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**Introduction**

Understanding about the psychological trauma experienced by hate crime victims compared with victims of non-bias crime has been accumulating over the past two decades from an international body of research.[[1]](#footnote-1) A small number of researchers have used survey data to quantify the particular post-victimization psychological impact suffered by hate crime victims compared with victims of non-bias crime. This body of research has shown a greater propensity for hate crime victims to report symptoms of post-victimization psychological distress compared with victims of comparable, but otherwise motivated crime.

The insights generated by this body of research — supplemented by qualitative studies which have illuminated the post-victimization trauma of hate crime in greater depth[[2]](#footnote-2) than studies using survey data — have been significant for guiding how law enforcement agencies might respond to victims. The research that has been carried out in the UK, for instance, has underpinned policy by providing “definitive evidence” that hate crimes can have a greater psychological impact upon victims (Giannasi 2014). The findings are also potentially significant for informing counselling and other psychotherapeutic interventions with hate crime victims.

The most robust survey evidence to date about the greater psychological impact of hate crime compared with non-bias crime has been produced from analyses of the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) (formerly known as the British Crime Survey). Surprisingly perhaps, given that ‘hate crime’ as a conceptual label emerged from social movement activism in the United States, data collected by the US Bureau of Justice Statistics National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) have not been used to explore post-victimization psychological trauma experienced by hate crime victims compared with victims of non-bias crimes. In this chapter we therefore uniquely provide such an exploration. We test out whether differences between the mental trauma experienced by hate crime victims and victims of otherwise motivated crime demonstrated by analyses of data from the Crime Survey for England and Wales hold in another national context — the United States.

**How hate crimes ‘hurt more’: earlier research on the psychological impact of hate crime**

To provide the context for the research findings we present it is instructive to briefly review the key themes from the survey research undertaken to date which has demonstrated the greater post-victimization psychological impact for hate crime victims compared with non-bias crime victims. A number of studies have shown a greater propensity for hate crime victims to report symptoms of post-victimization distress compared with victims of comparable, but otherwise motivated crime. The evidence shows that hate crime victims demonstrate similar, but also distinct impacts, compared with victims of parallel crimes.

Pioneering work was undertaken by Howard Ehrlich and colleagues in the United States in the late 1980s. In one of their projects they conducted a national telephone interview survey with a stratified random sample of 2,078 respondents. Over one-in-twenty respondents (6.5%) reported at least one experience in the previous twelve months of what Ehrlich and colleagues referred to as ‘ethnoviolence’. Notably, the notion of harm to victims lay at the core of their conceptualisation of ‘ethnoviolence’, which they defined as: “…prejudiced behaviour which causes, or is intended to cause, physical and psychological harm to its victims” (Ehrlich et al., 1994: 153).

Their survey aimed to measure the consequences of victimization by using a 19 item scale of psychophysiological symptoms of post-traumatic stress and 12 questions about social and behavioural changes made in the past year. To confine our comments to the first set of questions as they relate to the topic of this chapter, it is striking that ethnoviolence victims were more likely than victims of other violence in the survey to report psychophysiological symptoms. The differences were statistically significant on 18 of the 19 items. Notably, over half of the ethnoviolence victims reported that they “Felt depressed or sad” (56%), “Felt more nervous than usual” (54%), and “Thought over and over again about the same problem or incident” (52%). The pattern of difference between ethnoviolence victims and victims of otherwise motivated violence was replicated in a 1991 survey by Ehrlich and colleagues of violence in the corporate workplace. They noted that the “trauma took its toll on interpersonal relations as well: the loss of friends, anger with family members, and difficulties with significant others” (1994: 163).

The pioneering research on the psychological impact of hate crime was continued by Gregory Herek and colleagues in the late 1990s. From a questionnaire survey of 2,259 lesbian, gay men, and bisexual respondents in the 1990s in the Sacramento area of California, Herek, Gillis and Cogan (1999) showed that recent hate crime victimization (which they categorised as within five years prior to the survey) appeared to be “associated with greater psychological distress for gay men and lesbians” and negative world views, compared with victimization in non-bias crime.

The research findings about the greater likelihood of hate crime victims to report psychological distress was confirmed by other researchers in the United States. McDevitt and colleagues (McDevitt et al., 2001), with the cooperation of the Boston, Massachusetts police department, conducted a mail survey of all victims of bias-motivated aggravated assault between 1992 and 1997 along with a random sample of victims of non-bias assaults. The research found that hate crime victims reported negative “psychological sequelae more often than the non-bias control group on every item we measured.” (McDevitt et al., 2001: 709). However, McDevitt et al. cautioned that their limited sample size and non-representative sample raised “questions about generalizability”. Those questions about representativeness and sample size also affect the earlier research of Herek and colleagues, and Erhlich and colleagues, respectively.

Later research, on the other side of the Atlantic in Britain, overcame these methodological limitations by using larger random samples of crime victims with data from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW)[[3]](#footnote-3). The research demonstrated that hate crime victims are more likely to report post-victimization psychological trauma — even when controlling for crime type (Iganski 2008; Iganski & Lagou 2009; Botcherby et al., 2011; Nocon et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2012: Iganski & Lagou 2014).

The research for this chapter builds on the analyses undertaken of the Crime Survey for England and Wales. The aim was to explore, with similar but different variables in the NCVS, the post-victimization mental impact for hate crime victims compared with victims of non-bias crime. The objective was to test whether the greater post-victimization mental impact reported by hate crime victims in the CSEW is also evidenced by the National Crime Victimization Survey — thereby strengthening the reliability of the observation that ‘hate crimes hurt more’ (Iganski 2001).

**Research Design and Sample**

The research involved a secondary analysis of data collected by the U.S. National Crime Victimization Survey. The survey has been collecting data on crimes motivated by hate since 2003. The NCVS data are collected from a nationally representative interview sample of approximately 90,000 households, comprising nearly 160,000 persons (aged 12 and above) every year.[[4]](#footnote-4) Our analysis combined data from four collection years of the NCVS—2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 (the four most recent data sets at the time of writing)—to enable sufficient sample size for exploratory disaggregated analysis.

*A victim-centered approach to categorizing hate crime*

Respondents in the survey are asked if they experienced certain types of crimes in the previous six months. From the four collection years combined for the analysis 30,855 crime incidents were reported in the survey. For each crime incident reported, respondents are asked an array of questions. In one question it is put to the respondent that: “Hate crimes or crimes of prejudice or bigotry occur when (an offender/offenders) target(s) people because of one or more of their characteristics or religious beliefs. Do you have any reason to suspect the incident just discussed was a hate crime or crime of prejudice or bigotry?”

Respondents are then asked: “Do you suspect the offender(s) targeted you because of…(a) Your race? (b) Your religion? (c) Your ethnic background or national origin (for example, people of Hispanic origin)? (d) Any disability (by this I mean physical, mental, or developmental disabilities) you may have? (e) Your gender? (f) Your sexual orientation? (by this we mean homosexual, bisexual, or heterosexual).” Incidents for which respondents answered “yes” to any of these questions are coded as ‘hate crime’.[[5]](#footnote-5)

However, in our analysis we extend the capture of hate crime incidents beyond the BJS categorization because in another question, victims of crime incidents who have health conditions, impairments or disabilities are asked: “…do you have any reason to suspect you were victimized because of your health condition(s), impairment(s), or disability(ies)?” We include crime incidents where victims answered “yes” to this question in our own category of hate crime and in a sub-category we label ‘disability/health hate crime’.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Using our categorization of hate crime incidents, overall, 1-in-20 crime incidents captured by the survey (5%) were perceived by victims to have been hate motivated (Table 1) — covering both contact (or violent) crime incidents and non-contact crime incidents (or non-violent crime such as property crime), amounting to 1,117 hate crime incidents.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Female victims of crime were just as likely as male victims to believe that the crime incidents were hate motivated. White victims appear to be slightly more likely than Black/African American, Latino/Hispanic, and Asian victims to believe that they were victims of hate motivated crimes (although the observed differences are not statistically significant), while those classified in the ‘Other’ racial and ethnic groups combined were the most likely. Victims in the oldest age group, 55 and above, were the most likely to believe that crime incidents they experienced were hate motivated.

**Table 1. Proportions of incidents of NCVS reported crime believed to**

**be hate motivated: by sex, race, and age of respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  | United States, respondents aged 12 and above | |
| Row percentages | % of incidents |  |
| Female | 5 |  |
| Male | 5 |  |
| White | 5 |  |
| Black/African American | 4 |  |
| Hispanic/Latino | 4 |  |
| Asian | 4 |  |
| Other | 8 |  |
| 12-17 | 6 |  |
| 18-34 | 3 |  |
| 35-54 | 5 |  |
| 55+ | 7 |  |
| All incidents | 5 |  |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

Incidents of crime believed to have been motivated on grounds of the victim’s disability or health condition accounted for the highest proportion — nearly half — of all incidents believed to be hate motivated. In a smaller proportion of incidents, but still relatively large at just over one-third of all hate crime incidents, victims believed that there was more than one bias motivation (or multiple bias motivations) at work — indicating what has been coined as the ‘intersectionality’ of much hate crime (Mason-Bish 2015).

**Table 2. Incidents of NCVS reported crime believed to be hate motivated:**

**by type of hate motivation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | |  |
|  | United States,  respondents aged 12 and above | |
| Column percentages | % of incidents | | |  |
| Race | 7 |  | | |
| Religion | 2 |  | | |
| Ethnicity | 2 |  | | |
| Disability/Health condition | 45 |  | | |
| Gender | 3 |  | | |
| Sexuality | 3 |  | | |
| Association | 2 |  | | |
| Perception | 0 |  | | |
| Multiple hate motivations | 36 |  | | |
| n, all motivations | 1117 |  | | |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

**Experience of socio-emotional distress following hate crime victimization**

For every incident of reported violent crime victimization in the NCVS — rape and sexual assault, robbery and attempted robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault — victims are asked “How distressing was being a victim of this crime to you? Was it not at all distressing, mildly distressing, moderately distressing, or severely distressing?” (This question is not asked of victims of non-violent crimes).[[8]](#footnote-8)

Victims of violent hate crime incidents were more likely to report moderate or severe post victimization distress when compared with victims of non-bias violent crime. This differential impact between hate crime incidents and non-bias crime incidents holds even when controlling for type of violent crime, sex, age group, and race (Table 3) — with most differences statistically significant.

There are differences within each of these respondent groupings for both hate motivated and non-bias violent crime incidents:

* When considering the association of crime type with reported post-victimization distress, given that the numbers of victims of hate motivated rape and sexual assault, and also victims of robbery and attempted robbery, were small (below 50 for each group), we combined them into one crime category. Victims in incidents of crime in this category — both hate motivated and otherwise motivated — reported the highest rate of moderate or severe post-victimization distress compared with victims of aggravated assault, with a larger difference evident when compared with victims of hate motivated simple assault. (Although the difference between hate-motivated and non-bias motivated rape/sexual assault/robbery/attempted robbery incidents is not statistically significant).

**Table 3. Proportions of victims of violent hate crime incidents reporting that they were moderately or severely distressed following victimization compared with victims of non-bias violent crimes.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | United States,  respondents aged 12 and above | |
|  |  | Hate motivated crime incidents | Non-bias crime incidents |
|  | Row percentages | % of incidents | % of incidents |
| Crime type | Rape/sexual assault/robbery/attempted robbery | 82 | 69 |
|  | Aggravated assault | 80 | 55 |
|  | Simple assault | 71 | 44 |
|  | All violent crime | 75 | 50 |
| Sex | Female | 87 | 63 |
|  | Male | 64 | 38 |
|  | All | 75 | 50 |
| Age | 12-17 | 59 | 44 |
|  | 18-34 | 62 | 45 |
|  | 35-54 | 85 | 55 |
|  | 55+ | 90 | 65 |
|  | All ages | 75 | 50 |
| Race | White | 75 | 52 |
|  | Black | 72 | 48 |
|  | Hispanic/Latino | 76 | 45 |
|  | Asian | 70 | 37 |
|  | Other | 77 | 56 |
|  | All race groups | 75 | 50 |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

* Female victims of violent crimes reported substantially higher levels of moderate or severe post-victimization distress than male victims.
* When age group is considered there is an evident association between rising age and reported rate of moderate and severe post-victimization distress — for both hate motivated and non-bias crime incidents. (Although the differences in proportions between hate-motivated and non-bias motivated incidents for the 12-17 and 18-34 age groups are not statistically significant).
* There are relatively smaller differences between categories of respondents when race is considered. . (And the differences in proportions between hate-motivated and non-bias motivated incidents for the Asian and Other groups are not statistically significant).

However, despite these differences within respondent groupings it is important to emphasize that the greater rate of moderate or severe post-victimization distress reported for hate crime incidents in the main holds across all categories of crime type, sex, age, and race. While there will be differences between individual respondents in rates of reported post-victimization distress, as well as differences between categories of respondents, these findings provide prima facie evidence that hate crimes ‘hurt more’ on average when compared with parallel crimes.

The differential impact between violent hate crime incidents and non-bias violent crime incidents in respect of reported moderate or severe post victimization distress is also evident when we temporarily separate out from our hate crime category of incidents those crime incidents in which victims perceived that they were targeted because of any health conditions, impairments or disabilities (Figure 1).[[9]](#footnote-9) The apparent difference in proportions between our categories of ‘Hate crime incidents’ and ‘Hate crime incidents suspected targeted because of health condition’ are not statistically significant. These findings provided the rationale for our inclusion of ‘health crime’ incidents into a single hate crime incidents category used for the analysis reported in this chapter.



The post-victimization distress experienced by crime victims is measured in further ways by the NCVS. Victims of violent crime incidents are also asked if their experience of victimization lead to them having significant problems with their job or schoolwork, or trouble with their boss, co-workers, or peers.



They are also asked if being a victim of the crime lead to them having significant problems with family members or friends, including getting into more arguments or fights than before, not feeling that they could trust them as much, or not feeling as close to them as before (Figure 2).

In the case of these types of post-victimization impact only a minority of victims in violent crime incidents — both hate motivated and otherwise motivated — reported significant problems. While victims of incidents of hate motivated crime incidents were more likely than victims of non-bias violent crime to report such problems the observed differences are not statistically significant.

**The psychological impact of hate crime incidents**

For every violent crime incident reported in the NCVS, those victims who reported moderate or severe distress, or significant problems with their job or school work, or with family are asked about post-victimization psychological impacts: “Still thinking about your distress associated with being a victim of this crime did you feel any of the following ways for a month or more? Did you feel ...(a) Worried or anxious? (b) Angry? (c) Sad or depressed? (d) Vulnerable? (e) Violated? (f) Like you couldn’t trust people? (g) Unsafe? (f) Some other way?”

The terms ‘emotional’ and ‘psychological’ impact are frequently used interchangeably in academic, professional and everyday discourse. However, arguably, by asking about the impact of crime victimization persisting for a month or more this particular NCVS question goes beyond short-term feelings (which we would categorize as emotional reaction) and gauges more sustained mental impact (which we categorize as psychological reaction).[[10]](#footnote-10)

For each type of post-victimization psychological reaction higher proportions of victims in violent hate crime incidents reported the symptoms compared with victims in non-bias violent incidents (Figure 3). Each observed difference, apart from ‘Mistrust’ is statistically significant.



In addition to questions about psychological symptoms, victims of violent crime incidents are also asked about psychosomatic symptoms, experienced for a month or more, which provide a further measure of the psychological impact of victimization. They are asked: “Did you experience any of the following physical problems associated with being a victim of this crime for a month or more? Did you experience ...(a) Headaches? (b) Trouble sleeping? (c) Changes in your eating or drinking habits? (d) Upset stomach? (e) Fatigue? (f) High blood pressure? (g) Muscle tension or back pain? (h) Some other physical problem?” Again, by asking about symptoms for a month or more, any reported psychosomatic symptoms will be an indicator not of short-term emotional distress, but of more sustained psychological impact.



In general, smaller proportions of victims of hate crime incidents and victims of non-bias crime incidents reported psychosomatic symptoms compared with the reporting of psychological symptoms (Figure 4). However, it is noticeable that consistently higher proportions of victims of hate crime incidents reported each measured psychosomatic symptom when compared with victims of non-bias crime incidents. Each observed difference, apart from ‘Other’ is statistically significant.

**Conclusion**

The objective of the analysis presented in this chapter was to test out whether differences between the mental trauma experienced by hate crime victims and victims of otherwise motivated crime demonstrated by analyses of data from the Crime Survey for England and Wales are also evident in the data collected by the U.S. National Crime Victimization Survey — thereby strengthening the reliability of the observation that ‘hate crimes hurt more’. The analysis we present confirms that hate crime as a category of offence is more serious than similar but otherwise motivated crimes in respect of the greater post-victimization mental and psychological trauma experienced by victims. Hate crime victims demonstrate similar, but more severe impacts, compared with victims of parallel crimes. Understanding the potentially more severe impact of hate crime compared with non-bias crime is critical for appropriate victim support.

**APPENDIX TABLE 1**

**Standard errors for Table 1. Proportions of incidents of NCVS reported**

**crime believed to be hate motivated: by sex, race, and age of respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  | United States, respondents aged 12 and above | |
|  | Standard error |  |
| Female | 0.2% |  |
| Male | 0.3 |  |
| White | 0.2 |  |
| Black/African American | 0.4 |  |
| Hispanic/Latino | 0.3 |  |
| Asian | 0.7 |  |
| Other | 0.9 |  |
| 12-17 | 0.6 |  |
| 18-34 | 0.2 |  |
| 35-54 | 0.3 |  |
| 55+ | 0.4 |  |
| All incidents | 0.2 |  |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

**APPENDIX TABLE 2**

**Standard errors for Table 2. Incidents of NCVS reported crime believed to**

**be hate motivated: by type of hate motivation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | |  |
|  | United States,  respondents aged 12 and above | | |
|  | Standard error | | | |  |
| Race | 0.8% | |  | | |
| Religion | 0.4 |  | | | |
| Ethnicity | 0.4 |  | | | |
| Disability/Health condition | 1.7 |  | | | |
| Gender | 0.5 |  | | | |
| Sexuality | 0.5 |  | | | |
| Association | 0.4 |  | | | |
| Perception | 0.0 |  | | | |
| Multiple hate motivations | 1.6 |  | | | |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

**APPENDIX TABLE 3**

**Standard errors for Table 3. Proportions of victims of violent hate crime incidents reporting that they were moderately or severely distressed following victimization compared with victims of non-bias violent crimes.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | United States,  respondents aged 12 and above | | |
|  |  | Hate motivated crime incidents | Non-bias crime incidents | |
|  |  | Standard error | Standard error | |
| Crime type | Rape/sexual assault/robbery/attempted robbery | 4.7% | | 3.2% |
|  | Aggravated assault | 5.2 | 3.3 | |
|  | Simple assault | 3.9 | 2.1 | |
|  | All violent crime | 3.2 | 2.0 | |
| Sex | Female | 3.1 | 2.4 | |
|  | Male | 4.3 | 2.2 | |
|  | All | 3.2 | 2.0 | |
| Age | 12-17 | 6.4 | 3.2 | |
|  | 18-34 | 5.2 | 2.4 | |
|  | 35-54 | 3.6 | 2.8 | |
|  | 55+ | 4.1 | 3.7 | |
|  | All ages | 3.2 | 2.0 | |
| Race | White | 3.6 | 2.2 | |
|  | Black | 6.7 | 3.4 | |
|  | Hispanic/Latino | 6.0 | 3.3 | |
|  | Asian | 14.6 | 6.1 | |
|  | Other | 7.5 | 4.9 | |
|  | All race groups | 3.2 | 2.0 | |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

**APPENDIX TABLE 4**

**Standard errors for Figure 1. Proportions of victims of NCVS crime**

**incidents reporting moderate or severe post-victimization distress**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | |  | |
|  | United States,  respondents aged 12 and above | | | | |
|  | Standard error | | | |  |
| Hate crime incidents | 3.6% | |  | | |
| Hate crime incidents suspected targeted because of health condition | 4.1 |  | | | |
| Non-bias crime incidents | 2.0 |  | | | |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

**APPENDIX TABLE 5**

**Standard errors for Figure 2. Post-victimization socio-emotional impact of violent crime: NCVS hate crime incidents and non-bias crime incidents**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | United States,  respondents aged 12 and above | |
|  |  | Hate motivated crime incidents | Non-bias crime incidents |
|  |  | Standard error | Standard error |
|  | Significant problems with job or schoolwork | 1.8% | 0.7% |
|  | Significant problems with family members or friends | 2.1 | 1.0 |
|  | Both | 2.2 | 0.9 |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

**APPENDIX TABLE 6**

**Standard errors for Figure 3. Post-victimization psychological reactions to violent crime: NCVS hate crime incidents and non-bias crime incidents.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | United States,  respondents aged 12 and above | | |
|  | Hate motivated crime incidents | Non-bias crime incidents | |
|  | Standard error | Standard error | |
| Anxious | 3.0% | | 2.2% |
| Angry | 3.1 | 2.2 | |
| Sad or depressed | 3.7 | 2.3 | |
| Vulnerable | 3.5 | 2.3 | |
| Violated | 3.6 | 2.3 | |
| Mistrust | 3.7 | 2.3 | |
| Unsafe | 3.3 | 2.3 | |
| Other | 3.0 | 1.2 | |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

**APPENDIX TABLE 7**

**Standard errors for Figure 4. Post-victimization psychosomatic reaction to violent crime: NCVS hate crime incidents and non-bias crime incidents.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | United States,  respondents aged 12 and above | | |
|  | Hate motivated crime incidents | Non-bias crime incidents | |
|  | Standard error | Standard error | |
| Headaches | 3.8% | | 1.9% |
| Trouble sleeping | 3.8 | 2.3 | |
| Changes to eating/drinking | 3.6 | 1.9 | |
| Upset stomach | 3.8 | 2.0 | |
| Fatigue | 3.8 | 2.1 | |
| High blood pressure | 3.3 | 1.4 | |
| Muscle tension | 3.8 | 2.0 | |
| Other | 2.3 | 1.0 | |

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey

2010, 2011, 2012, 2013
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1. In this chapter we use the term ‘bias crime’ as an alternative to the term ‘hate crime’. We also use ‘non-bias crime’, ‘parallel crime’, and ‘otherwise motivated crime’ to refer to crimes that are not motivated by hate or bias. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Although usually without comparison groups of non-bias crime victims, given the resource demands of in-depth qualitative research. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Formerly known as the British Crime Survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=245 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See note 7 below. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. It is important to emphasize that our categorization of hate crime incidents is more inclusive than the BJS categorization. In reporting NCVS hate crime data the BJS (cf. Wilson 2014) does not include respondents who believed they were victimized because of their health conditions, impairments or disabilities, unless they respond elsewhere in the interview - when the focus is on hate crime - that they suspected they were targeted because of a disability they might have. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The BJS counting of NCVS hate crime incidents is confined to incidents confirmed by the police as bias-motivated and incidents perceived by victims to be bias-motivated because the offender used hate language or left behind hate symbols. This categorization excludes incidents where there was no police confirmation or tangible evidence that they were hate crimes. By contrast, in our analysis we take a victim-centred approach to the categorization of hate crime by counting all crime incidents which the victims believed were bias-motivated — even in the absence of police confirmation or tangible evidence. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Consequently, our sample size for analysis reduces to 531 hate crime incidents and 5016 non-bias crime incidents. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. But in the interview section which focuses on hate crime did not say that they suspected they were targeted because of a disability they might have. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Our categorization provides a further divergence from the BJS reporting of NCVS data where all of the impacts we are discussing in this chapter are generically referred to as ‘socio-emotional impact’ (cf. Langton & Truman 2014). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)