



Summary Report

Tackling prejudice and discrimination

Contents

■ Introduction	3
■ Key Findings	5
The pace of change is slow and long-term evaluation is key	5
There is not a simple ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution to tackling prejudice and discrimination.....	5
Real behavioural change must be measured.....	6
Prepare for unexpected outcomes.....	6
It is difficult to robustly evaluate an intervention with a small number of people.....	7
Evaluation makes a real difference to interventions.....	7
‘What works’? Educational approaches can change attitudes and awareness among young people	7
Funders and policymakers are responsible for raising expectations for evaluation	8
■ Our call to action for evidence-led policy and practice	9
■ Minimum standard of evaluation.....	11
■ Promising anti-prejudice projects.....	12
Globe Smart Kids’ One Globe Kids resource.....	12
Show Racism the Red Card workshop in secondary schools settings	13
Race on the Agenda training workshop	14
Kumon Y’all befriending initiative.....	15
■ Bibliography	16
■ Contacts.....	17

Introduction

We are striving for a Britain in which everyone can live without fear of humiliation, harassment, violence or abuse based on who they are. We want to reduce hate crime, unfair treatment, and other forms of unlawful behaviour that comes about because of people's prejudice.

We have a programme of work to understand the link between prejudice and unlawful behaviour and to find out what works to reduce identity-based hostility, abuse and hate crime in Britain. The challenge of tackling prejudice and discrimination in Britain is multifaceted and includes addressing individual attitudes and societal values, as well as improving the response by the criminal justice system and other agencies.

The first phase of the work programme was a **systematic evidence review** (Abrams, Swift and Mahmood, 2016) to establish what is known on:

- **The nature of prejudice in Britain – the link between attitudes that people hold because of prejudice and particular acts of unlawful behaviour, specifically discrimination and identity-based harassment and violence**
- **The extent and prevalence of unlawful discrimination in Britain**
- **What works to prevent or respond to unlawful behaviour that comes about because of people's prejudice.**

It has been a surprise to us and the researchers from the University of Kent that, in fact, we know much less about all of this than we assumed. The researchers looked at 228 pieces of evidence, including 24 evaluations of interventions, and found that there was little robust evidence that directly linked individuals' prejudice with particular acts of unlawful behaviour. This means that although we can assume there is a link, what this link looks like and how it works is still not very clear.

The report also identified a few promising interventions that were effective in preventing or responding to prejudice and unlawful behaviour and were evaluated robustly. The **Time to Change** campaign, for example, successfully challenges mental health stigma and discrimination. The **Anne Frank Trust schools initiative** is effective in challenging prejudice, and the **KiVa bullying prevention programme** leads to fewer incidents of bullying in schools. However, overall there was a lack of interventions that had been evaluated and shown to be working, and so there was little robust evidence that policymakers could draw on to prevent or respond to hate crime and other forms of unlawful behaviour that come about because of people's prejudice.

The second phase of the work focused on strengthening the available evidence on ‘what works’. This was achieved by developing meaningful **principles of evaluation and to build capability** among public bodies and third sector organisations working on projects to tackle prejudice, discrimination and identity-based harassment and violence so that they could evaluate their projects and interventions in a proportionate but robust way.

We also wanted to widen and broaden the **number and types of promising interventions** that were available so that policymakers have a larger range of evidence to use. To achieve this, we funded the evaluation of four ‘promising’ projects that had not been evaluated previously:

- **One Globe Kids mobile resource (app and website) from Globe Smart Kids, evaluated in partnership with the University of Kent**
- **Show Racism the Red Card educational work in secondary schools, evaluated in partnership with the University of Kent**
- **Kumon Y’all community initiative, evaluated in partnership with Cambridge Policy Consultants**
- **Race on the Agenda training sessions, evaluated in partnership the University of Greenwich and the Runnymede Trust.**

The robust evaluation of these interventions brought to light the difficulty of establishing ‘**what works**’. Each intervention was proven to be effective to some degree in tackling prejudice and unlawful behaviour; however a number of considerable challenges and valuable insights have emerged from across the projects when seeking to understand ‘what works’ to tackle prejudice, discrimination, and identity-based harassment and violence in Britain:

Key Findings

The pace of change is slow and long-term evaluation is key

Long-term investments and evaluations are needed to provide a clearer picture of what works, when and for whom.

The interventions that were evaluated through this project all acknowledged this challenge. One emphasised the ‘slow and low’ progress of their community-based approach over the course of a number of years, and felt that trying to force quick change is not effective. Another intervention found that it was difficult to know when a shift in a person’s attitudes towards someone different to them (for example, an individual of a different race or religion) would extend to a change in that person’s attitude towards the social group as a whole. All of the interventions felt that while these evaluations could capture short-term change, the longer-term and also unexpected effects of the interventions must also be measured.

There is not a simple ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution to tackling prejudice and discrimination

The question of ‘what works’ to tackle prejudice and discrimination in Britain is multifaceted and complex, and is an issue that cannot be answered by the evaluation of a single project. Each robust evaluation can make a small and important contribution to understanding the issue, but policymakers will not find the answer in a single ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution.

Although there are common drivers and causes of prejudice, we know that the nature of prejudice and discrimination experienced by different groups can vary considerably. This means that the very nature of the problem can shift.

Meanwhile, the local context (and wider societal, economic and demographic change) can have an effect on interventions that are carried out in local areas. This makes evaluating these projects and using this local evidence to paint a picture of ‘what works’ on a national level a significant challenge for interventions, evaluators, and those looking to make meaningful policy change using this evidence.

Real behavioural change must be measured

This project has highlighted the difficulty of capturing the effect of interventions on real behavioural outcomes (rather than intended or planned behaviour or other proxy measures of behaviour), and there is a lack of evidence of what works to drive a change in real behaviour relating to prejudice and discrimination. This is partly because observing or otherwise capturing real behaviours can be difficult and costly (in time and money).

Although proxy measures can be easier to capture, they come with their own challenges. Because people usually like to be seen in a favourable light (known technically as social desirability, a type of response bias), it can be difficult to detect change in reports of intended behaviours to act in a fair and non-prejudiced way (particularly among children) as people prefer to score themselves very high. This means that these measures can make it difficult to assess change in attitudes over time. In order to understand what works to reduce prejudiced and discriminatory (or promote fair) behaviour, evaluations need to use measures of real behavioural outcomes.

Prepare for unexpected outcomes

Interventions may often result in unexpected outcomes and unintended consequences, and knowing what these are can be essential to understanding what effect an intervention has, where, when, and importantly for whom.

One of the evaluations for this project assessed the impact of an anti-racism educational intervention on the attitudes of young people in secondary school. An unexpected outcome was that the intervention did not lead to changes in young people's intended responses to witnessing a racist incident. One of the measures tested showed that, after the intervention, young people were slightly less likely to say that they would respond to a racist incident by telling a friend or family member, or a teacher, or by standing up for the victim. This finding raised some questions – it could be that children were more confused after the intervention what was expected from them, or pupils may have felt that they had more proactive options to respond to a racist incident, such as educating others. Understanding nuances like this may lead an intervention to decide to tweak its approach, or carry out further evaluation to find out more.

Variations in local or societal factors can also influence the outcomes of an intervention carried out in different places or at different times. Those carrying out and using evidence from evaluations should keep an open mind and take into account unexpected outcomes of the intervention, if necessary to further explore and address these outcomes, and be prepared to evaluate and adapt interventions on an ongoing basis.

It is difficult to robustly evaluate an intervention with a small number of people

For interventions that only involve small numbers of people at a time, achieving a robust evaluation of impact can be a challenge. One solution may be for small or emerging interventions that are sufficiently similar, or which pursue similar outcomes, to join together for a group evaluation. This could help to ensure that evaluations involve a large enough sample of people to be able to detect and demonstrate impact.

Evaluation makes a real difference to interventions

Despite these challenges, carrying out robust evaluation helps interventions to improve their approaches and to demonstrate if and how they are effective in tackling prejudice and discrimination – both to funders and more widely to those making policies and those impacted by prejudice and discrimination.

The evaluations carried out for this project have given the interventions involved the opportunity to test and strengthen their approaches, as well as plan for future evaluation. The organisations leading these interventions have said that the evaluation has helped them to demonstrate that they are achieving their intended aims and helped them to show the impact and value of their work - including for current or future funders.

‘What works’? Educational approaches can change attitudes and awareness among young people

One of the interventions evaluated for this project found that education workshops in secondary schools which challenge racism resulted in improved overall understanding of racism among pupils, and lower levels of racial and national prejudice expressed as social distance (a measure of a preference towards, or against, different social groups).

Another intervention evaluated for this project found that an interactive resource used in primary school classrooms led to pupils reporting greater cultural openness and greater feeling of similarity with virtual children from other cultures.

Neither of these evaluations were able to track the longer-term impact of these approaches through this project.

Funders and policymakers are responsible for raising expectations for evaluation

There is an interest and appetite among organisations and interventions to understand the impact of their work through robust evaluation. However, there are many barriers to evaluation, including resourcing and funding, conflicting expectations, tensions between the sometimes different outcomes that organisations or funders are interested in, and the often short-term nature of project planning and resourcing.

There is much that we still do not know about what approaches are most effective in tackling prejudice and discrimination for different protected characteristics, and these four initial evaluations are only a small contribution. More radical and comprehensive approaches are needed to meaningfully influence the future evidence landscape.

Our call to action for evidence-led policy and practice

Based on this experience, we have four recommendations for policymakers who are at the driving end of tackling prejudice and discrimination:

- **Legislation, policies, action plans, projects and interventions that aim to reduce humiliation, harassment, violence or abuse based on who people are need to be robustly evaluated, fulfilling at least the minimum standards we set out in our guidance.**
- **Given there is no one-size-fits-all solution, policymakers need to take a nuanced and targeted approach to tackle prejudice and discrimination in different contexts and for different groups, while identifying where there are commonalities and opportunities to make use of best practice in other settings.**
- **Policymakers need to be mindful that interventions can have unexpected outcomes and unintended consequences and therefore need to be evaluated and adapted on an ongoing basis.**
- **Change is likely to come at a slow pace, so policymakers should encourage longer-term investment and planning to establish the impact of projects, including evaluating activities after the intervention itself has finished.**

We will continue building expertise and capability around prejudice and unlawful behaviour with our own work programme:

- **We will seek to embed the minimum standards of evaluation in our own work, and encourage others, especially Government departments, statutory bodies, funders and third sector organisations, to do the same.**
- **We will link up the learning from the first two phases of this work with similar work done by others to build understanding and avoid duplication. An example of this is the Home Office funding for community projects that prevent hate crime as part of the UK government's hate crime action plan.**
- **We will encourage the use of behavioural outcome and success measures throughout our stakeholder networks.**
- **We will seek to establish a 'national barometer' on prejudice and discrimination, using survey questions that would allow us to track levels of prejudice and discrimination and shifting attitudes over time, and compare this across England Scotland and Wales and the experiences of different protected characteristics.**

Eight principles for evaluating anti-prejudice projects

Designing the project

Principle 1

Our decision to make an intervention is based on a robust assessment and specification of the need to make an intervention.

Principle 2

We are clear about the difference we wish to make through our intervention.

Principle 3

We have reason to believe that the intervention we propose to deliver will produce that difference.

Planning the evaluation

Principle 4

We are clear about the nature of the data required to demonstrate that we have made a difference.

Principle 5

We are clear about the methods we will employ to collect that data.

Carrying out the evaluation

Principle 6

We know how we will analyse the data we collect to produce conclusions.

Principle 7

We know how we will use our conclusions.

Principle 8

We have assessed and committed the resources required to deliver the evaluation.

Minimum standard of evaluation

One of the aims of our work around prejudice and unlawful behaviour was to develop minimum standards of evaluation and build capability around how organisations can evaluate their interventions robustly in a way that is proportionate and realistic (Duff and Young, 2017). Better quality evaluation should yield better quality evidence on effective practice, which we and others can rely upon to inform policy work.

The guide is presented as a set of eight principles. These principles support users to take an approach that brings together processes of intervention design, evaluation design and evaluation implementation.

Application of these principles should enable users to achieve a minimum or 'good enough' overall evaluation of anti-prejudice interventions, while still ensuring that the evaluation is sufficiently robust and transparent to allow confidence in the findings and their use in designing policy.

The guide also sets out a rationale of the value of evaluation. It also takes into account various barriers organisations may face to robust evaluation, and sets out some recommendations for overcoming these.

Through some pilot training sessions which informed the development of the guidance, we have already improved capability for evaluation among 60 participants from England, Scotland and Wales.

Promising anti-prejudice projects

Globe Smart Kids' One Globe Kids resource

The **One Globe Kids** mobile resource (app and website) from Globe Smart Kids aims to help children resist prejudice and stereotypes by enabling them to 'meet' and make friends with children from other countries and cultures, to foster mutual liking, trust and friendship with children in other social groups.

The evaluation tested the resource with six and eight years old in four schools across England and Scotland, measuring its effect on 'intercultural competence' - a range of attitudes, behaviours and skills that are needed for people to successfully take part in everyday interactions that cross cultural boundaries - by capturing quantitative outcome measures before and after the intervention (Cameron and Swift, 2017).

The evaluation showed the One Globe Kids resource had a positive effect on some indicators of intercultural competence. Children who took part in the intervention reported greater cultural openness and feelings of similarity across cultures. Interviews with some of the teachers and children who took part in the evaluation suggested that differences between cultures seemed to be more relevant to children than similarities, and having a greater focus on similarities between cultures might further strengthen the effect of interventions like these.

The evaluation did not detect any impact on the school children's ratings of difference or intended positive behaviours towards the children featured in the app and website resource (for example, trying to make them feel better if those children hurt themselves). This may have been because the reported levels of these measures were high across both the control and intervention group.

Globe Smart Kids said the evaluation revealed to them the importance of emphasising similarities between the children featured in their One Globe Kids app and website and those using it, as well as differences.

Figure 2

Representation of the One Globe Kids resource



Show Racism the Red Card workshop in secondary schools settings

Show Racism the Red Card is an organisation that uses football to help tackle racism in society. Its main audience is children in primary school education in Britain, and it delivers anti-racism education workshops to schools containing a range of activities to engage all learners in safe and responsible discussions about the issue of racism. Show Racism the Red Card has recently started to run workshops with children in secondary schools. The aim of the project is to remove the burden of responsibility that is on victims or targets of racist incidents to respond to them. It aims to do this by enabling all pupils to recognise racism and respond in an appropriate way, creating a community of advocates. The evaluation assessed the impact of this intervention on recognition and perceptions of racism, and expressions and experiences of prejudice, in two secondary schools in England by quantitatively measuring attitudes and intentions before and after the workshops (Kingett and Abrams, 2017).

The evaluation found that among pupils in these schools before the intervention, the seriousness of racism was regarded as similar to that of other examples of prejudice, such as discrimination because of body image issues. This suggests a relatively low level of awareness of the effect of different forms of prejudice. The intervention resulted in improved overall understanding of racism among pupils, and improved levels of racial and national prejudice expressed as social distance (a measure of a preference towards, or against, different social groups).

The evaluation found that the intervention did not lead to changes in young people's intended responses to witnessing a racist incident. One of the measures tested showed that, after the intervention, young people were slightly less likely to say that they would respond to a racist incident by telling a friend or family member, or a teacher, or by standing up for the victim. This finding raised some questions – it could be that children were more confused after the intervention what was expected from them, or pupils may have felt that they had more proactive options to respond to a racist incident, such as educating others. These findings suggest that interventions like these should put a greater emphasis on appropriate reporting of racist incidents so that young people feel more enabled to report racist incidents, whether as a victim or as a witness.

As a result of this project, Show Racism the Red Card plan to widen the scope of their evaluation work in the future following their experiences and look at longer term outcomes.

Race on the Agenda training workshop

Race on the Agenda is a social policy think tank that focuses on issues impacting on Black, Asian and other ethnic minority communities. One of Race on the Agenda's activities is to deliver a two-day workshop on the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED). Through these workshops Race on the Agenda provides accessible and detailed information about what all organisations must do to comply with the Equality Act 2010, while also suggesting how organisations can meet or utilise the PSED.

The evaluation assessed the impact of one of these workshops on the confidence that participants reported in their knowledge of the Equality Act 2010 and PSED, their knowledge of the types of discrimination that are unlawful, issues faced by equality groups and the ability of organisations to effectively use the PSED (Haque and Jolliffe *et al.*, 2017). The evaluation used a mixed methods approach of a small quantitative survey of 28 people filled in before and after one of the workshops, an online survey of Race on the Agenda's past and potential participants (52 respondents), and eight interviews with participants.

The results from both the surveys and the interviews suggested that participation in Race on the Agenda's training was associated with greater confidence in participant's knowledge about key aspects of the Equality Act 2010, PSED, and the key rights and responsibilities associated with these, as well as increased confidence in the types of discrimination that are unlawful, the issues faced by equalities groups, and the ability of the individual's organisation to effectively use the Public Sector Equality PSED.

While the evaluation showed evidence of greater reported confidence following the training, due to the lack of time for subsequent follow-up it was not able to assess the likelihood of participants undertaking specific actions following the training. Because of the small scale of the evaluation, we need to be cautious about generalising the findings more widely.

Kumon Y'all befriending initiative

Kumon Y'all is based in Dewsbury, West Yorkshire, and was set up in 2008 with the aim to break down the racial and cultural divide between Muslims and non-Muslims in the area. It aims to address racial hate and social injustice, and reduce the potential for radicalisation, through sustained positive intergroup contact in a community setting.

The evaluation assessed the impact of a befriending project adopted by Kumon Y'all on reduced isolation and prejudice between different faith and race groups, highlighting shared values across groups, and between older and young people between 2013 and 2016. The befriending project is only one part of Kumon Y'all activity, which includes an ongoing and varied range of other community initiatives such as charity sports tournaments and clean-up events. The evaluation of the befriending project used a predominantly qualitative, mixed methods approach, taking place after the intervention had finished (Hirst and Rinne, 2017).

Kumon Y'all engaged with young people through word of mouth to encourage them to take part in befriending activities such as community volunteering projects and actions in neighbourhoods with a predominantly White British population living in two local residential complexes for older people. The project engaged 200 young people overall, from which a core group of approximately 50 young people who took part regularly in 20 befriending activities over 2013-2016.

A small online quantitative survey of 24 participating young people suggested a positive change in young Muslims' feelings towards and understanding of people of a different faith and race, including older people. Due to the small sample size, the survey results need to be treated with caution.

The survey indicated a very slight negative change in young Muslim people's feelings towards their home town and their peers and neighbourhood. Two focus groups with 11 participating young people suggested that the project had made the young people more aware of prejudices that exist in their community and peer group. Three focus groups with 13 older residents indicated that some misconceptions still exist among those older people and some of them remained concerned about engagement with the ethnic minority community. Some saw limited opportunities to interact, constrained by living in separate neighbourhoods but also by language and some cultural practices.

The results from the survey and focus groups indicate an overall increase in awareness of the prejudices and misconceptions and the need to tackle them in both communities. Both the older residents and young people felt that the intervention had reduced prejudices, although the older people raised some doubts about whether these changes would be sustained in the longer term.

Kumon Y'all plans using the findings from the evaluation to replicate the befriending model elsewhere in the county with local partners, and have shared the evaluation report with funders as evidence of impact. Because of resource constraints, there are currently no plans to do evaluation in future.

Bibliography

Abrams, D., Swift, H., Mahmood, L. (2016), 'Prejudice and unlawful behaviour. Exploring levers for change', Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Cameron, L., Swift, H. (2017), 'One Globe Kids in action: Evaluating an online platform for changing social attitudes in young children', Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Duff, C., Young, C. (2017), 'What works? Eight principles for meaningful evaluation of anti-prejudice work', Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Haque, Z., Jolliffe, D., Elahi, F., Garland, J. (2017), 'Empowerment and confidence in the Equality Act 2010: Evaluating the impact of training by Race on the Agenda', Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Hirst, A., Rinne, S. (2017), 'Pilot evaluation of Kumon Y'all befriending project', Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Kingett, J., Abrams, D. (2017), 'Show Racism the Red Card: Evaluating the impact of anti-racism educational interventions on the attitudes of young people in secondary school education', Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Contacts

This publication and related equality and human rights resources are available from the Commission's website: **www.equalityhumanrights.com**.

For advice, information or guidance on equality, discrimination or human rights issues, please contact the Equality Advisory and Support Service, a free and independent service.

Website **www.equalityadvisoryservice.com**

Telephone **0808 800 0082**

Textphone **0808 800 0084**

Hours **09:00 to 19:00 (Monday to Friday)**

10:00 to 14:00 (Saturday)

Post **FREEPOST EASS HELPLINE FPN6521**

Questions and comments regarding this publication may be addressed to: **correspondence@equalityhumanrights.com**. The Commission welcomes your feedback.

Alternative formats

This publication is also available as a Microsoft Word file from **www.equalityhumanrights.com**. For information on accessing a Commission publication in an alternative format, please contact: **correspondence@equalityhumanrights.com**.

© 2017 Equality and Human Rights Commission

Published November 2017

Front cover photo: Shutterstock.com/Rawpixel.com

You can download this publication from

www.equalityhumanrights.com

© 2017 Equality and Human Rights Commission
Published: November 2017

ISBN 978-1-84206-718-5
