They distinguish between direct forms of bullying - such as harassment and abuse specifically directed towards an individual because they are queer - and indirect bullying brought about by heteronormative environments. They argue that heteronormative (indirect) bullying is the general ignorance and normalization of heterosexuality; the "non-targeted general attitude of homophobia which may permeate any organization, including schools" (Minton, et al., 2008: 188).

According to the available evidence, the majority of LGBT+ people experience daily heteronormative micro-aggressions (Roffee and Waling, 2016) alongside verbal abuse, harassment, online abuse, damage to property, malicious communication through graffiti, threats, and physical abuse (Bradlow et al., 2017). This has a significant impact on the mental health of young LGBT people, with many experiencing shame, suicide ideation, depression, anxiety, and emotional distress (see *inter alia* Daley, Soloman, Newman, and Mishna, 2008; Grossman, et al., 2009; Kelleher, 2009; Kuper, Coleman, and Mustanski, 2014; McDermott, Roen, and Scourfield, 2008; Russell, et al., 2011). From a criminological perspective, the distinctive acts that sit under the umbrella of bullying - verbal abuse, harassment, physical abuse, malicious communications, threats etc. - are in parallel to acts that are legislatively covered as (hate) crimes. Whilst the former usually occurs within the school setting - although this has shifted slightly due to the nature of cyberbullying and cyberstalking (Cooper and Blumenfeld, 2012) - there is no demonstrable distinction between anti-LGBT+ bullying and anti-LGBT+ hate crime *per se*. Indeed, as acknowledged by Cuadrado-Gordillo (2012) there is yet to be unanimous agreement over how bullying should be defined.

Proponents of bullying typologies may advocate that bullying behavior is intimately tied to power dynamics between perpetrator and victim and - as a pattern of behavior - is a way of gaining power or exploiting power inequities over the victim rather than committing a crime. However, the hate crime literature also supports this notion, with many scholars theorizing acts of hate as tools to exploit macro and micro power inequities between victim and perpetrator (see Chakraborti and Garland, 2015; Chakraborti and Garland, 2012; Hall, 2013). Further, as already discussed, police forces in England and Wales distinguish hate into both *incidents* and *crimes*. Accordingly, adult anti-LGBT+ victimization, regardless of whether it meets the criminal threshold, is a concern to criminal justice agencies.

Formby (2015) argues there are significant limitations when framing the victimization of LGBT+ young people unilaterally as bullying. She argues that the bullying umbrella can neglect key areas of youth victimization. Bullying typologies overlook the broader school policies and practices, general negligence from teachers, and homo-bi-transphobia within the home settings. Young people have also questioned the appropriateness of bullying terminology, preferring to discuss wider social discrimination and structural oppressions in relation to their victimization (Formby, 2014). She posits that the current hegemonic framing of bullying restricts the focus of policy and practice. Victimologically, the link between anti-LGBT+ hate crime and anti-LGBT+ bullying, despite being symmetrical in tangibility, has not been fully realized.

The link between hate crime and wider social structures has been made; for example Perry (2001) argues that "hate crime is about the assertion of the offender's own identity and belongingness over and above others; in short it is about power" (p. 125). Additionally, Formby (2013) and later Marston (2015) argue that bullying discourses individualize the specific acts perpetrated, ignoring their relationship to heteronormative and homophobic social structures. Consequentially, schemes to tackle homo-bi-transphobic bullying focus on individualized punishment reactions rather than conscious raising, culture changing, whole-classroom awareness processes. The research concerning this article does not advocate for the criminalization of young people who perpetrate or take part in the victimization of LGBT+ young people. Rather, it was an exploratory project designed to bridge (adult-centric) victimological and criminological frameworks of anti-LGBT+ hate crime with LGBT+ youth victimization.

Definitions adopted

When providing data from individual participants I use the pronouns, sexuality, and pseudonym chosen by the participant. Participants chose their own pseudonyms, with several adopting drag style names or computer usernames. Participants were recruited from LGBT+ youth and community groups who catered for young people aged between 13 and 25. The sample group consists of a mixture of young adults (over 18's) and young teenagers (under 18). This article focuses heavily on the perspectives of under 18's, however the narratives of young adults - who reflect on their experiences as a young teenager - are utilized for theoretical analysis. Young adults were included in this research as the youth groups they were recruited from catered for this age range[2]. 'Young people' is therefore the phrase adopted when referring to participants from youth and community groups. Some scholars define 'young people' as anyone under 25 years of age (Toft, Franklin, and Langley, 2019). However, it is important to consider over 18's in this sample had different social lives, which largely centered on going out or working 'on the scene' (Valentine and Skelton, 2003).

LGBT+ is the acronym adopted throughout this article, as an umbrella term for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and other sexualities and genders that are not straight. I understand that identities falling outside of the 'lettered' identities under the '+' are visibly hidden and arguably excluded. However, there is no clear consensus on what is the most inclusive term of reference for non-straight people. Further, this paper does not have the scope to repeat the debate on what should be included within the acronym. It should be made clear however that no participant recruited from youth and community groups identified as a woman, girl, or lesbian. The sample is therefore heavily androcentric. However, individuals recruited from criminal justice professions all identified as women, with two identifying as lesbians. LGBT+ is therefore the preferred acronym to refer to participants collectively.

---

[2] For context, English education is organized (generally) by the following institutions and ages: primary school (typically 5-10), high school (typically 11-16), sixth form or further education (FE) college (typically 16-18), higher education (HE) university (typically 18+).

'Criminal justice professionals' will be used when referring to participants who held specialist roles within the criminal justice system.

Methods

The project recruited participants from two local youth and community groups - a gay and bisexual men's youth group and an LGBT+ youth group - from the North East of England. Criminal justice professionals were also recruited from a single police force area in the North East. These participants were recruited using a convenience sample as the principal investigator held established research links with these groups. Participants were invited to take part in two workshops designed to amplify the views on hate crimes held by LGBT+ young people. Six young people attended the first workshop, and seven attended the second, four of whom had taken part in the first. The sample was small and should therefore not be used to generalize. However, the depth of data provided in the context of such research paucity can aid in understanding LGBT+ youth perspectives of hate crime. As advocated by Layder (2013), small-scale research projects can be a valuable source of knowledge production as they allow for an in-depth analysis of information-rich 'cases'. Further, they can offer tentative hypotheses in an under researched area, which can be applied and extrapolated for future research inquiry (Hall, 2018). The workshops lasted for three hours each and incorporated a creative methodological approach, combining design methods and youth work exercises.

Within qualitative research, the narratives of individuals have traditionally been gathered through focus groups and/or interviews. A key benefit of conducting focus group style workshops is that participants "help to stimulate and develop data through their discussions with each other…not only what the group say to each other, but also how they

interact" (Bowes, 2018, p. 102). They are methodologically advantageous in exploratory research in that they allow significantly rich data to be collected over a short period; the need for extensive individual interviews is therefore not required. Increasingly, creative methods such as 'human and computer interaction' design techniques are being employed within qualitative social research (Golsteijn and Wright, 2013), in order to gain meaningful data. Friedman (2003) argues that

> "…design involves solving problems, creating something new, or transforming less desirable situations to preferred situations. To do this, designers must know how things work and why. Understanding how things work and why requires us to analyze and explain" (p. 507).

He goes on to argue that design methodology can be a useful tool to construct new theoretical knowledge by bridging the 'who, what, when, where, and why' components of knowledge creation. Engaging young people in exploratory research by using creative design methods was desired in order to contribute to such a fissure in hate crime research. The purpose of this research was to speculatively explore the reporting needs of young LGBT+ people. Further, the researchers employed youth work style exercises, in order to incorporate creative strategies that were appropriate and familiar to young participants. The design-led methodology utilized captured data which would not have been recorded using traditional approaches. The methods employed by researchers documented the imaginative process employed by young people to co-construct data. Prioritizing this allowed the research to be ontologically authentic, defined by (Heap & Waters, 2019) as a consideration of

> "whether the research participants, be that individuals or groups, gain a better understanding of the social world through taking part in the research project…with an improved 'conscious experiencing' of the world they live in" (p. 220).

The impact of the research on participants will be examined in the findings of this article.

Workshop 1

Participants (see Table 1) were provided 16 scenarios describing potentially homo-bi-transphobic behavior of varying degrees. They were asked to hang them on a washing line from *most likely to report* to *least likely to report*. The aim of this exercise was to explore young people's understandings of anti-LGBT+ hate and establish what acts they would report to the police. Given that police forces respond to both hate *crimes* and hate *incidents* we did not want to assume what type of acts participants would perceive as criminal and as non-criminal incidents. We explored what scenarios participants would hypothetically report to the police. Criminal justice professionals also took part in this exercise in order to gain their professional insights on what was appropriate and inappropriate to report to the police.

[Table 1 near here]

Workshop 2

As a follow up to the first workshop, participants (see Table 2) were provided similar scenarios at random and were asked to design, utilizing a variety of craft material, a reporting device for the victimization described. They were then asked to articulate the nature of their device, its purpose, and explain why they had made it in such a way. This approach was used so as not to limit their creative process. The researchers foresaw that many participants could limit their suggestions of a reporting device to an email service or an app. We therefore asked them to create a tangible device in order to foster an innovate design process. Following the presentation of these devices, the researchers facilitated a further design exercise, asking participants to consider what their devices would 'do' with the information they had reported. Participants presented their second devices, prompting a group discussion on how participants felt about reporting hate.

[Table 2 near here]

Analysis

Both workshops were audio-recorded and the researchers took pictures of all devices and activities that were produced by young people. Recordings were transcribed and coded thematically utilizing a grounded theory framework (see Glaser and Strauss, 1967), with transcripts being consistently compared to existing theory and literature as a mechanism for analysis. The researcher's organized themes into a coding framework in order to position, strategically, the most dominant themes - themes that were discussed the most by participants - together (Harding, 2013).

Findings

Given the project's exploratory nature, both workshops accumulated highly rich data. Analysis of the data produced numerous themes; five themes for Workshop 1 and four themes for Workshop 2. This paper makes the case for a theoretical framework to conceptualize the hate experiences of LGBT+ young people. I will present two themes from the first workshop - *difficulties in defining 'hate'* and *intimate perpetration and reporting* - to explore how young people experienced hate. I will move to discuss two themes from the second workshop - *immediate response needs* and *defense and protection* - to examine the responses young people 'designed' to combat their hate experiences. The themes in this paper are presented together as they specifically outline the reporting needs of young people.

Additional themes not disclosed in this paper are less youth focused and are more specific to police officer participants.

Workshop 1

The purpose of the first workshop was to explore both youth group and criminal justice participant's understandings of hate crime. Participants were presented with a variety of scenarios that could be deemed hateful. Scenarios were a mixture of behaviors that could be reported and recorded as both hate crimes and hate incidents. Participants were then asked to individually place them on a washing line in the order of what they were most likely to report. No hierarchy developed from this exercise as individuals positioned their scenarios relative to their personal thoughts. Table 3 indicates the placement of these scenarios.

[Table 3 near here]

Difficulties in defining 'hate'

When placing their scenarios, participants provided a range of reasons for why they would and would not report the experiences described. This prompted significant debate amongst participants about the nature of hate crime, specifically what tangible acts constitute a hate crime. There was a general ambivalence exhibited by young people to report their victimization to criminal justice agencies. It was agreed, however, that reporting hate crime could have a communal benefit by encouraging other LGBT+ people to report. For example Sapphire noted how

"I was already out but when I was in Year 11 (the final year of high school education) there was another guy who was in Year 7 (the first year of high school education) who had just come out and kept getting beaten up. He just wouldn't report it because he was too scared to. And it was just like he was getting bullied all the time. I never used to report it and because I didn't report what happened to me, he didn't have the courage to report it. So, as soon as I reported something he then felt that he could report it. And it had the ripple effect.

PC Morris: Well we are just like report everything, you know, put them all up (on the washing line) and report everything.

PC Davies: Yeah we are all neighborhood police officers so we are definitely interested in the community side of things, like stuff happening outside clubs and things. A lot of the stuff that I deal with is all of the unreported stuff."

Overwhelmingly, criminal justice professionals, specifically police participants, encouraged young people to report every scenario regardless of whether they met the crime threshold. Indeed, participants such as Alex noted after hearing the police express the importance of reporting

"it is really interesting because the things that we think aren't that important actually are really important. Like the things that we just brush off they actually are important."

Alex demonstrates two things here. Firstly, they seem to normalize their experiences of victimization and begin to realize, after receiving a positive police message, that they can challenge these instances instead of brushing them off. Secondly, Alex exemplifies the ontological and educative authenticity of the project by gaining a better understanding of the police response to LGBT+ victimization.

Similar to the Leicester Hate Crime Project (2014) and later research conducted by Chakraborti and Hardy (2015), participants normalized their experiences of hate and could not articulate their experiences initially utilizing the language of 'hate crime'. However, the majority defined their experiences as bullying or homophobia and frequently articulated their school experiences using these descriptors. Criminal justice professionals encouraged young people to report their experiences regardless of descriptor. However, participants such as

17

GayArtist iterated that "I don't know where I stand either, I don't know whether it's like a hate crime or not."

The police affirmed that young people should report non-criminal incidents. This represents a schism in how anti-LGBT+ abuse is understood. Even police officers such as PC Morris, when discussing several of the presented scenarios, acknowledged that "it is not a crime but it is something that needs to be addressed and the police should be told." These discussions revealed the lack of clarity on what is understood as constituting a hate crime, prompting GayArtist to recommend, "I think maybe if it was called hurtful crime then I would move my two scenarios further up, because hate crime seems quite extreme. And what someone considers hurtful is very specific to each person." Participants ultimately saw their experiences in relation to the perpetrator. If the perpetrator of hate was a parent, guardian, teacher, peer at school, or other person intimately connected to them, they seemed less inclined to define their victimization as hate crime. Anti-LGBT+ violence were circumscribed to the specific contexts in which they occurred.

Intimate perpetration and reporting

Like most forms of interpersonal violence, the victimization of LGBT+ young people occurred within intimate places, perpetrated by those known to them (Moran, 2018). The intimacy of this perpetration limited the capacity and agency of young people to report their experiences. Liam and Alex outlined this acutely when discussing the following scenario: *Alex's (this is a made up name and not a reference to Alex, a participant in this project) parents have thrown out his possession of anything that they think is gay or too feminine, such as make-up and clothes.* Coincidentally, Liam had shared with the group that this had

happened to him several days before the workshop and was still worried about how to deal with it. He relayed that his father had thrown out his make-up to stop him 'looking gay'.

> "I've just experienced this with my dad. Like my dad doesn't agree with me wearing makeup. And like he threatened me into not wearing it and stuff. Like, I would report it and stuff.
>
> Alex: And did you report it in the end?
>
> Liam: No.
>
> Alex: See this is the thing, you say in theory that you would report it…like you don't want your family to hate you for wearing makeup but then they will hate you even more if your dad had to talk with the police.
>
> Liam: Yeah and my dad was saying like real men don't wear makeup."

There is a conflict present here, where Liam initially affirms that he would report such hypothetical behavior as described in the scenario, but when questioned if he reported the very same behavior he had directly experienced, he replied "no". Reporting therefore seems to be a theoretical construct. This conversation between Alex and Liam demonstrates the very intimate nature of homophobia (and transphobia). Browne, et al. (2011) argue that the image of anti-LGBT+ hate crime portrays a 'stranger danger' illustration, which inaccurately construes anti-LGBT+ violence as being perpetrated by people who are not known to the victim. Young people are intimately bound to the fundamental institutions within society; the home, family and educational settings. Participants outlined that their victimization regularly occurred within these spaces. They found it problematic to consider reporting these experiences to external criminal justice agencies. As demonstrated by the above conversation, reporting to the police is a theoretical rather than a practical solution. The intimacy of anti-LGBT+ victimization complicates how young people negotiate their experiences. Young people still valued and cared for their (often-homophobic) family members, as demonstrated by Alex's sentiment of not wanting their family to hate them.

The victimization of young people, specifically child abuse and neglect, is often a hidden phenomenon due to the perpetrators influence of power over the young person, the vulnerability of the victim, the intimate environment - the home - that hides the victimization, and a lack of capability to disclose from both perpetrator and victims (Hillis, Mercy, & Saul, 2017). Many countries have developed mandatory reporting laws, requiring adults to report to child welfare agencies if they detect child abuse and youth victimization to be occurring (Matthews, Lee, & Norman, 2016). However, the complexity in power dynamics that exist between adult and child within intimate relations allow for mechanisms of silence to determine whether, when, and how child victimization is reported formally to criminal justice agencies. The power dynamics present between the adult perpetrators and the young people victimized leaves little room to formally challenge this behavior. Indeed, a civilian criminal justice professional emphasized, "there are some things which will never result in being prosecuted." The response from young people towards their victimization was therefore situational, involving several components, including a) understanding their victimization as victimization and b) the relationship of the perpetrator(s) to the young person. The inability for both young people and criminal justice agencies to act on these experiences left little clarity for young people on who they could report their experiences to, despite being encouraged by police officers to report all of the hypothetical scenarios. PC Davies, for example, remarked on the normalization of LGBT+ youth victimization

> "I think it needs to be addressed in schools as well, because it is sort of, it's just left like oh it's cool it's just part of growing up, but no it shouldn't be…we have had situations where we have not been allowed in schools. I mean there are times when safeguarding issues are overruled and we will go into schools. But we have had examples for example where a young girl discussed her sexuality with her teacher and immediately the next day she was banned from communal changing rooms with other girls."

Stronger partnerships between police liaison officers and schools may assist in the prevention of anti-LGBT+ behaviors by providing additional reporting mechanisms and safeguarding

procedures. However, participants deduced that reporting to an LGBT+ youth worker was a preferred option for them. They could share their experiences with an adult in a professional capacity who would understand the difficulties of navigating homophobic parents, teachers, and peers.

> "Alex: I wouldn't necessarily report to the police but I would probably report it to someone like a youth worker, because if they thought that it needed to be reported to the police then they could probably say it is on this road and then they would be easier to identify.

Criminologically, the emphasis on reporting victimization is placed on criminal justice pathways. Importantly, this project found that reporting could be reframed as sharing the experience with a trusted adult as a mechanism for coping or debriefing, and was viewed as more beneficial than reporting through criminal justice pathways.

The priority for much hate research has been to increase overall reporting. However, this study advances this understanding by demonstrating that there are additional factors, such as intimacy with the perpetrator, which show that it is not always beneficial to report victimization *formally*. It is important to emphasize that researchers did not identify any safeguarding risks to participants. Had any safeguarding issues been highlighted by the research we would have formally reported these experiences.

Workshop 2

The second workshop sequentially followed the first. The knowledge gained from this workshop is relevant to young people who are experiencing hate crime and to professionals who work with victimized young people. Appropriate reporting strategies within school settings and youth groups can be developed by understanding how, why, and in what way victimized youth wish to report their experiences.

After establishing the complexities of young people's understanding of hate crime, this workshop allowed participants to design 'devices' that they could utilize to report hate experiences. We used a speculative frame by asking young people to make magical devices, in order to explore what these reporting systems may look like. Participants were asked to construct their own scenarios, using templates from the previous workshop as a model. These scenarios were then swapped anonymously with other participants, who were asked to produce a magical device for the character described to report their hate incident. Such an approach enabled participants to convey their emotions in tangible ways and to imaginatively co-create solutions to the issues they were facing. The originality in this approach contributes to methodological understandings over conducting research with young people. The data produced from these workshops would not have been gained using traditional focus group methods.

Immediate response needs

In similarity to the previous workshop, young people drew on their own experiences, feelings, and thoughts when designing their devices. This exercise provoked a variety of empathic responses, as the scenarios directly related to their own experiences. Participants therefore produced a variety of devices, all with distinct features, magical powers, abilities, and uses. For most, reporting was a secondary feature added only as an afterthought. Participants designed all of these devices with immediacy in mind. Indeed, many devices were initially violent in responding to hate crime; hate crime bombs, shaming tools, and weapons to protect. For example, Steve's *Trollinator 3000* (see Figure 1), was designed to be

"put against your computer screen, it absorbs (their information and goes directly to the police) through these sort of pink sparkly and orange things that those are the trolls, but they don't look like trolls they look like cute aliens. Then the little flag goes

up and goes 'bing!' and then it comes round through here. And then these guys, are your personal sort of troll attackers and they will cross land and sea to attack…they will go and like stab the trolls in the fingers or something. If they get stabbed in the fingers they can't write anymore."

[Figure 1 near here]

Other participants designed 'bombs' with the purpose of blowing up hate crime perpetrators. Ironically, young people would have to commit a crime if many of the devices realistically existed as reporting tools due to their violent design components. Incorporating the creation of magical devices within the workshops enabled young people to articulate violent responses in a theoretical context, in order to process the emotions that victimization can cause. Young people expressed no threat of actual violence towards perpetrators. Rather, they used their magical devices to articulate violent language in an allegorical way, to explore how perpetrators could be prevented from committing future hate offences and be reported to external agencies. Nevertheless, this factor is important as it seems young people desired some form of justice to the victimization they experienced.

Other devices were designed to publicly shame perpetrators. For example, Sapphire and Alex's device was designed to display the perpetrators names on a well-known geographic landmark (see Figure 2)

"Sapphire: We'd have their names flashing up on the screen, obviously not a photo because I think that would take it too far, but maybe a name.

Alex: It could be like, you know the hunger games, like with the cannon and then their photo of their face (in specific areas of the North East) and call it District Cunt.

Sapphire: It's like so people know which areas to avoid if they want to."

[Figure 2 near here]

Shame has been used extensively throughout history as a tool for punishment. The type of public shaming implied in the above conversation is a form disintegrative shaming, which "stigmatizes and excludes the person being shamed…and involves not merely the labelling of particular acts, but labelling of the actor as well" (Newburn, 2017, p. 238). Young people not only want their experiences to be seen and heard but also the people who perpetrate against them. This has communal implications as participants desired to make visible the areas that hate was most likely to be perpetrated, in order to provide warning to fellow LGBT+ people who could avoid these areas and be prevented from being victimized. There is little criminological evidence that this form of shaming works in preventing hate crime. Further, there is a risk of ghettoizing specific areas as 'no-go areas'. The intention of the project, however, was not to establish a solution for hate crime. It was to explore the intricate desires of young people when responding to their victimization, in order to examine how these needs could be met in future design research.

Overwhelmingly, young people desired an immediate response to their victimization and, as can be seen by the above conversation, a form of justice that involved shaming the perpetrator whilst making it known to the public where this victimization occurred, in order to protect themselves. It is unclear how this would have manifested if the imagined perpetrator were a family member or friend. The devices appeared to be designed with a stranger-danger typology in mind (Browne et al., 2011). Further research should therefore place a higher emphasis on the intimate, often familial nature of hate crime, specifically when trying to identify how young people can disclose these non-criminal yet harmful acts of victimization.

Empathy was also a central 'magical' feature of the devices created by young people. The majority of participants wanted, as outlined by Sapphire, for perpetrators to empathize with the daily harms that LGBT+ people experience: "everyone will think they're gay and

24

then they'll have to deal with what we have to deal with." GayArtist for example designed a 'pronoun corrector' (see Figure 3) that

> "…has a beacon on the top so everybody around you will know exactly what pronouns you prefer, even the pronouns you prefer on that day so there is no excuse basically. And then when there is just a very stubborn person ummm there is like a little mini army man on the top and it will shoot them with the pronoun you prefer and knock them back into queerness…it shoots them and also they get misgendered."

[Figure 3 near here]

Young people desired the harms directed towards them to be 'put right' in some way and to discontinue. They also desired a form of restorative justice, through the use of empathy, to fully understand the harms of LGBT+ victimization. Several scholars argue that community mediations and restorative justice for hate crime cases have the potential of engendering tolerance and overcoming barriers of difference, by allowing perpetrators to see the humanity and dignity of victims (Walters and Hoyle, 2011; Walters, 2014; Walters and Hoyle, 2010). It was important for young people to receive an immediate response to their victimization that could provide some form of social justice. Anti-bullying schemes have previously borrowed from criminological analyses by adopting restorative justice practices within their scope (Morrison, 2002). Educating young perpetrators of anti-LGBT+ peer victimization within schools, sixth forms, and colleges, utilizing the language of hate crime - specifically by outlining that harassment and abuse towards sexuality outside the school setting can carry hate crime sentences - may reinforce the severity of anti-LGBT+ behavior.

Defense and protection

A secondary feature of the devices, which underpinned the active intention of remedying the harms of victimization, was to protect to the victim. Many participants designed their devices

with built in force-fields to protect them from physical violence, buttons which released bright lights or smells to blind and distract the perpetrator so they could escape, or safety features which would allow them to run to places of safety. Interestingly, some participants such as GayArtist asked if they could design their devices with abstract features that could empower them with feelings of courage. This is an interesting point as young people often fear that by reporting or disclosing their experiences of bullying and peer victimization, it will worsen (Formby, 2013). Providing a means of reporting hate that is empowering for victims can help overcome some of the reporting barriers of hate crime. Youth and community workers may play a key part in this empowerment process, specifically if they are the preferred stakeholder for young people to report their victimization. The feelings of safety, protection, and affirmation provided by youth and community groups can assist in the empowerment of young people.

The devices designed by the young people frequently contained a protective feature, demonstrating their active resistance to anti-LGBT+ violence. Chris for example developed a suit of armor (see Figure 4)

> "I was originally going to go for a suit of armor, like your words don't hurt me, but due to time and cost I had to scale it back [laughter] to 'fuck off please'. It's very obvious because it's got the arrows everywhere. The little spinner...I thought if it got too heated you could spin this and local authorities could be contacted. And then I put the 'I love camping' in to reassure myself and students that I'm really camp and that I accept myself for who I am and they can fuck off please"

[Figure 4 near here]

This suit of armor represents a form of active resistance against anti-LGBT+ hate. He seems to affirm his 'campness' - a visual cue of effeminacy in men - a positive reinforcement of his sexuality. He moves on to articulate, using confrontational language, that those who may use homophobic words "don't hurt" him and that he accepts himself for who he is. The protective feature of this device represents that for him, and possibly other LGBT+ young people, the

priority is about coping with their experiences of hate and resisting the harms of victimization that can occur. It is not uncommon for young LGBT+ and queer people to find active ways, such as joining community groups and demonstrating their queerness visually, to resist homophobic and heteronormative pressures (Brown, 2007; Singh and McKleroy, 2011; Singh, Hays, and Watson, 2011). Reporting these experiences was seen as a background feature of the devices rather than an active component however. The active role these devices played was to enable an immediate response, often externalized by some form of shaming or retribution, and to allow the young people to cope with their experiences. A key finding from the research indicates that developing a hate crime framework to include the perspectives of young people offers an inclusive reporting strategy, where young people can share their victimization with a trusted stakeholder such as a youth and community worker, rather than pursue a criminal justice response.

Concluding thoughts and implications

The LGBT+ young people spoken to in this research expressed their experiences of victimization in a variety of ways, with few considering whether these were hate crimes prior to the research. It was only once the question was posed did they begin to unpick and reframe their experiences as 'hate' experiences. Criminal justice professionals were affirmative in their message to young people by encouraging them to report *everything* regardless of whether it required a criminal categorization. This left little clarity over what was prosecutable and what would be treated as a non-criminal incident. However, young participants expressed, after witnessing a positive police message, that it was important to report their experiences. Despite this affirmative stance from police officers, it was preferred to 'report' to youth workers and other appropriate adults over *formal* - criminal justice - agencies, due to the

intimate and familial connections young people held with perpetrators (parents, friends, teachers etc.). The devices designed by young people featured reporting tools that were aimed at reporting anti-LGBT+ hate to the wider community, with reporting to the police either not featuring or appearing as a background feature to their device. Previous research (see xxxx, 2019) indicates the despite the police making proactive steps in encouraging hate crime reporting, few choose to direct their reports through criminal justice channels. It is likely that the methodological strategies adopted allowed participants to design devices pertinent to their own lives, contexts, and situational experiences. As has been highlighted throughout this article, the power dynamics that exist within the lives of young people often mean that they invisiblize their victimization from formal reporting pathways. Future criminological research examining LGBT+ youth relations with the police could expand further on why young people were ambivalent on reporting through criminal justice pathways.

Educational initiatives within schools can model hate crime frameworks by educating pupils of the criminogenic nature of their bullying, which if perpetrated outside of a school setting (as an adult) could be prosecuted as a hate crime. Thus, rather than criminalizing young people, this would act as a conscious raising exercise designed to promote tolerance and respect whilst engendering the potential severity of identity-based victimization.

Young LGBT+ people are framed within scholarly discourse and school policy as experiencing homo-bi-transphobic bullying and peer victimization. Despite being tangibly the same - in terms of the specific acts being committed - hate crime and bullying are seen as distinct processes. These findings demonstrate that criminal justice professionals want young people to report their experiences. However, it is important to remain mindful that the response to hate crime is contextual and varies from country to country. The findings also demonstrate that young people desire specific outcomes when reporting victimization. Viewing the victimization of young people as a hate crime has policy implications for both

schools, which often house such victimization, and criminal justice agencies that may process these experiences as hate. Making partnerships with local police forces to deliver hate crime talks to students and contribute to anti-LGBT+ bullying strategies/education programs can be beneficial in providing young LGBT+ people with a positive police message whilst promoting the severity of anti-LGBT+ victimizing behavior. This paper does not advocate for the criminalization of young perpetrators of anti-LGBT+ hate. Rather, the present findings support the notion that bullying typologies overlook the victimological and criminological implications of LGBT+ youth victimization. Examining the reporting needs of victimization allow both formal - criminal justice - and informal - youth and community workers, teachers, counsellors etc. - pathways to develop initiatives that best enable young LGBT+ people to share their experiences of victimization. The findings presented into this article are important in overcoming adult-centric barriers that inhibit young people from articulating their experiences of hate.

References

Almeida, J., Johnson, R. M., Corliss, H. L., Molnar, B. E., & Azrael, D. (2009). Emotional distress among lgbt youth: The influence of perceived discrimination based on sexual orientation. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38(7), 1001-1014.

Aragon, S. R., Poteat, P., Espelage, D. L., & Koenig, B. W. (2014). The Influence of Peer Victimization on Educational Outcomes for LGBTQ and Non-LGBTQ High School Students. Journal of LGBT Youth, 11(1), 1-19.

Bachmann, C. L., & Gooch, B. (2017). LGBT in Britain. Hate Crime and Discrimination. United Kingdom: Stonewall.

Bowes, H. (2018). Methodological Approaches to Criminological Research. In P. Davies, & P. Francis, Doing Criminological Research (3rd ed., pp. 93-110). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Bradlow, J., Bartram, F., Guasp, A., & Jadva, V. (2017). School Report: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bi and trans young people in Britain's schools in 2017. London: Stonewall.

Brown, G. (2007). Mutinous eruptions: autonomous spaces of radical queer activism. Environment and Planning, 39(11), 2685-2698.

Browne, K., Bakshi, L., & Lim, J. (2011). 'It's Something You Just Have to Ignore': Understanding and Addressing Contemporary Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Safety Beyond Hate Crime Paradigms. Journal of Social Policy, 40(4), 739–756.

Campbell, R. (2014). Not getting away with it: linking sex work and hate crime in Merseyside. In N. Chakraborti, & J. Garland (Eds.), Responding to Hate Crime: The case for connecting policy research (pp. 55-67). Bristol: Policy Press.

Chakraborti, N., & Garland, J. (2009). Hate Crime: Impact, Causes and Responses. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Chakraborti, N., & Garland, J. (2012). Reconceptualizing hate crime victimization through the lens of vulnerability and 'difference'. Theoretical Criminology, 16(4), 499-514.

Chakraborti, N., & Garland, J. (2015). Hate Crime: Impact, Causes & Responses (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Chakraborti, N., & Hardy, S.-J. (2015). LGB&T Hate Crime Reporting: Identifying Barriers and Solutions. Leicester: The Leicester Centre for Hate Studies: University of Leicester.

Clayton, J., Donovan, C., & Macdonald, S. J. (2016). A critical portrait of hate crime / incident reporting in North East England : The value of statistical data and the politics of recording in an age of austerity. Geoforum, 75, 64-74.

College of Policing. (2014). Hate Crime Operational Guidance. Coventry: College of Policing Ltd.

Cooper, R. M., & Blumenfeld, W. J. (2012). Responses to Cyberbullying: A Descriptive Analysis of the Frequency of and Impact on LGBT and Allied Youth. Journal of LGBT Youth, 9(2), 153-177.

Crown Prosecution Service. (2012). Hate crime and crimes against older people report. England and Wales: Crown Prosecution Service.

Cuadrado-Gordillo, I. (2012). Repetition, Power Imbalance, and Intentionality: Do These Criteria Conform to Teenagers' Perception of Bullying? A Role-Based Analysis. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37(10), 1889–1910.

Daley, A., Soloman, S., Newman, P. A., & Mishna, F. (2008). Traversing the Margins: Intersectionalities in the Bullying of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth. Journal of Gay & Lesbian Studies, 19(3-4), 9-29.

Duggan, M., & Heap, V. (2014). Administrating Victimisation: The Politics of Anti-Social Behaviour and Hate Crime Policy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Formby, E. (2013). Understanding and responding to homophobia and bullying: Contrasting staff and young people's views within community settings in England. Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 10, 302-316.

Formby, E. (2014). The Impact of Homophobic and Transphobic Bullying on Education and Employment: A European Survey. Brussels: International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer Youth and Student Organisation (IGLYO).

Formby, E. (2015). Limitations of focussing on homophobic, biphobic and transphobic 'bullying' to understand and address LGBT young people's experiences within and beyond school. Sex Education, 15(6), 626-640.

Friedman, K. (2003). Theory construction in design research: criteria: approaches, and methods. Design Studies, 24(6), 507-522.

Garland, J. (2010). ' It's a Mosher just been banged up for no reason ': Assessing targetted violence against goths and the parameters of hate crime. International Review of Victimology, 17, 159-177.

Garland, J. (2012). Difficulties in defining hate crime victimization. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 25-37. doi:10.1177/0269758011422473

Garland, J., & Hodginson, P. (2014). 'F**KING FREAK! WHAT THE HELL DO YOU THINK YOU LOOK LIKE: Experiences of Targeted Victimization Among Goths and Developing Notions of Hate Crime. British Journal of Criminology, 1-19.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine.

Golsteijn, C., & Wright, S. (2013). Using Narrative Research and Portraiture to Inform Design Research. (pp. 298-315). Cape Town: IFIP Conference on Human-Computer Interaction.

Grossman, A. H., Haney, A. P., Edwards, P., Alessi, E. J., Ardon, M., & Howell, T. J. (2009). Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth talk about experiencing and coping with school violence: A qualitative study. Journal of LGBT Youth, 6(1), 24-46.

Hall, N. (2013). Hate Crime (2nd ed.). London: Taylor and Francis.

Hall, S. (2018). Doing Ethnographic Research. In P. Davies, & P. Francis, Doing Criminological Research (3rd ed., pp. 385-410). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Harding, J. (2013). Qualitative Data Analysis from Start to Finish. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Hatchel, T., Gabriel, M. J., & Espelage, D. (2018). Peer victimization and suicidality among LGBT! youth: the roles of school belonging, self-compassion, and parental support. Journal of LGBT Youth, Online First, 1-23.

Heap, V., & Waters, J. (2019). Mixed Methods in Criminology. Abingdon: Routledge.

Hillis, S. D., Mercy, J. A., & Saul, J. R. (2017). The enduring impact of violence against children. Psychology, Health & Medicine, 22(4), 393-405.

Home Office. (2018). Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2017/18. London: Home Office.

Iganski, P. (2001). Hate Crimes Hurt More. American Behavioral Scientist, 45(4), 626-638.

Iganski, P., & Lagou, S. (2015). Hate Crimes Hurt Some More Than Others: Implications for the Just Sentencing of Offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30(10), 1696-1718.

Kelleher, C. (2009). Minority stress and health: Implications for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) young people. Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 22(4), 373-379.

Kuper, L. E., Coleman, B. R., & Mustanski, B. S. (2014). Coping With LGBT and racial-ethnic-related stressors: A mixed-methods study of LGBT youth of color. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 24(4), 703-719.

Layder, D. (2013). Doing excellent small-scale research. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Marston, K. (2015). Beyond bullying: the limitations of homophobic and transphobic bullying interventions for affirming lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) equality in education. Pastoral Care in Education, 33(3), 161-168.

Matthews, B., Lee, X. J., & Norman, R. E. (2016). Impact of a new mandatory reporting law on reporting and identification of child sexual abuse: A seven year time trend analysis. Child Abuse & Neglect, 56(1), 62-79.

McDermott, E., Roen, K., & Scourfield, J. (2008). Avoiding shame: young LGBT people, homophobia and self-destructive behaviours. Culture, Health & Sexuality, 10(8), 815-829.

Metropolitan Police. (2019, September 3). What is hate crime? Retrieved from met.police.uk: https://www.met.police.uk/advice/advice-and-information/hco/hate-crime/what-is-hate-crime/

Minton, S. J., Dahl, T., O'Moore, A. M., & Tuck, D. (2008). An exploratory survey of the experiences of homophobic bullying among lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered young people in Ireland. Irish Education Studies, 27(2), 177-191.

Mizock, L., & Lewis, T. K. (2008). Trauma in Transgender Populations: Risk, Resilience, and Clinical Care. Journal of Emotional Abuse, 8(3), 335-354.

Moran, L. (2008). Homophobic Violence as Hate Crime. Criminal Justice Matters, 48(1), 8-41.

Moran, L. J. (2004). The Emotional Dimensions of Lesbian and Gay Demands for Hate Crime Reform. McGill Law Journal, 49, 925-949.

Moran, L. J. (2018). Sexuality and Victimisation. In S. Walklate (Ed.), Handbook of Victims and Victimology (pp. 156-173). Oxon: Routledge.

Morrison, B. (2002). School Bullying and Restorative Justice: Toward a Theoretical Understanding of the Role of Respect, Pride, and Shame. Journal of Social Issues, 62(2), 371-392.

Newburn, T. (2017). Criminology (3rd ed.). Oxon: Routledge.

Perry, B. (2001). In the Name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crimes. Abingdon: Routledge.

Perry, B. (2003). Hate and Bias Crime: A Reader. London: Routledge.

Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2011). 'We are all vulnerable': The in terrorem effects of hate crime. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 57–71.

Perry, J. (2009). At the intersection: Hate Crime Policy and Practise in England and Wales. Safer Communities, 8(4), 9-18.

Pickles, J. (2019). Policing hate and bridging communities: a qualitative evaluation of relations between LGBT+ people and the police within the North East of England. *Policing & Society:* Online First

Roffee, J., & Waling, A. (2016). Rethinking microaggressions and anti-social behaviour against LGBTIQ+ youth. Safer Communities, 15(4), 190-201.

Russell, S. T., Ryan, C., Toomey, R. B., Diaz, R. M., & Sanchez, J. (2011). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Adolescent School Victimization : Implications for Young Adult Health. Journal of School Health, 81(5), 223-230.

Russell, S. T., Sinclair, K. O., Poteat, V. P., & Koenig, B. W. (2012). Adolescent health and harassment based on discriminatory bias. American Journal of Public Health, 102, 493-495.

Singh, A. A., & McKleroy, V. S. (2011). "Just Getting Out of Bed Is a Revolutionary Act": The Resilience of Transgender People of Color Who Have Survived Traumatic Life Events. Traumatology, 17(2), 34-44.

Singh, A. A., Hays, D. G., & Watson, L. S. (2011). Strength in the Face of Adversity: Resilience Strategies of Transgender Individuals. Journal of Counseling and Development, 89(1), 20-27.

The Leicester Hate Crime Project. (2014). Findings and Conclusions. Leicester: The University of Leicester.

Toft, A., Franklin, A., & Langley, E. (2019). Young disabled and LGBT+: negotiating identity. Journal of LGBT Youth, Online First, 1-16.

Toomey, R. B., McGuire, J. K., & Russell, S. T. (2012). Heteronormativity, school climates, and perceived safety for gender nonconforming peers. Journal of Adolescence, 35(1), 187-196.

Valentine, G., & Skelton, T. (2003). Finding Oneself, Losing Oneself: The Lesbian and Gay `Scene' as a Paradoxical Space. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 27(4), 849-866.

Walters, M. (2014). Hate Crime and Restorative Justice: Exploring Causes, Repairing Harms. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walters, M., & Hoyle, C. (2010). Healing Harms and Engendering Tolerance: The Promise of Restorative Justice for Hate Crime. In N. Chakraborti (Ed.), Hate Crime: Concepts, policy, future directions. London: Willan Publishing.

Walters, M., & Hoyle, C. (2011). Exploring the everyday world of hate victimization through community mediation. International Review of Victimology, 18(1), 7-24.

Walters, M., Wiedlitzka, S., Owusu-Bempah, A., & Goodall, K. (2017). Hate Crime and the Legal Process. Options for Law Reform. Sussex: University of Sussex.

Ybarra, M., Mitchell, K., Palmer, N., & Reisner, S. (2015). Online social support as a buffer against online and offline peer and sexual victimization among U.S. LGBT and non-LGBT youth. Child Abuse & Neglect, 39, 123-136.

Tables

Table 1: Workshop 1 participants

Young People			
Chris	15	gay	cis male
David	17	gay	cis male
GayArtist	22	gay	non-binary/trans male
Sapphire	19	gay	cis male
Alex	15	bisexual	genderfluid/non-binary
Liam	15	gay	male
Criminal Justice Professionals			
Susan	Criminal Justice Worker	lesbian	cis female
PC Smith	Community liaison police officer	straight	cis female
Pc Davies	LGB&T liaison officer	straight	cis female
PC Morris	LGB&T liaison	lesbian	cis female

	officer		

Table 2: Workshop 2 participants

Young People			
Chris	15	gay	cis male
GayArtist	22	gay	non-binary/trans male
Matthew	20	gay	cis male
Quinn	15	gay	cis male
Sapphire	19	gay	cis male
Alex	15	bisexual	gender fluid/non-binary
Steve	17	gay	trans male
Criminal Justice Professionals			
Susan	Criminal Justice Worker	lesbian	cis female
Invited but not present were two LGBT liaison officers			

Table 3: Final placement of scenarios from 'most likely to report' to 'least like to report'

1	Jake 'comes out' in conversation with one of his friends. She says that's amazing because she's always wanted a gay best friends
2	Whenever Crystal posts articles about LGBT rights on Facebook, Liam, a friends from primary school, posts comments asking provocative questions about gender identity
3	Cat is told 'unofficially' by the team captain that she's not allowed to join the hockey team as a number of the players have refused to play with a lesbian on the team
4	Oliver kisses his boyfriend goodbye. A woman across the street shouts "fucking queer" several times.
5	Kate and her girlfriend go home for Christmas and her parents tell them they have to sleep in separate rooms for the week they're staying there
6	Paul and his boyfriend walk across the bridge to Gateshead. A group of drunk men holding beer bottles approach them and they both immediately feel threatened of physical violence
7	Tess and her girlfriend walk down a main road. Someone sat in their garden spits at them, narrowly missing them.
8	Alex's father throws out any of the Alex's possessions he considers to be 'gay' or too 'feminine' such as make-up and clothing.
9	Nick has decided to go home. A group of students who see him walk out of the club ask him whether he's a bender.
10	Nicola and Rachel are often told they don't have 'real sex'.
11	Frank and his boyfriend check into a hotel. The receptionist seems alarmed that they've booked a double room and say there is a tin available.
12	"Oh, my friend is gay, do you know him?"
13	Simon, a trans man, is asked if it is possible to have sex and what is going on 'down there'?
14	Stuart left a gay club last Saturday to go home but was followed by three straight men who laughed and taunted him because he had a gay walk.

| 15 | Max and Mitchell are holding hands in the supermarket and are told by a mother that it's not appropriate in front of her kids |
| 16 | Paige has only just started taking hormones and has visible facial hair and gets looked at a lot and told she looks like a 'man in a dress' |