

HATE MAGNIFIED Communities in Crisis





Appendix
January 2019

HATE MAGNIFIED

Communities in Crisis

Appendix

- 3 Full Methodology
- 8 Codebook
- 17 Definitions not Covered in Codebook
- 18 Partners



Full Methodology

DATA COLLECTION

Communities Against Hate has collected data since
November 2016 by way of a convenience sample of
individuals who desire to share their stories with the
Communities Against Hate team. They may report to us
directly through our site or through one of our partner
sites who have the same or similar forms for reporting of
incidents. They may also call us on the hotline and speak with
individuals at the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under
Law who record their story and then provide legal, mental, or
social services.

Additionally, Communities Against Hate builds on this aggregation of data by supplementing our reports with news clips that exhibit hate incidents from around the country.

Direct Reports

Communities Against Hate and national, local, and state partner organizations include a link to the form on their websites, which is advertised through community events, social media, listservs, email newsletters, and/or distributed palm cards at events or at front desks. Through this form, individuals can report an event in the way that best describes their experience. Employees at the national organization level and The Leadership Conference Education Fund review the incident and determine if it should be approved for the database.

Determining the Report Should be Approved:

Step 1: Deciding if the Incident was Hate or Bias Motivated

Hate Incident: A bias-motivated incident committed, in whole or in part, because of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability and/or ethnicity. Hate incidents may or may not constitute a crime.

Step 2: Verification

There is a general belief that people are truthful in sharing their stories with CAH. It remains a founding principle of CAH to promise a space for those impacted to share their story about how they have either experienced or witnessed a hate incident. The first step for many organizations is to ensure that the incident occurred or that the incident is not "spam." Some organizations have a verification process to follow-up with the individual, if contact information is available, to verify that reports are real and to get a better sense of what occurred. Additionally, some of these organizations may also search for a corresponding news story to verify the report.

If there is any doubt about the validity, the entry will be disapproved and not included in the database. However, if there is reasonable consensus that the entry is true, the incident will be approved for inclusion in the database.

News Clips

Our data collection also includes news clips traditionally found by The Leadership Conference Education Fund through a search of news clips and various newsletters, and the ProPublica news stories database. Relevant stories hosted on major news sources are evaluated against the approval criteria and entered into the database. Local news sources for smaller towns and cities are also used. If law enforcement, a community, or the family perceive the incident to be motivated by hate, the incident will be entered and approved in the database. If there is a question regarding the true motivation of the incident, the incident is followed until more information surfaces. Then, the incident can be entered into the database if found to be hate motivated. News stories are also researched and flagged for the database via partner organizations.

Data Analysis

The Leadership Conference
Education Fund houses a
data team that has created a

methodology under the context of this aggregation of data incidents as a convenience sample of individuals. While our database currently has more than 4.500 entries, we have only reviewed entries that were said to have occurred between November 2016 and May 2018. Incidents that are determined to be spam or out-of-scope by the database manager are removed from the analysis. Three-thousand, ninehundred-eighteen entries were qualitatively analyzed for several codes including the action that occurred in the incident, whether multiple or singular incidents were experienced by an individual, invocations of hate groups or politicians, emotions felt by witnesses or impacted individuals, immediate actions taken in response by impacted individuals or witnesses, knowledge of bias motivation, long-term actions taken after, and evidence of outcomes or longer-term effects. Additionally, the analysis collected categories within the form including the cited motivation for the incident and the location type where the incident occurred as conveyed by the individual who submitted the report.

The codebook for qualitative analysis was developed during multiple explorations of the database by the lead analyst who remarked on themes as they became more apparent. Additionally, national partners contributed categories that they were interested in learning more about from the database. Finally, throughout the process, a team of analysts contributed to the codebook when a new potential theme arose. The codebook was approved by The Leadership Conference Education Fund, following consultation with national partners.

Data analysis was conducted by three analysts. One 15 percent sample of co-coded entries was conducted by all three analysts to ensure high-level coder agreement. The three analysts were then each given a portion of entries to code separately. A final 5 percent sample of cocoded entries was studied for coder agreement at the end of the coding process as well. Where differences in interpretation of definition occurred, the analysts conferred collectively to decide on the outcome of the code.

Coder agreement was consistently high across both samples. In the 15 percent sample, percent agreement occurred over 85 percent in all categories, with most codes occurring over 95 percent agreement between the three analysts. In the 5 percent sample, percent agreement was over 95 percent for all codes.

HATE INCIDENCE POLL

The Leadership Conference Education Fund commissioned a poll to better understand the reality of hate incidents from a representative sample across the United States. These findings are from a proprietary survey conducted by brilliant corners Research & Strategies on behalf of The Leadership Conference Education Fund. This nationwide survey consisted of 800 adults, as well as oversamples of 200 African Americans, 200 Hispanic Americans, and 200 Arab American/Middle Eastern Americans. The survey was conducted by phone and online, starting on Sept. 30, 2018 and ending on Oct. 16, 2018 and requested information regarding experiencing, feeling, and witnessing hate incidents

or expressions over the last two years. The data was weighted slightly to adhere to population demographics of the population in the country. The margin of error for the sample is +/- 3.5 percent, with a 95 percent confidence interval. Notably, the margin of error for sub-groups will be slightly higher depending on the size of the sub-group sample and the size of the actual response to any given question. The poll survey instrument was designed based on the collected data from the Communities Against Hate reporting system as well as codes from the findings of the qualitative report. Findings and data taken from the poll and data from the Communities Against Hate database are distinguishable throughout the report.

Limitations

Our database has collected incidents from a variety of sources. Anyone who wishes to share a story with the Communities Against Hate initiative has been welcomed to do so. Where possible, we attempt to confirm that a story has truly taken place; however, it is our founding principle/belief that people are truthful when they share their story with CAH. We believe that

sharing a story is itself therapeutic. Additionally, it is not the mission of Communities Against Hate to serve as judge and jury over alleged incidents that occur. We merely strive to share and report on these stories to help inform the public narrative on what is actually happening in this country as it relates to hate.

Our analysis here relies on a convenience sample delivered to us through individuals' own words. Any conclusions made in this analysis of the CAH database are not meant to be generalized to the entire nation, but instead offered as a way of explaining the hate incidents that have come to our aggregate database. As our database is not entirely exhaustive, we are certain that more hate incidents occur throughout the nation than what our database holds. No organization or government institution has yet been able to accurately capture the exact amount of hate incidents that occur across our country each year. Offered throughout are numbers from the Hate Incidence Poll, which help to speak to the representative sample to provide context to the stories we have discovered throughout the database.

Additionally, we are not proposing that this database can be compared to the FBI database, which tracks hate crimes as defined by federal law. We track hate incidents, some of which may be hate crimes under a state or federal statute, but because we seek to capture a broader spectrum of hate, our numbers are likely to be very different than federal numbers. All figures used here are meant to describe what our database holds, with the understanding that subjectivity has been mitigated by operating with a team of analysts.

Motivation for incidents in the CAH database is determined at the point of intake of the form by the individual who witnessed or experienced a hate incident. Motivation is used to determine who was impacted by the incident. It may also be interpreted by the database manager or by the hotline manager, if not explicitly stated.

In the CAH database, more than one motivation can be selected for each entry. In these incidents, anti-Black and anti-Semitic motivations are chosen together. Rather than this indicating that

Black Jewish people are being targeted, it is likely because some of the same alt-right language that was historically targeting Jewish populations during the Holocaust was adopted by alt-right hate groups in the modern and postmodern era. For example, although the swastika was historically used by Nazis during the Holocaust and associated with anti-Semitism. it is now used by many white supremacist groups targeting not just Jewish communities. but also African American and other minority communities. For most other motivations that were selected simultaneously in the CAH submissions, there are obvious correlations. Anti-Muslim, anti-Hispanic, anti-Asian, or anti-South Asian motivations were frequently selected alongside anti-immigrant. Often, these groups are targeted with language such as "Go back to your own country" or "This is my country" during verbal attacks. Many reports in the CAH database involving anti-Asian rhetoric involve the attacker using language insisting on the target's foreignness. Similarly, 34 percent of Arab/Middle Eastern poll respondents stated they experienced or witnessed nativism or xenophobic attacks in the survey.

Location is determined at the point of intake of the CAH form by the individual who witnessed or experienced a hate incident. It may also be interpreted by the database manager or by the hotline manager, if not explicitly stated within the original report.

"Other" location is also possible and typically involves public locations not represented on the form, such as public parks, government buildings, or other public property. On some occasions, "Other" is selected if the location is unknown or happened in multiple places. Incidents were coded as cleanup when they met the following definition: An incident in which community or friends and family support an individual though helping to clean-up after an incident has occurred. All hate incidents of this nature involved damage to property and/or written abusive language. Some of the incidents are less direct such as those that involved witnesses removing recruitment flyers that a hate group had placed on a campus or in a community.

Codebook

TYPE OF INCIDENT

Hate incident	A bias-motivated incident committed, in whole or in part, because of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, and/or ethnicity. Hate incidents may or may not constitute a crime.
Discrimination	Different treatment for similarly situated parties, especially when no legitimate reason appears to exist. (Cornell Law School)
Other	An incident in which an individual affects another individual in an unwanted way and the action is not motivated by hate or discrimination.

ACTION IN INCIDENT

Property Damage	Incidents in which a location was affected through physical damage to the property which involved images or symbols that relate to hate.
	Incidents in which a location was affected by graffiti that exhibited hateful language.
	Incidents in which a part of the property has been destroyed in some way.
	Incidents in which a location was affected through physical damage to the property, which involved something being thrown or left as a symbol.
Left Symbol (Under Property Damage)	Incidents in which a location was affected through something being left as a symbol.
Abusive Language (Spoken)	Incidents in which an individual insults another individuals with derogatory names. Include general slurs (idiot, stupid, etc) as well as specific slurs that speak to motivation (N-word, slut, etc.).
	Incidents in which an individual verbally threatens the life of an individual or an individual's family due to hatred of that individual for a bias motivated reason.
	Incidents in which an individual threatens physical violence of another individual or their family or friends.
	Incidents in which an individual tells another individual that they do not belong in America.

ACTION IN INCIDENT (CONTINUED)

Abusive language (Written)	Incidents in which an individual threatened another individual or an entity on a public online space.
	Incidents in which an individual threatened another individual or an entity through private messaging through text message or email.
	Incidents in which an individual threatened another individual or an entity through a written and delivered note.
Death	Incidents in which an individual was killed as result of a bias hatred.
Physical Sexual harm (can also distinguish here from hate versus violence against women)	Incidents in which an individual was touched when they did not want to be touched and touched with or without their knowledge. The incident includes any part of the body, not just private areas. Ex: butt was grabbed, person pressed up against me in subway.
	Incident in which an individual is forced or manipulated into intercourse of any kind without their consent.
Sexual Intimidation	Incidents in which an individual has a photo taken of them without their express permission and/or the photo was shared to others without express permission.
	Incidents in which an individual is followed physically or online, which makes the individual feel uncomfortable. Stalking/following can have multiple motivations (ie. Due to infatuation or due to desire to harm the individual).

ACTION IN INCIDENT (CONTINUED)

Sexual Intimidation (continued)	Incident in which an individual makes a gesture or performs an action, which is sexual in reference and in the presence of others who are uncomfortable by the action.
	Incident in which an individual makes a comment to another individual, which calls out their appearance and implies sexual advancement.
Intimidation	Incident in which an individual threatens another individual by physical presence. Ex: Standing over someone or blocking an entrance.
	Incident in which an individual threatens another individual by attempting to attack them, but not succeeding.
	Incident in which an individual feels continually threatened by another individual in a variety of ways.
	Incident in which an individual blackmails another individual through written or verbal communication.
Stolen Property	Incident in which an individual's items are stolen. This is generally in conjunction with vandalism and/or graffiti that proves a bias motivation.
	Incident in which an individual attempted to steal items, but were unsuccessful.
Physical Harm	Incident in which an individual is attacked with a hand-held object.
	Incident in which an individual is attacked with a flying object.

ACTION IN INCIDENT (CONTINUED)

Self-Harm	Individual harms or kills themselves as a result of a hate incident.
Refusal of Rights or Equal Opportunity	Incident in which a person sought services, products, or resources and was refused business, services, or resources based on a bias against them.
	Incident in which a person or an entity was denied a right based on a bias against them.
	Incident in which a person was fired, demoted, or affected in their job as a result of an employer's bias against them.
False Promises/Tricks	Incident in which an individual is promised citizenship in a scam to take their money.
	Incident in which an individual is offered something in career, life, or school that is desirable but is forced to do something or lured into a trap.
Use of Immigration Status	Incident in which an individual's immigration status is threatened.
Isolation	Incident in which an individual is purposefully isolated from family, friends, or community.
Emotions/Feelings	Individual voiced in description how they felt before, during, or after the incident took place.
	Coded as: Anger/Frustration; Discomfort; Disgust; Shock; Resentment; Offended; Grief/Sadness; Strong; Confusion; Shame; Fear; Alienation

INVOCATIONS OF GROUPS, PEOPLE, POLICIES, OR RHETORIC

Invoke the name of Trump, MAGA, build that wall, etc.	Incident in which Trump's name or any of his common phrasings associated with his administration or his election is used during a hate incident or in order to threaten an individual based on bias motivation.
Invoke the name of Hate Group	Incident in which an individual invokes the name of a white supremacist hate group, uses a name or symbol, or is found to be a member of a hate group in order to threaten, intimidate, or offend a person and/or is based on bias.
Other hate groups	Incident in which an individual invokes the name of a hate group (not white supremacy or alt-right related), uses a name or symbol, or is found to be a member of a hate group in order to threaten, intimidate, or offend a person and/or is based on bias.

LONG-TERM ACTIONS TAKEN BY VICTIM AND/OR COMMUNITY

Restorative Justice	Incident in which the offender reconciles their action by working with community or the offended members and learns more about their bias.
Clean-Up After Incident	Incident in which community or friends and family support victim through helping to clean-up after an incident has occurred.
Fundraising	Incident in which community or friends and family support victim through raising funds for clean-up, medical bills, or other results of the incident.

IMMEDIATE ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE VICTIM

Returned physical or verbal contact	Individual defended themselves by striking back or verbally attacking the assailant.
Displayed emotional response (cried)	Individual cried, screamed, had a panic attack, or showed another emotional response.
Ran away	Individual ran away from the assailant
Walked away without making contact	Individual did not make contact and walked away.
Called police	Individual called police or other security for the property.
Called Caregiver or support	Individual called a parent, friend, teacher, religious mentor, or other for support.
Called administrative official/business owner, etc.	Individual called a business owner or corporation for a response or reached out to leadership of the property for a response.

HOW VICTIM STATES IT WAS HATE MOTIVATED

Detail in the description that helps to indicate that the incident was bias motivated.

Language/imagery/ statement	Incident included language, imagery, or a statement that has clear bias before, during, or after.
Feelings, instincts, perception	Individual felt or perceived that the incident was bias motivated.
After revealing information	Incident occurred after the individual identified personal information about themselves.
Police confirmed incident was a hate crime	Incident was confirmed a hate crime by law enforcement officials.
Other legal designation	Incident was confirmed a hate incident by another legal designation.
Advocacy Group/CBO designation* Should be selected if the entry came from a partner organization	Incident was confirmed a hate incident by an advocacy group or community, despite possible disagreement by law enforcement or by courts.
	Legal advocacy.
	Support/validation/crisis counseling.
Incident occurred on or near a holiday, event	Incident occurred on or near a holiday or event that is associated with a group affected. Ex: Mosque received bomb threat after hosting a collaboration event between Muslims and Christians.
Incident occurred on or near a location or gathering place	Incident occurred on or near a location or gathering place. Ex: Mosque received a bomb threat with no explicit bias, but is presumed to be due to the fact that it is a religious institution.

NUMBER OF HATE INCIDENTS EXPERIENCED BY INDIVIDUAL

Series from same person/ entity	Individual recorded a series of incidents in which the same offender committed incidents against them.
Series of incidents from different people/entities	Individual recorded a series of incidents in which different offenders have committed incidents against them.

NUMBER OF HATE INCIDENTS AGGRESSOR COMMITTED

Offender was involved or
committed multiple hate
incidents

Multiple incidents occurred from the same offender with different or the same individual(s) affected.

EVIDENCE OF OUTCOME/LONGER-TERM EFFECTS

Performance at work or school	Individual reported that they lost their job, were demoted, had poor grades or school performance, or stopped attending work or school altogether after the incident occurred.
Emotional/physical health	Individual reported that they sought therapy, a doctor, or had long- term mental or physical health effects after the incident occurred.
Level of participation in public/community life	Individual reported they stopped seeing family or friends, stopped going to church, reduced or stopped their online presence after the incident occurred.
Change in behavior to prevent incidents	Individual reported they changed or thought about changing their dress, their commute, their living arrangement, or their lifestyle or they censored themselves after the incident occurred.

DEFINITIONS NOT COVERED IN CODEBOOK

Convenience Sample:

Convenience sampling is a type of nonprobability sampling in which people are sampled simply because they are 'convenient' sources of data for researchers.

Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods, Sage Publications

Alt-Right:

The Alternative Right, commonly known as the "alt-right," is a set of far-right ideologies, groups and individuals whose core belief is that "white identity" is under attack by multicultural forces using "political correctness" and "social justice" to undermine white people and "their" civilization.

Southern Poverty Law Center

Hate Group:

An organization that – based on its official statements or principles, the statements of its leaders, or its activities – has beliefs or practices that attack or malign an entire class of people, typically for their immutable characteristics.

Southern Poverty Law Center

Partners

Current and former Communities Against Hate National Partners

The Leadership Conference Education Fund

civilrights.org/againsthate/

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

lawyerscommittee.org/project/stop-hate-project/

Anti-Violence Project

avp.org/communities-against-hate/

Asian Americans Advancing Justice

www.standagainsthatred.org/

Color of Change

colorofchange.org/

Community Change

communitychange.org/

Fair Immigration Reform Movement

fairimmigration.org/

Gay Straight Alliance Network

gsanetwork.org/updates/united-against-hate/

Hollaback!

www.ihollaback.org/

Muslim Advocates

www.muslimadvocates.org/anti-muslim-hate/

National Action Network

nationalactionnetwork.net/

National Center for Transgender Equality

transequality.org/issues/anti-violence

National Council of Jewish Women

www.ncjw.org/act/action/together-we-can-fight-hate/

National Disability Rights Network

www.ndrn.org/en/public-policy/nohate.html

National Fair Housing Alliance

nationalfairhousing.org/report-hate/

National Network for Arab American Communities / ACCESS

www.takeonhate.org/

Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

rac.org/hate-crimes

The Sikh Coalition

www.sikhcoalition.org/our-work/preventing-hateand-discrimination/hate-crime-tracking-andprevention/

South Asian Americans Leading Together

saalt.org/policy-change/post-9-11-backlash/

Transgender Law Center

transgenderlawcenter.org/resources/actioncenter/cah

UnidosUS

blog.unidosus.org/2017/03/14/standing-united-hate-communities/

National, state, and local Supporting Organizations

African Law Center

africanlawcenter.org/

Asian Services in Action

www.asiaohio.org/reporthatecrime/

CAIR Florida

www.cairflorida.org/

CAIR New York

www.cair-ny.org/

Center for Worker Justice

www.cwjiowa.org/hate-crimes/

EmpowerMT

www.empowermt.org/

Global Deaf Muslim

globaldeafmuslim.org/

Granite State Organizing Project

granitestateorganizing.org/

High Plains Fair Housing Center

www.highplainsfhc.org/

Hispanic Federation

hispanicfederation.org/

Holocaust Memorial & Tolerance Center

of Nassau County

www.hmtcli.org/

Hope Fair Housing Center

hopefair.org/pages/113/report-hate/

Make the Road New York

maketheroadny.org/

Michigan Organization on Adolescent

Sexual Health

www.moash.org/

The Sanctuaries

www.thesanctuaries.org/

Student Action with Farmers

www.saf-unite.org/

SUNY Impact Foundation

sunyimpactfoundation.org/

Theater of the Oppressed NYC

www.tonyc.nyc/resources

YWCA

www.ywca.org/

YWCA Southern Arizona

ywcatucson.org/program/stat/





1620 L Street, NW Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20036

202.466.3434 voice 202.466.3435 fax www.leadershipconferenceedfund.org