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Abstract

Gyspsy Travellers and the Roma are much maligned in the media (Leveson, 1999). Although there is wide range denunciation of all forms of overt prejudice and racist discourse against other minorities, GRT communities continue to endure prejudicial treatment and racially motivated attacks (Cemlyn, 2009, Lane & Spencer, 2014). The GTR community frequently face racist treatment from all corners of society, including the media, the political arena, the judicial system and society at large (EHRC, 2015, Richardson, 2006, Lloyd and McCluskey, 2008, Netto, 2006, Machperson 1999). The Home Office report ‘Hate crime, England and Wales’ (2015), recorded that 52,528 hate crimes were committed in 2014/15, 42,930 (82%) of which were racially motivated hate crimes. It is impossible to know what proportion of this
figure is hate crime was directed towards the GTR communities because GRT are not counted as a separate ethnic group in hate crime monitoring. The results found by this study support the previous literature, finding that 78.79% of the respondents who self-defined as not belonging to the GRT would report an experience of hate crime as opposed to 37.50% of the GRT community. The aim of this research was to examine the attitudes and awareness within the GTR community; focusing on the words used to describe hate crime and attitudes towards reporting. 16 members of the GTR community and 33 people who self-identified as not belonging to the GTR community chose to partake in the research, their responses are compared and presented. This research supports calls made in current literature for a removal of barriers in regards to reporting hate crime (Lane and Spencer, 2014). Additionally it supports previous research that highlights the large amount of hate crime experienced by the GTR goes unreported (HM Government, 2014 Greenfields, et al,. 2015, Home Office, 2012).
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1 Introduction

The community known as Gypsies and Travellers, is made up of number of subgroups, each is distinct from the other with their own unique history, traditions, religion and language. Gypsies (Roma) it is believed fled persecution and migrated west from India, arriving in Britain around the 16th century, many still retain the Romani language, which is thought to derive from Sanskrit. Irish Travellers (Pavee) migrated to Britain in the 19th century, some still retain their own distinct languages Kant and Ga’moon (Okely, and Callaway, 1992). Some would argue that the Pavee are the indigenous people of Ireland (before the invasion of the Celts), and that Kant is the original language, they argue that Kant and Ga’moon are distinct and different from Gaelic. This is a highly nuanced debate, and would require a thesis in itself to examine this argument fully. Scottish Travellers use a mixture of Scottish colloquial language, Romani and Kant. Occupational travellers (Show people) are also included under the umbrella term GTR, as are what is referred to new (age) Travellers. Although these groups are distinct and diverse there is one commonality between them and that is the discrimination and racism they encounter.

GTR have a shared nomadic history and lifestyle, although some may no longer live nomadically they do retain their distinct culture and traditions. The exact population of GTR in the UK is difficult to quantify, 57, 680 people (ONS, 2011), self-defined in the 2011 census as being GTR, this was the first year that this distinction was offered. However government studies examining direct counts of caravans, school records and other records suggest 300,000 GTR reside in Great Britain (Niner, 2004,b). There various reasons why these figures vary, fear of discrimination, illiteracy, not being included in the official census, and many more.
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Although there is wide range denunciation of all forms of overt prejudice and racist discourse against other minorities, GRT communities continue to endure prejudicial treatment and racially motivated attacks (Cemlyn, 2009). This is supported by research published by the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups and Anglia Ruskin University (Lane & Spencer, 2014). The report describes discrimination towards the GRT as the “last bastion of acceptable racism in Britain” (p3). The GTR community frequently face racist treatment from all corners of society, including the media, the political arena, the judicial system and society at large (EHRC, 2015, Richardson, 2006, Lloyd and McCluskey, 2008, Netto, 2006, Machperson 1999). Indeed Deputy Chief Constable Janette McCormick, the National Police Chief Council’s lead for GTR, stated in 2015 that “prejudice against Gypsies and Travellers is sadly endemic in society and is often fuelled by stereotypes in the media.” (NPCC, 2015, P1).

Notwithstanding the international and super national legislation and case law in place, which is aimed at eliminating discrimination and racism. GTR still have both direct and indirect discrimination directed towards them, both in GB and Europe (Open Society, 2005, ERHC, 2001, 2009, and 2015). Evidence for overt racism and racial profiling can be found in the case brought against the Weatherspoon’s group, when in 2015 A Court ruled that the Wetherspoon’s pub chain had breached the Equality Act 2010 when it had refused service for Travellers on racial grounds. This was considered to be direct discrimination and harassment (TM & Others V Weatherspoons, 2015).

The first EU-wide survey to ask ethnic minorities and immigrant groups about their experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation in everyday life: EU-MIDIS (European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey, 2010) revealed that
Roma (including Gypsies and Travellers) reported the highest levels of discrimination. Amnesty International (2014) highlighted a marked rise in the frequency of violence towards Roma throughout Europe, and what’s more, the report described the response to these incidents as “shockingly inadequate”. This is particularly disturbing because GTR are the largest minority in Europe and are exposed to disproportionately higher levels of hate crime (Amnesty, 2011, Bennett, 2012, Chakraborti, 2015). Further research has shown that hate crimes against GTR minorities in both the UK and Europe are not confronted or recorded in the same way as comparable acts committed against other minority ethnic communities (James, 2014). What’s more Thames Valley Police commissioned a review on the ‘Force’s policies and procedures which directly impact on the GTR communities. One of its key findings is ‘the need for standardising official intelligence record keeping relating to GTR’ (Greenfields et al., 2015).

The Home Office report ‘Hate crime, England and Wales’ (2015) reported that 52,528 hate crimes were committed in 2014/15, 42,930 (82%) of which were race hate crimes. It is impossible to know what proportion of this figure is hate crime against GTR communities because GRT are not counted as a separate ethnic group in hate crime monitoring (Traveller Movement, 2016). It is plausible that the overall percentage would be even greater as underreporting among the GRT is widespread (HM Government, 2012). If crime is not measured, it cannot become a target to be tackled, therefore, crimes against these communities will remain the lowest of priorities.

There are examples of serious crimes committed against GRT being racially motivated. In 2003 Johnny Delany, a 15 year old Pavee boy, was beaten and stomped to death by two teenagers who were heard to say that he deserved it because he was ‘only a Gypsy’ (BBC, 2003). Another example is the case of Barry Smith a Gypsy who
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was beaten to death and set alight by a woman, her husband and a friend after the woman had lost her job for racially verbally abusing Mr Smith at her workplace (BBC, 2014).

In May 2004 the Police Launched the True Vision initiative offering an online reporting option. The intuitive is designed to make the reporting of a hate or racially motivated crime easier. Traveller Movement’s and Gypsy, Roma, Traveller Police Association’s negotiations with True Vision have successfully lobbied for a specific GTR section is to be included on the online hate crime reporting system (Chakraborti, Neil and Garland, 2015). However this intuitive has only been adopted by 23 constabularies in Britain therefore access to this facility is a post code lottery (Hall, 2013).

2 Literature review

This research aims to contribute towards current literature on the subject by filling a gap, examining attitudes regarding hate crimes directed towards the GTR. It seeks to further to examine awareness of the mechanisms put in place to combat racism and Hate crime. Such as, Trade unions, Local Councils, District Councils, The Police, True Vision website, Schools, Liaison Group and the Equality advisory service. The research also seeks to gain an insight into the attitudes of the participants regarding further hate crimes being committed. Finally, the results of the primary research conducted will aim to highlight some of the barriers that prevent members of the GTR from reporting hate crimes.

It is the intention of this review to include current research evidence and literature on discrimination and hate crimes towards Reputable sources were selected
Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

for relevance and were summarised and were included in the review. Although it is far from exhaustive, the review does highlight the discrimination and prejudice directed towards the GRT community.

**Ethnicity**

The term ‘Gypsy/Traveller/Roma’ (GTR) is used in this research in reference to a collection of diverse communities each with its own distinct ethnicities, languages and traditions. Defining individual the subgroups is complex, as their ethnicity may be established in a variety of ways, group history, lifestyle or occupation. Some, but not all, of these groups may have involved a nomadic lifestyle.

The term ‘Gypsy’ stems from medieval times and refers to Romany groups, who fled persecution in settling all over Europe, living nomadically. These communities became established and, up until recently, maintained a key societal role in seasonal work, agriculture and metal working (Okely, 2008). ‘Romany’ is a medieval word referring to groups and communities who speak versions of the Romani language. Now more commonly known as Roma, although some of these groups may no longer speak Romani they nevertheless retain a distinct identity. The term ‘Travellers’ refers to an equally diverse range of communities including Scottish, Welsh and Irish Travellers (Pavee) who have, at different points in history, taken up nomadic lifestyles, each group with their own set of traditions and, in some cases, languages (Cemlyn, et al., 2009). Alongside Gypsies and Travellers, a further group to be considered are Travelling Show people.

**History**
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Gypsies and Roma communities are certainly not a recent phenomenon, and there is evidence that prejudice towards them has always existed, examples can be found in history such as, the Egyptians Act (1554) which effectively closed England’s boundaries to the Gypsies. The Vagrancy Act 3 (1597) which legalised the deportation of anyone classed as living a nomadically additionally discrimination of GTR, has long been an element of European History as well. An Example of such is the "Nuremberg Law" (1935) this law outlawed any Gypsy from Marriage with “white” people (McNamara, 2004). The Gypsy community has also endured much persecution, indeed in 1944 (WW2) several thousand gypsies were massacred in the Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp, furthermore it is recorded that by 1945 the Nazi regime had annihilated a shocking 70% to 80% of the Gypsy population (Alt and Folts, 1996).

Legislation

There are national and supranational European policies in place to promote inclusion and equality for the GTR. Examples of which are the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)'s Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma, the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015, and the European Union’s (EU) Common Basic Principles for Roma Inclusion (Garland, et al., 2006., Greenfields and Ryder, 2012). However the Open Society Institute warned in their No Data - No Progress report (2010) that due to the “almost complete unavailability of reliable statistics” it is impossible to measure if these initiatives are effective.

Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 imposed a duty on local authorities to promote race relations and equal opportunities, and to eliminate racial discrimination.
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Yet, many local authority staff are not aware that this also applies to Gypsy Travellers (Lloyd and McCluskey, 2008).

**Discrimination**

Research conducted in central Europe revealed that there is still overt prejudice towards Gypsies and the Roma (Open Society Institute, 2005), British research conducted by the Equal Opportunities Committee (ERHC) of the Scottish Parliament (2001, 2009) affirmed that widespread discrimination also persists in British society. This is supported by research published by the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups and Anglia Ruskin University (Lane and Spencer, 2014). The report describes discrimination towards the GRT as the “last bastion of acceptable racism in Britain” (p3). This view is further supported by the Equality and Human Right Commission's (EHRC) (2015) report which found that GTR communities routinely experience bias and hostility in the UK.

The EA protects Romany Gypsies, Irish Travellers (Pavee) and Roma from discrimination in relation to education, employment, housing, planning, the exercise of public functions, and the provision of goods, facilities and services.

However research has shown that prejudice against GTR exists in the criminal justice system, immigration authorities, health care provision, the labour market, housing markets, education, and planning authorities (Lane and Spencer, 2014). There are examples of discrimination in planning matters; for instance in 2015 the High
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Court held that Eric Pickles, then Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government was in breach of the EA and the Human Rights Act and had "discriminated unlawfully against a racial group" when he subjected planning applications from Gypsies and Travellers to special scrutiny REF.

For instance, in education, bullying in schools diminishes GTR children's chances to complete their education; in health care provision the refusal of NHS practices to register GTR as patients denies members of these communities equal access to health care (Lane and Spencer, 2014, Cemlyn, et al., 2009).

Research has shown that hate crimes against GTR minorities in both the UK and Europe are not confronted or recorded in the same way as comparable acts committed against other minority ethnic communities (James, 2014). This finding is supported by an Amnesty International report (2014) which found a marked rise in the frequency of violence towards Roma throughout Europe, and what's more, the report described the response to these incidents as "shockingly inadequate. This is particularly disturbing because GTR are the largest minority in Europe and are exposed to disproportionally higher levels of hate crime (Amnesty, 2011, Bennett, 2012, Chakraborti, 2015).

The first EU-wide survey to ask ethnic minorities and immigrant groups about their experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation in everyday life: EU-MIDIS (European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey) revealed that Roma (including Gypsies and Travellers) reported the highest levels of being discriminated against.
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Institutional prejudice is also evident an example of which is the comment made by the Conservative MP Andrew MacKay, who stated in a House of Commons debate “They [Gypsies and Travellers] are scum, and I use the word advisedly. People who do what these people have done do not deserve the same human rights as my decent constituents going about their ordinary lives” (Richardson, 2006).

Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 imposed a duty on local authorities to promote race relations and equal opportunities, and to eliminate racial discrimination. Yet, many local authority staff are not aware that this also applies to Gypsy Travellers (Lloyd and McCluskey, 2008).

Hate crimes

A hate crime is any bias motivated criminal incident committed against an individual or group because of their race, sex, ethnicity, disability, and/or beliefs as defined in the crime and disorder act 1988. It is useful to remember that hate crime is not just about hate, but rather bias, ignorance and prejudice (Jacobs and Peters, 1998). In most cases, hate crimes are committed against a minority by the majority (Johnson and Byers, 2003). Under the Equality Act 2010 (EA), it is unlawful to discriminate against anyone on grounds of race which includes colour and ethnic or national origin.

Monitoring hate crime

Since race hate crime amounts to 82% of all reported crimes nationally, it should be mandatory for all the UK CJS agencies to include the 2011 Census racial, ethnic and national group categories in their monitoring systems.
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All criminal justice system (CJS) agencies share the common definition of monitored hate crime and are responsible for collecting data on hate crimes and most hate incidents (The College of Policing, 2014). However, Traveller Movement’s research revealed that of the 48 territorial and special police forces across the country, only 9 include a code to identify Gypsies (Roma) and Travellers REF.

In fact, CJS agencies are not currently mandated to include these communities in their ethnic monitoring systems, despite both these groups being classified as ethnic minorities in the Office for National Statistic’s 2011 National Census. There is clear evidence for this in the Home Office report ‘Hate crime, England and Wales’ DATE which recorded that 52,528 hate crimes were committed in 2014/15, 42,930 (82%) of which were race hate crimes. It is impossible to know what proportion of this figure is hate crime against GTR communities because GRT are not counted as a separate ethnic group in hate crime monitoring (Traveller Movement, 2016). It is conceivable that the overall percentage would be even greater as underreporting among the GRT is widespread (HM Government, 2012). If crime is not measured, it cannot become a target to be tackled. Therefore, crimes against these communities will remain the lowest of priorities.

Thames Valley Police commissioned a ground-breaking review to date of the ‘Force’s policies and procedures which directly impact on the GTR communities. One of its key findings is ‘the need for standardising official intelligence record keeping relating to GTR’ (Greenfields, et al., 2015).
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As the police have an important role in protecting hate crime victims, communities need to have the trust and confidence that the police will act fairly and care for their needs (The College of Policing, 2014).

The Police have gone some way to address discrimination with the introduction of the True Vision initiative launched in May 2004. The intuitive is designed to make the reporting of a hate or racially motivated crime easier, offering an online reporting option. Traveller Movement’s and Gypsy, Roma, Traveller Police Association’s negotiations with True Vision have been successful and a specific GTR section is to be included on the online hate crime reporting system (Chakraborti, et al., 2015). However this intuitive has only been adopted by 23 constabularies in Britain therefore access to this facility is a post code lottery (Hall, 2013).

The Police College 2014 training manual “Hate Crime operational guidance” suggested that as local Traveller communities have a good relationships with local authority appointed liaison officers and education outreach workers, it would be cost-effective to offer training to outreach staff and local Authority officers, so that they can assist in “third party reporting”.

Prosecution

If a hate motivated crime has been charged in the aggravated form and/or when a prosecutor has assessed that there are sufficient evidence of the offender’s hostility, that offence can be prosecuted as hate crime (College of Policing, 2014).

The Home Office produced a report entitled challenge it, report it, stop it (2012), in which the need to work with other government departments and with the voluntary
Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

sector to get rid of the barriers that stop people reporting hate crimes was noted. The report set out how the law has also changed, so that if people are found guilty of a hate crime by a court, the hate part of the crime is treated as an aggravating factor in the consideration of sentencing. The report stated the Government’s commitment to putting measures in place to stop hate crime happening, get more victims to report incidents, support those who report hate crime and making the way hate crimes are dealt with better (Home Office, 2012).

However, there are examples of the Police actively detailing serious crimes committed against GRT as racially motivated, however the courts declined to accept the race aspect as an aggravating element in terms of sentencing. In 2003 Johnny Delany, an Irish Traveller boy, was beaten and stomped to death by two teenagers who were heard to say that he deserved it because he was ‘only a Gypsy’. The police reported and investigated the incident as a race hate crime, but the judge disagreed that the attack was racially motivated (BBC, 2003).

Another example of unrecognised hate crime is the case of Barry Smith an English Gypsy who was beaten to death and set alight in 2011 by a woman, her husband and a friend after the woman had lost her job for verbally abusing Mr Smith at her workplace. Again, the police flagged the case as being racially motivated, but the judge ruled that the racist comments were a separate incident and unrelated to the murder of Mr Smith (BBC, 2013) Therefore in both of these cases because the crimes were unrecognised as racially motivated the perpetrators received a lesser sentence.

There are some examples of successful prosecutions in 2015 the Court ruled that the Wetherspoon’s pub chain had breached the Equality Act 2010 when it had
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refused service for Travellers on racial grounds in 2011. This was considered to be direct discrimination and harassment (TM & Others V Weatherspoons, 2015)

**Hate Incidents**

Any non-crime incident which is perceived by the victim or any other person to be motivated by hostility or prejudice against the victims race or perceived race, religion or perceived religion, sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation, disability or perceived disability or against a person who is transgender or perceived to be transgender (Newburn, 2007)

**The media**

Racism towards ethnic minority groups is mostly hidden, less frequently expressed in public, and widely seen as unacceptable (Lane and Spencer, 2014). However, that towards Gypsies and Travellers is still common, frequently overt and seen as justified. Abusive media coverage add to the ignorance and prejudice of many members of the settled population (Doughty, 2014). In deed the Leveson (1999) inquiry into the culture, practices and ethics of the press, identified Gypsies and Travellers as targets of press hostility and/or xenophobia. Further studies have also found that hostility towards and racial stereotyping of GTR people is widely exercised by the press in a way that would not be accepted with any other minorities (Grofts-Gibbons, 2013).

Social media has enabled anti-Gypsy rhetoric and hate speech to spread more quickly and extensively, and to take on even more serious and intimidating forms. Racism in the social media is especially harmful because of its immediate results within
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all sectors of society. Social media can be a new and powerful forum for hate speech, and according to Hatebase, an online database that ‘records’ hate speech on Twitter, Gypsies and Travellers are the number one targets of online hatred (Shubber, 2014).

Deputy Chief Constable Janette McCormick, the National Police Chief Council’s lead for GTR, stated in 2015 that “prejudice against Gypsies and Travellers is sadly endemic in society and is often fuelled by stereotypes in the media.” (NPCC, 2015). Willers, (2015) stated that hostility towards GTR communities is long-standing and widespread, and politicians and the media throughout Europe continue to use hate speech against GTR. Further claiming that this has created a climate in which racist violence is thought more acceptable.

Accommodation

Many GTR are caught between the insecurity of unauthorised encampments and developments and an insufficient supply of suitable accommodation, facing a cycle of evictions. Roadside stopping places, severe disruptions to access to education for children, healthcare services and employment opportunities become a way of life. Although Gypsies and Travellers are often portrayed in the media through the prism of high profile unauthorised sites, the vast majority of traveller caravans (80%) are on authorised sites that have planning permission (Greenfields, 2002).

The shortage of suitable living conditions with basic amenities impacts heavily on the health of GTR families. Consequentially GTR suffer poorer health than the settled population, with higher levels of stress, a lower life expectancy, higher rates of miscarriage and stillbirth, and infant mortality (Power, 2004; Lawrence, 2005). These findings were supported in a later report which stated that overall conditions of life for
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GRT, are characterised by high unemployment, sub-standard housing and poor access to health services (EUMC, 2006).

The London and Gypsy Traveller Unit (LGTU) detailed a series of horrific incidents of racism experienced by housed Irish Travellers in North London, including attempts to burn people out of houses and gang attacks on flats lived in by Travellers (LGTU, 2001). They noted that ‘Travellers often believe that their claims are disregarded and their treatment by housing authorities is rude and dismissive’ (2001, p. 7).

Thomason supported the findings of the GTAA’s in his 2006 study which found that the problem most commonly reported by housed Gypsies and Travellers was 'neighbour trouble'. Indeed Niner (2006, p. 73) reported that one woman had ‘tried a house but it had been fire bombed before she even moved in.

4 Methodology

The importance of conducting research empirically, within the field of the social sciences is well documented (Payne and Payne, 2004, Gilbert, 2008), it allows us examine different perspectives and to drill into social issues (Gilbert, 2008). Criminologist’s research a wide range social problems and examine polices governments put in place to target the issues raised. With regards to this research project, it was decided to examine the Attitudes of the GTR towards hate crime and to highlight the awareness of the mechanisms put into place to tackle racism and hate crime. There are numerous studies that highlight racism towards the GTR (Brearley, 2001, James, 2014. Mirga, 2009. Halasz, 2009. Donnelly, 2002), however there
Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

appears to be a lack of examination into the awareness of recourse for anyone who has suffered racial discrimination and abuse.

It was decided that a mixed methodological approach, utilising both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection was the most useful as ‘both methods can provide both discovery and validation for each other’ (Deren, et al., 2003, p. 10). Although data collected quantitatively can be ranked and ordered systemically, it is at times limited, especially when exploring attitudes (Bryman, 2016). Whereas, a qualitative approach can provide richer data, and offers in depth explanations, which lend support to the quantitative element (Denscome, 2008).

Enlisting participants was challenging, so it was suggested that correspondence with Facebook groups whose followers were predominantly from the GTR community would be a useful way to recruit participants. The administrators of these pages were approached and the rationale behind this study was explained, the Author also disclosed her family connections to the GTR. A copy of the questionnaire was sent to the administrators for approval before the link was posted on the open forum, therefore the administrators acted as gatekeepers. A copy of the link was also posted on the researcher’s page. Participants where asked if they self-defined as a member of the GTR community or not, data collected from both communities is analysed and compared.

A self-administered survey in the form of an internet webpage link to a well-known survey site was the chosen method for generating responses. Survey sites offer an inexpensive way of reaching participants, they also ensure participants anonymity (Gilbert, 2008). It is prudent to point out that many members of the GTR communities
Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

do not have access to the internet, or may not necessarily be members of the Facebook groups approached. Furthermore there is still a vast number of the GTR community that are illiterate, and or do not have English as their first language, therefore their attitudes were not captured by this research. The survey was live for one month. Although in order to gain a larger sample, it may have been beneficial to extend this however due to time restraints and finance this was not possible.

Closed questions were used in the survey (see appendix figure 1) because it is said providing an option can increase the response rate for the question, making it easier and quicker for the participant to complete (Bryman, 2016, Gilbert, 2008). Long and complex questions may encourage the participant to avoid answering or skim through not giving proper attention and thought to the question. It was felt that participants should be offered the option not to answer or elaborate on questions, this was done to avoid causing distress or intrusion into private lives (Davis, et al., 2011).

Having considered that a qualitative element would enrich the data, the chance to explain the answer selected was offered in some questions.

The literature reviewed prior to conducting the survey highlighted the extent of racism directed towards the GTR community. This research focused on hate crimes, and highlighted the attitudes participants held towards the likelihood of GTR being a victim of hate crime. Additionally the research sort to highlight the awareness within the community of mechanisms put in place to combat hate crimes. The two mechanisms this research chose to focus on are the Equality advisory service, and the true vision website. The true vision website is a police funded online facility for reporting Hate Crime. The survey also highlighted other authoritative bodies through which hate
Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

crime and racism can be reported, such as the Police, Councils, Tarde unions etc. The survey questions were therefore categorised using two main themes attitudes and awareness.

Conducting a pilot survey was considered and the benefits acknowledged (Bryman, 2016), however, it was decided that this would not be useful in this research. This was in part due to the difficulties initially accessing participants from the GTR community, additionally it was felt that conducting an extensive literature review would be sufficient to generate accordingly focused questions.

The questionnaire was sent to administrators of the Romany ways, Romany Road, Romany Gypsy’s and Romany Heritage Facebook pages, additionally the link was published on the Authors Facebook page; sixteen responses were gathered from the GRT community and thirty three from the settled community. Participants may have been discouraged from completing the survey due to the emotive topic. Although questions were phrased as such, that they did not ask for personal experiences, however the fact remains that hate crime and prejudice is emotive and can be destressing to acknowledge. The questions were concise and the survey was deliberately kept as simple as possible to prevent respondent fatigue (Herzog and Bachman, 1981). It was decided that ten questions was sufficient.

A grounded theory approach was taken in regards to the analysis of the data, (Strauss, 1987, Strauss and Corbin, 1990, Thomas, 2009). This was because primary focus of this research was to provide insight on the attitudes of hate crime directed at the GTR community and to explore the awareness and attitudes towards the mechanisms put in place to combat this, as opposed to proving a particular hypothesis.
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Using a computer programme for the analysis was considered and the benefits acknowledged, however, as it was decided a qualitative element was essential to ‘reveal different themes and trends of data’ (Thomas, 2009, p. 198). Software such as SPSS would reveal any statistical significance of quantitative data (Thomas, 2009), but because this research project was not designed to make definite assumptions or claims, but rather to shed light on the attitudes and awareness, it was decided that this method of analysis was not suitable.

Ethical issues

‘Ethics say that while the truth is good, respect for human dignity is better’ (Bulmer, 2001, p. 45). As this statement demonstrates, when gathering information for research involving human participants it is crucial for precautions to be made in order to protect participants from harm. It is important to consider five key areas to ensure that social research is conducted ethically. The first is ensuring informed consent is sort prior to acquiring information from the public, that participation is optional, as well as the opportunity to have their data removed from the research at any point of the process (Bulmer, 2001). The survey for this research was posted on an open forum therefore participants did not have to fill out this survey. The fact that all participants were required to be aged over 18 was highlighted on the consent form and was also confirmed in the survey itself.

It was important to protect the confidentiality of participant’s data, especially as the participants were asked to self-define their ethnicity. As stated previously, the survey was distributed through an online survey site which allowed all participants to remain anonymous. Therefore the survey did not require the disclosure of, name,
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gender or geographical location, however information regarding age and ethnicity was collected for the benefit of the research.

Another ethical consideration was respecting participants' privacy. Withholding information, by choosing not to answer certain questions was one way in which participants could protect their privacy (Bulmer, 2001), so the questionnaire was designed so that participants could skip questions where necessary. In conjunction with this, the researcher also considered the potential harm caused to participants of the research. As Bryman (2008, p. 11-8) has mentioned, harm can include ‘physical harm; harm to participants’ development; loss of self-esteem; stress’. Because the sensitive topic of race and hate crime was being explored, it was vital to consider the harm subjects could face if this research was conducted improperly, links to the true vision website were given and offers to signpost advisory services was also made. Finally it was paramount to be respectful to the GTR community and to assign the correct titles to each group to avoid offending any members of these distinct communities. The Author was very fortunate to make contact with Phien O’Reachtigan, who is the Vice Chair of the National Gypsy, Traveller and Roma Council (Formally the Gypsy Council), who helped guide her through the terminology and history of the distinct groups, identified under the Umbrella term GTR.

5 Results

As identified in the methodology, responses were gathered via an online survey site and the results were collated and analysed using Microsoft Excel. All percentages are accurate to 0.1%. A copy of the full questionnaire is available see figure 1 in the appendices. The results were categorised by self-defined ethnicity.
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Q2: Do you identify as a member of the Roma/Gypsy/Traveller community?

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 1

Do you identify as a member of the Roma/Gypsy/Traveller Community?

There were more respondents from the settled community than the GRT community, as shown in Table 1 and Graph 1. 16 people defined themselves as not belonging to the GRT community and 33 self-defined as GRT.
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Q2: Please State your age

Graph 2

The ages of respondents was recorded in order compare results across age categories, although on reflection it was decided that this was unnecessary. However the question did reiterate the age restriction.

Q3: Do you find the term Hate Crime useful?

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settled</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Settled</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>GRT</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3

Table 2 and Graph 3 illustrate the responses given to question 3

Q4: If you experienced a hate crime would you report it?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78.76%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.26%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4
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Graph 4 shows that 78.79% of the respondents who self-defined as not belonging to the GRT would report an experience of hate crime as opposed to 37.50%
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(shown in graph 5) of the GRT community who felt that they would report an incidence of hate crime.

**Q5: If so who would you report it too?**

**Graph 6**

The option to skip this question was taken up by 7 members of the GT community and 3 from the settled community. The responses do indicate that reporting hate crime to the Police is the preferred option for both communities.

**Q6: If you chose not to report a hate crime could you please explain why?**

Here Respondents were asked to expand on their reasons for not wishing to report an experience of hate crime. The data was analysed thematically, this method
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was chosen because thematic analysis is a widely-used qualitative analytic method (Boyatzis, 1998; Roulston, 2001) that is utilised within and beyond psychology.

Although only 7 people of the settled cohort chose the option of not reporting a hate crime 10 people offered an expansion of their views. These general themes emerged upon analysis of the settled responses

**couldn't be bothered**

“I wouldn’t want to go through more hassle”

“If it was continuous…”

“if I thought my family were at risk of harm or abuse”

**lack of trust in authority**

“Nothing would be done”

“Most of the time people think you are being touchy or over sensitive”

**face to face confrontation of hate crime**

“im 1/2 Traveller but brought up gorja (Romani for A member of the settled community) (I am also a Traveller Support worker) I look more Gorja than Traveller. I prefer to tackle racism myself and put them in their place. The look on their faces is priceless when they realise i’m connected to Travellers”.

**fear of repercussions**
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“Because it would likely cause more hatred towards me or the individual…”

9 members of GRT cohort chose the option not to report an experience of the crime and 11 member chose to expand on these views, these comments were again thematically analysed and these common themes emerged,

An overwhelming lack of trust in Authority

“Because nothing gets done and it’s always (always) the Gypsies fault had away though school and my daughter did too ..”

“No one listens”

“Because no matter how much one reports there is never anything done about it”

“Don’t feel like I would get listened to by the police”

“We are used to it and don’t deal with police”

“No one takes it seriously what would be the point”

“Because there would be no real point. Hate crime against Gypsies and travellers is at best a joke to most people, and at worst justified and perfectly acceptable. When i was about 19 i reported being punched and called disgusting names in a bowling alley, simply because i was a Gypsy. The police man i told my story to just laughed, and told me to grow up and stop wasting his time. I said that the staff had watched and laughed, and refused to let me back in to call my mam to pick
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me up afterwards. To that he said i wouldn't go back there again then, now fuck off before i do you with wasting police time.

Fear of reprisal

“It comes back to you”

One respondent highlights that prejudice can be from within your own community.

Q7: Have you ever heard of the Equality advisory service?

Graph 7

As graph 7 illustrates 31.25% (5) of respondents from the settled community had heard of the equality advisory service, as opposed to 27.27% (9) of the GRT
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The graph also shows that 68.75% (11) of the settled and 57.58% (19) had never heard of the service, 15.15 (5) settled people were unsure if they were aware of this service.

Q8: The True vision Website is an online facility for reporting Hate Crime, Do you feel this would be a service you would useful?

Graph 8

This graph shows that the usefulness of the true vision website was thought to be quite similar between the cohorts, with 43.75% of GRT and 42.42% of the settled community in agreement. 12.50% of GRT thought that the website was unhelpful as opposed to 3.03% of the settled community. Whereas 54.55% of the settled community and 43.75% thought the website maybe useful.
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Q9: Please rank in order of importance the following reasons to report hate crime? With 1 being very important and 7 being not at all important.

All 16 participants that had self – identified as GTR opted to complete this question and the results show that that the majority of participants (31.25%) from the GTR cohort thought it was important to report hate crime to create better integration between the two communities.
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All 33 participants that had self-identified as not from the GTR opted to complete this question and the results show that the majority of participants (48.48%) from the settled cohort thought it was important to report hate crime to prevent and tackle hate crime.
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Q10: On a scale of 1 - 10 how common do you feel it is for members of The RGT community to experience hate crime? With 1 being highly likely and 10 being highly unlikely?

Again these responses were gathered using a sliding scale measured from highly likely to highly unlikely. The results are illustrated as such:

Graph 10

The respondents were given a list of reasons to report hate crime and asked to rank them on a sliding scale, in order of which they felt were the most important the results are as follows:

Graph 11
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1 member of the settled community chose to skip this question

The respondents were given a list of reasons to report hate crime and asked to rank them on a sliding scale, in order of which they felt were the most important the results are as follows:

**Q10: On a scale of 1 - 10 how common do you feel it is for members of the RGT community to experience hate crime? With 1 being highly likely and 10 being highly unlikely?**

Again these responses were gathered using a sliding scale measured from highly likely to highly unlikely. The results are illustrated as such:
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**Graph 12**

How common is it for GRT to experience hate crime (GRT)

![Graph 12](image)

**Graph 13**

How common is it for GRT to experience hate crime (Settled)

![Graph 13](image)
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1 member of the settled community chose to skip this question

6 Discussion

The aim of this research has been to focus on attitudes about hate crimes directed towards members of the GTR community. This project has also intended to assess the awareness of policies and practices which have been put into place to combat racism and hate crimes. The data produced by this study has highlighted some of the reasons why Hate crime is underreported. Any unreferenced quotes within this chapter are taken directly from the qualitative data produced by the survey conducted.

Primarily, it is important to the ethnicity that participants chose to self–identify as belonging too. By asking participants to self-identify as GRT or not, allows for comparison of the results between the GTR community and others. 16 participants identified as belonging to the GTR community, 33 Participants identified as not belonging to the GTR community. However upon reflection it would have been interesting to be able to compare the attitudes of each distinct ethnicity, i.e. Gypsy, Pavee, etc. It is argued that further research into whether certain groups within the GTR community experience more hate crimes than others would be fascinating and as of yet there seems that no such research has been conducted. Do the Pavee experience more or less prejudice that English Gypsies? Is it more or less or just different? How do the Roma and other immigrant Gypsies fare? Is the prejudice they experience and the hate crimes directed at them, the same, More, Less, or just different? Is there racial tension between the groups themselves?

Additionally Water based continuous Travellers (Water Gypsies) who fall within the parameters of the term GTR have been omitted from this study, the omission of
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this group was not intentional, it was just not considered, and the researcher has discovered they are also mostly overlooked with in the literature. It was only upon reflection that the researcher became aware that any reference to Water gypsies is rare with in the literature. A comparison study between the experiences of Water Gypsies and land based GTR would be extremely interesting, do Water Gypsies experience the same prejudicial issues when it comes to planning, mooring/stopping places? Do they have issues obtaining Medical care registering with doctors, accessing education etc., do Water Gypsies experience racially motivated crime?

Due to the low participant numbers especially from the GTR community, this study cannot be seen as a representable sample. Additionally as mentioned in the methods section participants were sourced via online social media, not all members of the GTR community are literate, have access to the internet or have English as their first language, or indeed follow the social media groups selected with in this study. Furthermore had there been similar proportions of each ethnicity amongst participants, the study may have produced, a more reliable set of results (Thomas, 2009). That said the study has shown some interesting results.

The study aimed to explore the attitudes of participant’s in regards of the term hate crime. The results showed that 42.42% of the settled cohort felt that the term was useful, 9.09% felt it was not useful and 49.48% felt it was somewhat useful. As opposed to 37.5% of the GTR community who felt the term was useful, 6.25% felt it was not useful, and 56.25% felt it was somewhat useful. This indicates that the term hate crime is not by the majority of both cohorts thought to be to be a useful term. It was considered by almost half of both cohorts to be somewhat useful. This could indicate that perhaps the term needs better clarification, or is subjective therefore it is open to
interpretation. A definition for hate crime was omitted from the survey, this was done to ensure that the data collected was an individual perspective of the term hate crime and not a reflection of the official definition. One such official definition offered is a hate crime is any bias motivated criminal incident committed against an individual or group because of their race, sex, ethnicity, disability, and/or beliefs as defined in the crime and disorder act 1988. Although it is useful to remember that hate crime is not just about hate, but rather bias, ignorance and prejudice (Jacobs and Peters, 1998).

The participants were asked if they experienced a hate crime would they report it. This question was asked to see if there was a difference between the two cohorts. The results show that the GTR community are much more reluctant to report a Hate crime, with 37.5% indicating they would report a hate crime as opposed to 78.76% of the settled community. This is supported by previous research which found that under reporting with in the GTR community is ‘widespread’ (HM Government, 2014 Greenfields, et al., 2015, Home Office, 2012).

The participants were asked which authorities they would report an incident of hate crime to, this question was designed to on the one hand raise awareness that these authorities are in fact the appropriate place to report hate crimes, and on the other hand to assess the attitudes towards these authorities. The results show that both cohorts feel that the Police are the best authority to report hate crime too. With 77.78% of the GTR and 90% of the settled community opting to report to the Police.

A qualitative element was on consideration thought important to provide richer data, and offers in depth explanations, additionally it was thought it would lend support to the quantitative element (Denscome, 2008), because “both methods can provide
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*both discovery and validation for each other*’ (Deren, et al., 2003, p. 10). The participants were offered the option on expanding on the reason they would not report a hate crime. Although only 7 people of the settled cohort chose the option of not reporting a hate crime 10 people offered an expansion of their views. These general themes emerged upon analysis of the settled responses were, couldn't be bothered/if it escalated to physical harm, which can be evidenced with such comments as

“I wouldn't want to go through more hassle”

“If it was continuous…”

“if I thought my family were at risk of harm or abuse”

Lack of trust in Authorities, was also an emerging theme which is evidenced with such comments as

“Nothing would be done”

“Most of the time people think you are being touchy”

One participant who identified them self as such “I'm 1/2 Traveller but brought up gorja (Romani for a member of the settled community)” and claimed “I look more Gorja than Traveller.” The author is unsure quite what is meant by the statement I look more Gorja than Traveller, this indicates some form of stereotyping by this particular participant. The GRT community are as diverse in looks as the settled community. This particular participant also stated that

“I prefer to tackle racism myself and put them in their place.”
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As with the responses from the settled community, more participants left explanations than opted to say no. 9 members of GRT cohort chose the option not to report an experience of the crime and 11 member chose to expand on these views, these comments were again thematically analysed and the prominent theme to emerge was an overwhelming lack of trust in Authorities evidence for this can be found in comments such as

“Because nothing gets done and it's always (always) the Gypsies fault had away though school and my daughter did too ..”

“No one listens”

“Because no matter how much one reports there is never anything done about it”

“Don't feel like I would get listened to by the police”

“We are used to it and don't deal with police”

“No one takes it seriously what would be the point”

“Because there would be no real point. Hate crime against Gypsies and travellers is at best a joke to most people, and at worst justified and perfectly acceptable”

There is evidence for support to these attitudes, with in the literature. Such as The Home Office report, ‘challenge it, report it, stop it’ (2012), in which the need to get rid of the barriers that stop people reporting hate crimes was noted. Further evidence can be found in numerous other studies ((LGTU, 2001, p. 7, NPCC, 2015, Willers,
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2015, College of Policing, 2014). Therefore the results found in this study are consist with findings found within the literature reviewed. Additionally one participant took this opportunity to express the fact that hate crime and prejudice “Can be from your own community”. Although there is no further explanation offered regarding this comment and it is not clear exactly what was meant by it, it could be that there is racial tension between the different ethnicities encompassed under the umbrella term of GTR. This would lay weight to the Author’s argument that future comparison research into the perspective and attitudes of each distinct group, would enrich and broaden current literature. A fear of repercussion was also expressed by 2 participants from the GTR community and 1 of the settled cohort.

The Equality and support service is a helpline which advises and assists individuals on issues relating to equality and human rights, across England, Scotland and Wales. The Question Have you ever heard of the Equality advisory service? Was asked the aim of this question was to measure awareness of this service. The results show that 31.25% (5) of respondents from the settled community had heard of the equality advisory service, as opposed to 27.27% (9) of the GRT community. The results also shows that 68.75% (11) of the settled and 57.58% (19) from the GTR had never heard of the service, 15.15 (5) settled people were unsure if they were aware of this service. This would indicate that this service would benefit from greater publicity, and promotion from Traveller liaison, and or social media groups, Councils and activists. The Police College 2014 training manual “Hate Crime operational guidance” suggested that as local Traveller communities have a good relationships with local authority appointed liaison officers and education outreach workers, it would be cost-effective to offer training to outreach staff and local Authority officers, so that they can
Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

assist in “third party reporting”, additionally these would be useful organisations to enable signposting to this and other services.

The True Vision initiative is designed to make the reporting of a hate or racially motivated crime easier, offering an online reporting option (Chakraborti, et al., 2015). The question do you feel this would be a service you would find useful? Was asked in the survey, this was asked to measure the attitudes of the 2 cohorts, regarding this online reporting tool. The results show that the usefulness of the true vision website was thought to be quite similar between the cohorts, with 43.75% of GRT and 42.42% of the settled community in agreement. 12.50% of GRT thought that the website was unhelpful as opposed to 3.03% of the settled community. Whereas 54.55% of the settled community and 43.75% thought the website maybe useful. It is prudent to highlight the fact that the true vision website has been live since 2004, however it has taken 11 years and extensive lobbying by Traveller Movement’s and Gypsy, Roma, and Traveller Police Association’s for a specific GTR section to be included on the online hate crime reporting system (Chakraborti, et al., 2015). This may well also one of the many reasons why there is a considerable amount of underreporting of hate crime with in the GTR community (Greenfields, et al., 2015).

The attitudes behind the reasons for reporting Hate crimes was also examined. The participants were asked to rank in order the importance of the following reasons, to educate, to seek prosecution, to prevent and tackle hate crime, to enable authorities to understand the types of hate crimes being experienced, to enable authorities to understand the quantity of hate crimes being committed, to enable authorities to better understand the situations and locations that hate crime occurs and finally to create better integration of the communities. The results are shown in the chart below
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Chart 1

Please rank in order of importance the following reasons to report hate crime? With 1 being very important and 7 being not at all important. (GTR)

- To educate
- To seek Prosecution
- To prevent and tackle hate crime
- To enable authorities to better understand the types of hate crime experienced
- To enable authorities to understand situations and locations of hate crimes
- To create better intergation between communities
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Chart 2
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The results show that that the majority of participants (31.25%) from the GTR cohort thought it was important to report hate crime to create better integration between the two communities. Whereas the majority of participants (48.48%) from the settled cohort thought it was important to report hate crime to prevent and tackle hate crimes. The Home Office report ‘Hate crime, England and Wales’ (2015), recorded that 52,528 hate crimes were committed in 2014/15, 42,930 (82%) of which were racially motivated hate crimes. It is impossible to know what proportion of this figure is hate crime was directed towards the GTR communities because GRT are not counted as a separate
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ethnic group in hate crime monitoring. Therefore it is important to understand and tackle the barriers that prevent hate crime being reported because if crime is not measured, it cannot become a target to be tackled (HM Government, 2012). Therefore, crimes against these communities will remain the lowest of priorities

7 Conclusion

GTR communities have for centuries been vilified, and accused of the most heinous of crimes, such as child stealing. The media have perpetuated and promoted these myths (Doughty, 2013). The argument that the media are by far the most influential source of, prejudice, and racism, is well documented (Campbell, 1995; Cha’vez, 2001; Cottle, 2000; Entman and Rojecki, 2000; Gandy, 1998; Hartmann and Husband, 1974; Jacobs, 2000; Kellstedt, 2003; Prieto Ramos, 2004; Rome, 2004; Ruhrmann, 1995; Smitherman-Donaldson and Van Dijk, 1987; Ter Wal, 2002; Van Dijk, 1991, 1997; Wilson, 2005; Wilson and Gutie´rrez, 1985). Gypsies were also linked by the media to the high profile disappearance of Madelaine McCann (The sun, 2017). This is supported by anthropological research conducted by Judith Okely of Oxford University, who said “through the centuries, Gypsies have been demonized long after it was a capital offence to be a Gypsy at the end of the 18th century in England” (Okely, 1983: p4). Adding in further research “While other minorities may have gained greater acceptance, the Gypsies have continued to be an easily imagined and racist scapegoat. Ancient myths and populist stereotypes are given new life by a ruthless, circulation-driven modern media” (2014). Arguing further that “Traditional, in-depth journalism is overtaken by the bullet point and any arresting image”. This said maybe there should be work around dismissing the myths which surround the GTR
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community. The media must be held to account for perpetuating these myths and therefore creating fear and moral panics (Young, 1971, Cohen, 2002).

Virtanen and Huddy (1998) raised the point that play a central role in formulations of prejudice. The media relies on stereotypes defining characters in ways that are easy to identify and categorise. Although the media today is more guarded in the reporting of issues relating to culture and gender, the creation and perpetuation of stereotypes common misconceptions about groups of people persists. Oversimplified and inaccurate portrayals affect how we perceive and relate to one another. Repetition tends to normalise, stereotypes, serving to validate and perpetuate them. Because stereotypes may be characteristic of some or many members of a group, they are widely perceived truthful. By dispelling the myths and removing the fear maybe there will be better social cohesion, and therefore less hate and prejudice.

Finally, there has been considerable positive improvements in the rights of the GRT community both here in the UK and in Europe. However the GRT community continues to experience discrimination and prejudice. They continue to experience bias and receive a negative portrayal in the media (Amnesty, 2012). The review of literature surrounding this topic as shown that there are inconsistences in the recording and processing of hate crimes (Chakraborti, and Garland, 2009). This makes accessibility of reliable data somewhat difficult. So in conclusion the Author would like to reiterate that Society has come a long way in the inclusion, acceptance and tolerance towards the GRT community but there still remains much work to do.
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Attitudes and awareness of Hate Crime

Hate crimes are any crimes that are targeted at a person because of hostility or prejudice towards that person's:

disability
race or ethnicity
religion or belief
sexual orientation
transgender identity
This can be committed against a person or property.

A victim does not have to be a member of the group at which the hostility is targeted. In fact, anyone could be a victim of a hate crime. Hate Incidents can feel like crimes to those who suffer them and often escalate to crimes or tension in a community. For this reason the police are concerned about incidents. The police can only prosecute when the law is broken but can work with partners to try and prevent any escalation in seriousness.

1. Please state your age.

☐ 18-29
☐ 30 - 39
Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

☐ 40 - 49
☐ 50 - 60
☐ over 60

2. Do you identify as a member of the Roma/Gypsy/traveller community?
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no

3. Do you find the term Hate Crime useful/appropriate?
   ☐ yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Somewhat Useful

4. If you experienced hate crime would you report it?
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no
   ☐ Prefer not to say

5. If so would you who would you report it to?
   ☐ Police
   ☐ Local Council
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☐ District Council

☐ Liaison Group

☐ Internet website

☐ Trade union

☐ School

☐ Other

6. If you would choose not to report an experience of hate crime please could you explain why not?

[Text field]

7. Have you ever heard of the Equality advisory service?

☐ yes

☐ No

☐ not sure

8. The True vision Website is an online facility for reporting Hate Crime, Do you feel this would be a service you would use?

☐ Yes
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☐ No
☐ Maybe

9. Please rank in order of importance the following reasons to report hate crime? With 1 being very important and 7 being not at all important.

☐ To educate

☐ To seek Prosecution

☐ To prevent and tackle hate crime

☐ To enable Authorities to better understand the types of hate crimes experienced

☐ To enable Authorities to better understand the amount of hate crime experienced by the community

☐ To enable Authorities to understand the situation and locations of hate crime
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To create a better integration of the settled and RGT communities

10. On a scale of 1 - 10 how common do you feel it is for members of The RGT community to experience hate crime? With 1 being highly likely and 10 being highly unlikely

1 10
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Dissertation Supervisor Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Type of Contact (email, phone, in person)</th>
<th>Overview of meeting content (including outcomes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/10/16</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>To discuss Research topic and to discuss the fact that to get ethical approval I would need to make sure that we concentrated on attitudes not experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/10/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I emailed Olivia the Ethics forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/10/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Olivia emailed to say amendments were needed to ethics form and questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/16</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Finalised amendments to questionnaire and ethics form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Olivia confirmed amendments made and confirmed sending form off to ethics panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/01/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I emailed Olivia asking for advice re permission to attend Gypsy Council AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/01/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Olivia replied advising me that I did not permission from the University, and said that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

attending the AGM would be helpful for the research

07/02/17 Email To book appointment

17/02/17 Meeting To have a quick scan of literature review to see if it was structured correctly and was not too long. It was decided that I need to reassess the categorisation of literature review and that the length was fine.
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NAME OF PARTICIPANT:

Title of the project: Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community:

Main investigator and contact details: Claire Rice
claire.rice@student.anglia.ac

1. I agree to take part in the above research. I have read the Participant Information Sheet which is attached to this form. I understand what my role will be in this research, and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research at any time, for any reason and without prejudice.
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3. I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded.

4. I am free to ask any questions at any time before and during the study.

5. I have been provided with a copy of this form and the Participant Information Sheet.

Data Protection: I agree to the University\(^1\) processing personal data which I have supplied. I agree to the processing of such data for any purposes connected with the Research Project as outlined to me*.

Name of participant
(print)…………………………..Signed……………………..Date………………

Name of witness
(print)……………………………..Signed……………………..Date………………

YOU WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS FORM TO KEEP

\(^1\) “The University” includes Anglia Ruskin University and its partner colleges
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If you wish to withdraw from the research, please complete the form below and return to the main investigator named above.

Title of Project:

**I WISH TO WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY**

Signed: _______________________________     Date: _______________________________

_____________________________________
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Information Sheet

Thank you very much for agreeing to complete this survey and take part in this research. The researcher is conducting this research for her dissertation in a Bsc (hons) in Psychology and Criminology.

The aim of this research is to explore awareness of Hate crime within the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma community. To explore attitudes to the terms used to describe hate crime. The ways in which hate crime can be reported and attitudes to the motivations and importance of reporting hate crime. The findings of this report could help raise awareness of hate crime, the resources available for reporting and the importance of reporting hate crime.

Participants are only asked for a general opinion, they are not asked to discuss any personal experiences.

Your data will be respected and confidentiality is ensured as the survey does not require you to state your name.

Data can and will be removed from the research at any point throughout the research process. This can be done by emailing the research at claire.rice@student.anglia.ac.uk.

Once again, Thank you for participating
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Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form

Section 1: Details of the Researcher and their Research

N.B. If you are conducting research that involves ‘animals and significant habitats’, please use the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form involving Animals and Habitats (www.anglia.ac.uk/researchethics).

Applicants carrying out research with children or vulnerable adults may also need to carry out an online Safeguarding course and submit the pass certificate with their ethics application. Please refer to the Question Specific Advice for the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form at the above weblink.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Claire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family name</td>
<td>Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Faculty</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:claire.rice@student.ac.uk">claire.rice@student.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution where you study or work (if not Anglia Ruskin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Are you:

Please tick

- Undergraduate (UG) Student
- Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Student
- Postgraduate Research (PGR) Student
- Member of ARU Staff
- Member of ARU staff carrying out Masters/Doctorate research

Students (including staff proposing research on a course/programme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your SID</th>
<th>1408441</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your course/programme title</td>
<td>Psychology and Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of your First Supervisor (for PGR) or Supervisor (for UG and PGT)</td>
<td>Olivia Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of your research project</th>
<th>Attitudes and awareness of hate crime within the Roma/Gypsy/Traveller community: Focusing on the terms used to describe hate crime and attitudes towards reporting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and institutional affiliation of any research collaborators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of application</td>
<td>28/10.2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief Project Summary (up to 700 words)

Please summarise your research in non-specialist language.

You may find these headings useful:

**Methodology:** An online survey will be conducted to assess the awareness and attitudes of hate crimes and the processes in place to report hate crime experiences within the Roma/Gypsy/Traveller community (GRT). The data will be analysed and published in a dissertation.

**Theoretical approaches:** The dissertation will take the form of a qualitative research project.

**Research questions:** How useful do the RGT community find the terms used to describe hate crime? How aware of reporting opportunities are the GRT community? What are the attitudes towards reporting Hate crime?

**Details of participant population (recruitment, inclusion and exclusion criteria):** The participants will be drawn from online forum groups accessed via Facebook. The forum groups have been approached via a private message to the administrators whom will act as gatekeepers, the survey will be sent via private message for their approval before being posted on the member’s only page. The participants will be told that only people over the age of 18 years are requested to take part in this survey. All participants will be asked to...
place themselves with in an age group. Surveys will be recorded under role number. All participants will be advised of their role number and will be offered the option to withdraw their data at any time and this will be reiterated again within the response message. Participants will be given researchers email address to aid withdrawal of data. All survey participants will be asked if they identify as a member of the GRT community those who do not will not have their data collected.
Please explain the potential value of your research to society and/or the economy and its potential to improve knowledge and understanding.

The purpose of the research is to explore awareness of hate crime within the Roma/Gypsy/Traveller community. To explore attitudes to the terms used to describe hate crime. The ways in which hate crime can be reported and attitudes to the motivations and importance of reporting hate crime. The findings of this report could help raise awareness of hate crime, the resources available for reporting and the importance of reporting hate crime. Additionally this report could assist authorities in tackling hate crime and helping them to understand the communities’ ability to report. This could assist liaison groups and councils.

Participants are only asked for a general opinion, they are not asked to discuss any personal experiences.
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Section 2: Research Ethics Checklist (Refer to Section 3 for an explanation of the colour coding.)

N.B. If you are conducting research that involves ‘animals and significant habitats’, please use the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form involving Animals and Habitats (www.anglia.ac.uk/researchethics).

You must provide a response to ALL questions. Please refer to the Question Specific Advice for completing the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form for guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will your research:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   Involve human participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   Create a risk that individuals and/or organisations could be identified in the outputs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   Involve participants whose responses could be influenced by your relationship with them or by any perceived, or real, conflicts of interest?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   Involve the co-operation of a ‘gatekeeper’ to gain access to participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   Offer financial or other forms of incentives to participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Involve the possibility that any incidental health issues relating to participants be identified?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Involve the discussion of topics that participants may find distressing?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Take place outside of the country where you work and/or are enrolled to study?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cause a negative impact on the environment (over and above that of normal daily activity)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Involve gathering or preparing non-living biological samples <em>not held already</em> in a university, museum or other collection?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Involve genetic modification of human tissue, or use of genetically modified organisms classified as Class One activities?²</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Involve genetic modification of human tissue, or use of genetically modified organisms above Class One activities?³</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Collect, use or store any human tissue or DNA (including but not limited to, serum, plasma, organs, saliva, urine, hairs and nails)?⁴</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Involve medical research with humans, including clinical trials or medical devices?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Involve the administration of drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food, vitamins) to humans?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cause (or have the potential to cause) pain, physical or psychological harm or negative consequences to humans?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Involve the collection of data without the consent of participants, or other forms of deception?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Involve interventions with people aged 16 years of age and under?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Relate to military sites, personnel, equipment, or the defence industry?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Risk damage/disturbance to culturally, spiritually or historically significant artefacts/places, or human remains?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Contain research methodologies you, or members of your team, require training to carry out?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Involve access to, or use (including internet use) of, material covered by the Counter Terrorism and Security Act (2015), or the Terrorism Act (2006), or which could be classified as security sensitive?⁵</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Email FST-Biologicalsafety.GMO@anglia.ac.uk for further information.

³ As above.

⁴ For any research involving human material you must contact Matt Bristow (matt.bristow@anglia.ac.uk) for further guidance on how to proceed

⁵ The Counter Terrorism and Security Act (2015) and Terrorism Act (2006) outlaws web posting of material that encourages or endorses terrorist acts, even terrorist acts that have occurred in the past. Sections of the Terrorism Act
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<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Involve you or participants in a) activities which may be illegal and/or b) the observation, handling or storage (including export) of information or material which may be regarded as illegal?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Require ethical approval from any recognised external agencies? e.g. NHS, Social Care, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Defence. Please refer to the Question Specific Advice for the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form and Code of Practice for Applying for Ethical Approval for further information.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Involve individuals aged 16 years of age and over who lack 'capacity to consent' and therefore fall under the Mental Capacity Act (2005)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pose any ethical issue not covered elsewhere in this checklist (excluding issues relating to animals and significant habitats which are dealt with in a separate form)?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the FREP will refer to the Office of the Secretary and Clerk any application where, in the view of the Chair, the proposed research poses a risk of a legal or security related nature to Anglia Ruskin University. The Chair will seek guidance from the Secretary and Clerk before the FREP decides if the proposed research can be granted ethical approval and/or the nature of any special arrangements which need to be put in place.

also create a risk of prosecution for those who transmit material of this nature, including transmitting the material electronically. The storage of such material on a computer can, if discovered, prompt a police investigation. Visits to websites related to terrorism and the downloading of material issued by terrorist groups (even from open-access sites) may be subject to monitoring by the police. Storage of this material for research purposes may also be subject to monitoring by the police. Therefore, research relating to terrorism, or any other research that could be classified as security-sensitive (for example, Ministry of Defence-commissioned work on military equipment, IT encryption design for public bodies or businesses) needs special treatment. If you have any doubts about whether your research could be classified as security-sensitive, please speak to your FREP Chair.
Section 3: Approval process

All student applications must be sent to your Supervisor for checking.
Your Supervisor must then forward the application to the DREP/FREP (as appropriate)

FREP = Faculty Research Ethics Panel
DREP = Departmental Research Ethics Panel

Risk category Green
NO answered to all questions
Complete Section 5 of this form and then send it to your DREP (or FREP for the Faculty of Medical Science only).
You do not require ethical approval from a committee.
You can start your research immediately.

Risk category Yellow
YES to any of Questions 1-11 and/or 26 but NO to all other questions
Complete Section 4 and 5 of this form and submit it, and the Participant Information Sheet (PIS) and Participant Consent Form (PCF), to your DREP (or FREP for Faculty of Medical Science only). Your faculty may require further documents.
You need to wait for ethical approval before you start your research.

YES to any of Questions 12-23
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**Risk Category Red**

Complete Section 5 of this form and complete the Stage 2 Approval form. Submit both, and any other documents required, to your FREP. If you answered YES to Question 22 you must also complete and submit for consideration by the committee the Stage 3 Approval form.

You need to wait for ethical approval before you start your research.

**Risk Category Purple**

YES to either or both of Questions 24-25

You need external approval(s) which, if granted, may be regarded as equivalent to approval from an Anglia Ruskin ethics committee. Refer to the Question Specific Advice for the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form and Code of Practice for Applying for Ethical Approval for further information.

You need to wait for ethical and/or governance approval before you start your research.
Management of Ethical Risk

For each of Questions 1-11 and Question 26, where you have responded ‘Yes’, please explain for the committee how you justify and will manage the ethical risk created. Your research is in the Yellow risk category.

A gatekeeper is utilised in this study in the shape of admin of the Facebook groups approached, a copy of the survey will be sent via private message to the Admin and there opinion will be sort, additionally their permission will be requested before the survey is posted.

Although attitudes and amount of awareness are being recorded, participants are not asked to discuss or grade any personal experiences. The researcher is interested in a general opinion on the subject.

Section 5: Confirmation/Declaration statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirmation Statements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I have completed the relevant training in research ethics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I have consulted the Research Ethics Policy and the relevant sections of the Code of Practice for Applying for Ethical Approval, available at <a href="http://www.anglia.ac.uk/researchethics">www.anglia.ac.uk/researchethics</a>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where required, UG or PGT students must submit confirmation with this form that they have passed the on-line ethics training. Some courses have exemption from this requirement. Please check with your supervisor.
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<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have completed a Risk Assessment (Health and Safety).&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My research complies with the UK Data Protection Act (1998) and/or the data protection laws of the country where the research is being conducted.&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>For research funded externally where the funding was acquired via Anglia Ruskin, I have completed a Project Risk Assessment.&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have attached my confirmation of passing a Safeguarding course.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>If my research project involves a contract between Anglia Ruskin University and an external party, I have had the contract approved by the Secretary and Clerk’s Office&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

For research conducted at ARU including Ixion, University Centre Peterborough and College of West Anglia, go to [http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/staff/sec_clerk/gen_info.phtml](http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/staff/sec_clerk/gen_info.phtml) for the relevant guidance. Students at other institutions must follow local processes.

For guidance go to [web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/staff/sec_clerk/dpa.phtml](http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/staff/sec_clerk/dpa.phtml)

For details go to [web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/rdcs/compliance/faqs.phtml](http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/rdcs/compliance/faqs.phtml)

For details go to [http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/staff/sec_clerk/](http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/staff/sec_clerk/)
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By sending this form you confirm that:

- Physical documents containing personal or confidential information will be stored securely and only accessible to the research team and other authorised individuals.
- You will not store protected information [as defined by the Data Protection Act 1998] in personal cloud services, such as Dropbox, Google Drive or Microsoft OneDrive as their quality or security cannot be guaranteed.
- Any portable media, such as USB storage devices, removable hard drives, CDs or DVDs, that are used to hold personal, confidential or sensitive data will be securely stored on-premises and appropriately encrypted when used off-premises.
- Access to our remote desktop facilities will always be via an approved connection.

The preferred storage solution for electronic files is on a University server accessed from a password protected computer.

Please consult our IT Acceptable Use Policy for further information and guidance: [http://web.anglia.ac.uk/it/policy/](http://web.anglia.ac.uk/it/policy/)

**Applicant Declaration**

By sending this form from my Anglia Ruskin e-mail account, I confirm that I will undertake the research as detailed here. I understand that I must abide by the terms of my ethical approval and that I may not amend the research without further ethical approval. I also confirm that the research will comply with all Anglia Ruskin ethical guidance, all relevant legislation and any relevant professional or funding body ethical guidance.

**Supervisor/First Supervisor Declaration**

By sending this form from my Anglia e-mail account, I confirm the statements in the Applicant Declaration and that I will supervise the research as detailed in the application.

Thank you for completing the Stage 1 Research Ethics Application Form.
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Please submit it as follows:

**Staff Researchers**: Send form directly to the relevant committee.

**Student Researchers**: Send form to Supervisor/First Supervisor.

**Supervisor/First Supervisor**: Check application and forward to the relevant committee.

Date 8 September 2016

Version 3.1
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