

Appendix: Methodology

Piotr Godzisz and Giacomo Viggiani

331

The aim of the study was to understand the legal and policy situation of victims of hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity in ten EU member states, and the barriers to justice they face. Specifically, the research aimed to:

- provide up-to-date, robust and comparable data on the legal and policy framework relevant to anti-LGBT hate crime and victims' rights
- Map the availability of places where victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes can report hate crimes and receive support adequate to their needs
- assess the training needs of professionals working with anti-LGBT hate crime victims

Coverage

The research was conducted in 10 EU member states (Belgium¹¹, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Spain, and the United Kingdom). The sample aimed to ensure scale and diversity among the studied cases. The study covers over 1/3 of the Union, or around 40 per cent of the EU population. Countries were selected based on:

- their geographical location within the EU
- their legal tradition (common law/continental law)
- the population/area of the country (small/large states)



¹¹ Flanders only

- the level of social acceptance of LGBT people
- the legal approach to anti-LGBT hate crimes (recognized/not recognized)
- public availability of statistics on anti-LGBT hate crimes

Study design

The research used qualitative methods of inquiry, including desk-based research of primary and secondary sources, mapping of relevant institutions and organizations, and in-depth interviews.

332

As the first step in the research, to ensure a uniform knowledge base and starting point, a reading list of publications relevant to the study topic was drawn up by the scientific supervisor and shared with the consortium. Country researchers and coordinators were encouraged to familiarize themselves with key concepts and debates as well as the most recent and up to date comparative and national reports. Following the review of secondary sources, the researchers analyzed the existing legal and policy frameworks relevant to anti-LGBT hate crimes including, inter alia, criminal laws, criminal procedure laws, and laws transposing the Victims' Directive; national anti-hate action-plans, guidelines on policing and prosecuting hate crimes, and other relevant public policy documents.

The second activity involved the mapping of organizations and institutions which (could potentially) work with victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes. For analytical purposes, the identified organizations and institutions were divided in two categories: reporting centers and victim support service providers. The first category included, inter alia:

- law enforcement agencies
- prosecution services
- equality bodies
- LGBT organizations
- human rights NGOs

The second category included actors such as:

- state-sponsored crime victim support services
- legal aid
- crisis centers
- shelters
- NGOs, particularly LGBT organizations

In practice, several organizations fell into both categories. For example, some LGBT rights organizations, such as the Hatter Society in Hungary or Lambda Warsaw in Poland, are involved both in supporting victims and in recording hate crime cases for the purpose of advocacy. In such cases, respondents were categorized either as a representative of a reporting center or a victim support service provider depending on which of both activities were more dominant in their work, or relevant for them.

333

The third activity consisted of structured, in-depth, individual interviews with professionals working in reporting centers and with victim support service providers. Partners were recommended to select interviewees in a way that allowed for diversity of experiences and views. In particular, the selection criteria included the territorial distribution of services/activities in each country, the responsibilities of the interviewees, target groups, and the kinds of services provided. Cross-cutting issues, particularly gender (see below), were also considered.

The recruitment of research participants was the responsibility of the researchers in each country. Most of them chose to recruit participants using a snowball method or personal contacts, taking into consideration the above guidelines. In some states, researchers sought to obtain official permission to conduct interviews with law enforcement officers, whereas in other countries the decision whether formal permission was needed was left to the interviewee. In several cases there were considerable difficulties in accessing respondents, particularly police officers. In the end, a total of 195 professionals (95 representatives of reporting centers and 100 representatives of victim support service providers) were interviewed. These figures are presented in the Table 1 below:

Country	Reporting centers	Victim support service providers
Belgium	7	6
Bulgaria	4	16
Croatia	10	10
Greece	10	9
Hungary	11	9
Italy	11	11
Lithuania	12	10
Poland	10	9
Spain	10	10
UK	10	10
TOTAL	95	100

Table 1: Professionals interviewed in each country

Two standardized interview models, each based on four guiding themes, were developed to collect comparable information on both types of organizations. For reporting centers, the guiding themes covered:

1. Motivations, context and practice of (non-) reporting by victims
2. Accessibility of reporting services (physical, online)
3. Data collection and procedures for identifying and registering hate crime incidents
4. Case management, safeguarding victims, follow-up

For victim support service provision, themes included:

1. Reception of the victims
2. Case management, safeguarding victims and referrals
3. Follow-up and accompaniment
4. Case closure

Whenever relevant, interviewees were asked about the specific training received and provided on LGBT issues or on hate crime, as well as about the presence of evaluation procedures. Fuller information about the guiding themes is provided in the Methodology Guide.

Interviews were conducted in national languages, in person or on the phone or using video-conferencing tools.

The fieldwork took place from February to June 2017.

Analysis and Writing Up

Most interviews were audio-recorded (with permission) and researchers took detailed notes during the interview and immediately after. Analysis of the interview data followed the guiding themes and was based both on the recorded interview and the researchers' notes. Only selected fragments were transcribed *verbatim* to exemplify findings. A template for interview analysis was developed to improve comparability.

The drafting of the chapters followed detailed guidelines elaborated by the scientific leader and each national chapter was peer-reviewed by the authors of two other chapters. Comments were shared during an online feedback session, as well as in writing. The comparative chapter was reviewed by a representative of all involved countries.

Any findings of this research are grounded in the data collected and cannot be generalized beyond this specific dataset.

Ethical considerations

To ensure that all participants understood the nature of the research, its goals, confidentiality, the voluntary character of their participation and the possibility of withdrawal at any time, an information sheet and consent form were developed, translated to national languages and distributed at the beginning of the research or read out by interviewers (if the interview was conducted on the phone or online). All data were stored and processed for the purpose of analysis using the highest available standards of data protection. Original data (notes and recordings) were destroyed following the acceptance of the draft.

Cross-cutting Issues

336

Intersectional aspects, such as gender and discrimination on multiple grounds were duly considered in the planning and execution of this research. Cross-cutting issues were considered when selecting members of the research teams, as well as interviewees. As far as possible, researchers tried to understand and acknowledge how the regulatory frameworks, the availability of reporting centers and support services, and other relevant aspects affect (i.e. respond to the needs of) lesbians and bisexual women, trans, non-binary and intersex people, as well as sex workers, minority ethnic groups, LGBT youth, homeless persons or asylum seekers.

