PsySSA
Psychological Society
of South Africa

Emotional consequences of hate incidents: experiences of a South African cohort

Amori Marais[1], Juan A Nel[1]
and Rajen Govender[2]

Abstract

The consequences of hate incidents are far greater than transgressions without an underlying bias motive. The powerful emotional and psychological effect observed in victims of hate rests in the perpetrator attacking the identity or an unchangeable characteristic of a victim. Within South Africa, these effects are compounded by the country's legacy of discrimination and oppression; thus, the potential consequences of hate victimisation within this context extend beyond the emotional. This justifies differential retributive and restorative measures following such incidents; however, legislative and policy frameworks to respond to hate victimisation are only in the beginning stages. The scarcity of empirical research on hate incidents and their consequences in South Africa renders this investigation the first of its kind. The researchers aimed to determine the demographic and situational variables that put individuals at a higher risk for experiencing emotional consequences as a result of hate victimisation. Descriptive statistics and logistic regression modelling were used to analyse data ($n = 409$, Mean Age = 31.5). Results indicate a higher vulnerability of emotional consequences if a victim is exposed to economic consequences, if the offender is known to the victim, and if the victim identifies as Black African. Sex and type of incident (hate crimes, hate speech, and intentional unfair discrimination) showed no significant relationship with emotional consequences. The results enable greater insight into victim experiences of emotional consequences and motivate prioritising psychosocial health care, targeted interventions, and relevant legislative and policy frameworks for victims and communities affected by hate incidents.

[1]Department of Psychology, University of South Africa, South Africa
[2]Institute for Social and Health Sciences, University of South Africa, South Africa

Corresponding author:
Juan A Nel, Department of Psychology, University of South Africa, PO Box 511, Groenkloof, Pretoria 0027, South Africa.
Email: nelja@unisa.ac.za

Hate incidents are distinguishable from other acts of victimisation without a bias motive as they inflict greater harms on the victim[1] (Ignaski, 2001). Thus, the consequences of hate incidents surpass what is explicitly visible and include deeper psychological and/or emotional lesions (Ignaski, 2001; McDevitt et al., 2001). These lesions can be divided into two interrelated categories: psychic injury and the *in terrorem* effect (Ignaski, 2001). Psychic injury refers to the emotional and psychological consequences associated with victimisation, whereas the *in terrorem* effect denotes hateful messages to the victim and their community. Perhaps the largest contribution to the powerful psychological effects observed in victims of hate is that perpetrators attack the self (identity) of the victim, and in most cases, motivations for such acts are based on an ascribed characteristic, which is often unchangeable and/or fixed (Mellgren et al., 2017; Pieterse et al., 2018). The effect of an attack on the self is captured in the following statement: 'now I know I was targeted and I was chosen for something about myself that I can't change, that is at the core of my being, that I wouldn't want to change, that is unique to who I am' (Ignaski, 2001, p. 628). Thus, the distinction of hate-motivated incidents is not about the severity of the injury sustained, but rather the compounding effects of the circumstances of the incident.

Underlying messages of intolerance, mistrust, resentment, and discrimination may result in trauma and undermining of social cohesion, which could lead to hostility, anxiety, and distrust between different communities (Breen et al., 2016; Breen & Nel, 2011; Perry, 2003). Walters and Hoyle (2011) recognise that the majority of hate incidents are perpetrated by parties known to the victims, which exacerbates the emotional trauma. Hate incidents also perpetuate negative stereotypes that enhance intergroup tensions (Boeckmann & Turpin-Petrosino, 2002). This is based on evidence that hate incidents do not only affect individuals but effects extend to the larger group to which that individual belongs and may instil fear or anger within those groups (Ignaski, 2001; Nel & Mitchell, 2019; Perry, 2003). Vulnerable populations could be targeted on the premise of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender diversity, nationality, religion, age, mental/physical disability, and other similar characteristics (Breen & Nel, 2011; Department of Justice and Constitutional Development [DoJ&CD] and Foundation of Human Rights [FHR], 2013; Nel & Mitchell, 2019; Pieterse et al., 2018). These vulnerable and marginalised individuals are at a heightened risk for fear, depression, and anxiety (McDevitt et al., 2001). The heightened emotional and psychological consequences for vulnerable and marginalised individuals are very apparent in the South African society, based on the country's history of colonialism and apartheid (Breen et al., 2016; South African Human Rights Commission [SAHRC] vs Qwelane Equality court proceedings, as cited in Judge & Nel, 2018). The added psychological consequences strengthen justifications for differential punishment and attention to these incidents (Breen & Nel, 2011; Ignaski, 2001).

Based on the high prevalence of violent (contact) crimes and the lack of legislative recognition of hate incidents in South Africa, the Hate Crimes Working Group (HCWG)[2] set out to determine the nature of hate-motivated incidents in South Africa (Mitchell & Nel, 2017; Nel et al., 2013).

Contextualising hate incidents in South Africa

South Africa's history of institutionalised discrimination under colonialism and apartheid forms the backdrop for understanding hate victimisation (Breen et al., 2016). Given the extremely compromised position of Black Africans during apartheid, their experiences need to be understood most pointedly in relation to Whites.[3] The country is increasingly known for continued struggles with injustices and violent crimes, regardless of its internationally recognised progressive legislative framework (Breen et al., 2016). This contradicts the principles on which post-apartheid South Africa was founded, which enshrines individuals' rights to safety and security, human dignity,

equality, and social justice (Republic of South Africa, 1996). Hate incidents do not yet have the necessary recognition and intervention strategies by legislators, policy makers, and authorities within South Africa, and therefore, it is imperative to present stakeholders with accurate data on the nature and impact of such incidents.

A lack of legislative recognition becomes even more problematic when considering other factors contributing to vulnerability, such as socio-economic status (SES) which affects individuals' access to resources, power, privilege, and ultimately their ability to effectively cope with such incidents (Williams, 2012). This indicates that alongside overt forms of violence, there are everyday occurrences of symbolic violence, oppression, and structural and institutional discrimination. Symbolic violence is interpreted as a form of internalised oppression or humiliation, which legitimises inequality and hierarchies of expression of class power and this could take many forms including: sexism, racism, and heterosexism (Perry, 2003; Pieterse et al., 2018). Societal norms as shaped by histories determine hierarchical patterns of domination versus subordination and the accompanying advantage and disadvantage (Williams, 2012). These social hierarchies are based on social groups; groups of individuals sharing a range of cultural and/or social characteristics (Hardiman et al., 2007).

Normative social practices form collectives and so-doing establish symbolic boundaries between different social groupings, which in turn categorise individuals and mobilise different forms of oppressions (Judge & Nel, 2018; Pieterse et al., 2018). Thus, broader societal norms are influential in determining the beneficiaries of privilege and targets of oppression and are understood as the benchmark against which hate is perpetrated. Oppression manifests in, among others, political, economic, cultural, and social structures (Pieterse et al., 2018). Patterns of racial discrimination are still prominent in mainstream institutions in South Africa and promote benefits to White people, while Black Africans continue to incur costs.

Historically, the following social groupings within South Africa, among others, have been subjected to hate victimisation based on the dominant hetero-cis-normative ideology, rendering such groups as minorities: Black Africans, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons, and Jewish persons (Breen et al., 2016). Non-conformity to established societal norms may communicate being non-deserving of respect, human dignity, and safety, to an individual and the larger community to which they belong.

Defining hate incidents

As will become evident in this article, reference is made to hate incidents as an inclusive term for hate crimes, hate speech, and intentional unfair discrimination (IUD).[4] The term is preferred over hate crimes as it conveys a more in-depth connotation of hate victimisation incorporating other terms such as targeted hostility, prejudice, and bias, as well as associated discrimination (Hardy & Chakraborti, 2016; Nel & Mitchell, 2019). As such, hate incidents include but are not limited to: robbery/theft, damage to property, illegal eviction, assault, threatening with a weapon, assault with intent of grievous bodily harm, murder, (corrective) rape, attempted murder, sexual assault, extortion/blackmail, arson, intimidation, harassment, and/or defamation of character/harm to dignity, all notably with a bias motive (Mitchell & Nel, 2017).

A hate crime is defined as a criminal offence that conveys and is motivated by prejudice, bias, and/or hostility towards an individual's intrinsic identity (Hardy & Chakraborti, 2016; Perry, 2003). Evidently, hate crimes contain two main parts: an act categorised as a crime under criminal law and a bias motive based on the perception of 'otherness', when selecting the victim (Boeckmann & Turpin-Petrosino, 2002; Nel et al., 2013). While hate crimes may be targeted at a particular

individual, the effects of the attacks spread to the entire group to which that individual belongs (Mellgren et al., 2017).

Hate speech is the act of expressing publicly or intentionally hatred towards another person or groups of persons based on the identified characteristics that serve as a motive for hate-motivated incidents (DoJ&CD & FHR, 2013; Nel et al., 2013). Hate speech may be internalised by victims and lead to feelings of inferiority, self-doubt, self-loathing, and often suicide ideation (SAHRC vs Qwelane Equality court proceedings, as cited in Judge & Nel, 2018). On the other hand, IUD is characterised as intentionally engaging in conduct, which unfairly discriminates directly or indirectly against other individuals or group of individuals on the basis of a range of intrinsic characteristics (DoJ&CD & FHR, 2013; Nel et al., 2013). In addition, IUD also includes perpetuating systematic disadvantage and undermining human dignity (DoJ&CD & FHR, 2013).

Evidently, the acts constituting hate incidents are very diverse and have the ability to leave varying intensities of tacit emotional scars, alongside the more physical, mental, spiritual, economic, and relational consequences. Based on the differing constituents of hate crimes, hate speech, and IUD, it is anticipated that the severity of emotional consequences will vary. Alongside the identified consequences, the intense feelings of displacement and non-belonging experienced as a result of victimisation could manifest in intense emotional consequences. Therefore, emotional changes, indicative of distress or trauma, may be observed in victims, either as a direct response to the hate incident or as a secondary response to another change.

Distinguishing the different changes resulting from hate incidents

For this investigation, the emotional consequences of hate incidents are measured by the self-reporting of changes in victims, respectively, including emotional, mental, economic, and physical changes. These self-reported changes were included in the Hate and Bias Crimes Monitoring Form (hereafter the Monitoring Form)[5] and are conceptualised in the accompanying User Guide: Hate and Bias Crimes Monitoring Form[6] (Nel et al., 2013).

Emotional changes refer to distress or trauma experienced by victims and may manifest as guilt, grief, fear, anxiety, severe panic, denial, depression, emotional shock, feeling overwhelmed, uncertainty, and irritability (Nel et al., 2013). However, mental changes are conceptualised as affecting a victim's ability to function normally or when their level of cognitive functioning decreases or becomes less effective during and after the traumatic event (Nel et al., 2013). Accordingly, mental distress could manifest as poor attention; concentration and decision making; memory problems; loss of time, place, or person orientation; nightmares; and heightened or lowered alertness.

It is necessary to draw a clear distinction between emotional and mental changes, as the terms may appear overlapping but in the literature are comprised of very specific defining 'symptoms'. While mental changes may seem synonymous to emotional changes, they manifest in different ways. The main focus for this investigation is emotional changes, as the term connotes more general psychological changes than mental changes, which describe specific clinical changes observed in victims. Also, the Monitoring Form enabled more complete capturing of emotional consequences which allowed more conclusive analyses with other variables.

Nel et al. (2013) identify economic changes as:

loss of employment due to serious physical injuries such as brain damage, sustained in an assault. Serious emotional damage such as severe depression as a result of, for instance, an onslaught on someone's pride and dignity during a hate incident, similarly may impact on someone's work functioning or ability to achieve success. (p. 27)

Finally, physical changes refer to the loss of a limb or body function after a serious assault and other symptoms where the victim may require emergency health care services. These symptoms include, but are not limited to, muscle tremors, chest pain, elevated blood pressure, rapid heart rate, nausea and vomiting, and shock symptoms (Nel et al., 2013). The interrelatedness between economic, emotional, mental, and physical changes is thus very apparent and reflects a victim's impaired ability to function normally and contribute meaningfully to society. While emotional consequences are not the same as emotional changes, the literature suggests such changes may, indeed, be indicative of emotional consequences. Therefore, it is vital to further investigate the consequence of the changes as a result of hate victimisation, in South Africa (Mitchell & Nel, 2017).

The objective for this study is to determine the demographic and situational variables that put individuals at a higher risk for experiencing emotional consequences as a result of hate victimisation. Informed by the literature review, the following is hypothesised in relation to the selected variables: (a) women are more likely than men to suffer emotional consequences of hate incidents; (b) Black Africans are more likely than Whites, in particular, to suffer emotional consequences of hate incidents; (c) emotional consequences will be impacted by incident type (hate crime, hate speech, or IUD); and (d) emotional consequences are more likely to occur if the offender is known to the victim.

Method

Participants

The original dataset includes 1061 cases of which 945 cases were suitable for analysis after initial data cleaning. Given the focus of this article, the sample for this specific investigation was 409 victims of hate incidents, with an average age of 31.5 years. Participant demographics appear in Table 1 in the 'Results' section.

Instruments

The data were obtained using the Hate and Bias Crime Monitoring Form, a bespoke self-report questionnaire developed by the HCWG to represent the characteristics of hate incidents and hate victims in the local context. The instrument is not a standardised (nor psychometric) instrument, but rather a monitoring tool and therefore does not have (nor require) validity/reliability statistics. The Monitoring Form mainly consists of closed-ended questions, with a few open-ended questions for obtaining clarification on responses provided. The seven sections, respectively, cover the following: general information; the victim details and background; the incident details and characteristics; details on the alleged offender(s); details of police presence and activity at the incident and thereafter; victim access to and use of health care assistance and support; and finally, details of previous incidents experienced by the victim. Importantly, these seven sections in the Monitoring Form enquired about and allowed for representation of the characteristics of hate incidents and hate victims in the local context, extending beyond the critical dependent variable (emotional consequences). During interviews, changes that may, indeed, be suggestive of emotional consequences were mostly self-reported by interviewees and/or inferred by fieldworkers when data sources other than interviews were used.

Procedure

Primary data on hate incidents in South Africa was collected for the period 2013–2017 by the HCWG. Volunteers from at least 85 organisations, including the Psychological Society of South

Table 1. Sample descriptive characteristics.

	n	%
Emotional changes		
Yes	325	79.5
No	84	20.5
Physical changes		
Yes	99	24.2
No	310	75.8
Economic changes		
Yes	195	47.7
No	214	52.3
Mental changes		
Yes	38	9.3
No	371	90.7
Incident type		
Hate crime	148	36.2
Hate speech	120	29.3
IUD	141	34.5
Offender known to victim		
Known	213	52.1
Unknown	196	47.9
Victim nationality		
Non-national	251	61.4
National	158	38.6
Victim race		
Black African	388	94.9
White	21	5.1
Victim sex		
Female	117	28.6
Male	292	71.4

IUD: intentional unfair discrimination.

Africa (PsySSA) Student Division, were trained in the administration of the Monitoring Form and assisted to source and collect the information. The Monitoring Form allows for self-reporting of the hate incident in response to relevant items in the instrument and interviewees are primarily responsible for the interpretation of changes that occurred. To enable continuity and support of the form usage, a User Guide (see Nel et al., 2013) was designed alongside the form as a resource to train and assist those gathering data.

Ethical considerations

The ethical principles summarised in the Belmont report were used as the foundation for this research study. This includes respect for persons, beneficence and non-maleficence (minimising risk and maximising benefits for participants), justice, and non-discrimination against participants. The study received clearance on 14 November 2014 from the Ethics Committee of the Department of Psychology, University of South Africa.

Data analysis

The data were analysed using descriptive statistics and logistic regression modelling for the purpose of mitigating the effects of small sample sizes due to missing data on selected variables. It thus provides a more robust account of the statistically significant effects for explanatory variables. All analyses were performed using the IBM Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS), Version 25.

The outcome variable for the logistic regression analysis was whether or not the respondent experienced emotional changes as a consequence of the victimisation they suffered. The outcome variable is a binary variable with the experience of emotional changes as the category of interest. The following explanatory variables were included in the analysis.

Type of hate incident – this variable distinguished the type of hate incident experienced, differentiated into the three categories identified in the introduction: hate crimes and hate speech, as opposed to IUD (reference category).

Victim race – this variable differentiated between Black Africans and Whites (reference category).

Victim sex – biological sex was categorised as either female or male (reference category).

Offender Known – this variable distinguished whether the offender was known or unknown to the victim (reference category).

Nationality – this variable differentiated between non-nationals and nationals (reference category).

Physical changes – these are physical changes that occurred as a result of the victimisation, differentiated into occurrence or non-occurrence (reference category).

Mental changes – these are mental changes that occurred as a result of the victimisation, differentiated into occurrence or non-occurrence (reference category).

Economic changes – these are economic changes that occurred as a result of the victimisation, differentiated into occurrence or non-occurrence (reference category).

Two additional variables included in the research were excluded from the present analysis due to the very high proportion of missing values: Sexual Orientation (34.6% missing cases) and Gender Identity (55% missing cases).

Results

Descriptives

71.4% of the sample were male, with 61.4% being non-nationals, and the majority being Black Africans (94.9%). There was almost an equal distribution of hate crimes (36.2%), hate speech (29.3%), and IUD (34.5%) among the cohort. In 52.1% of incidents, victims knew their offender. Table 1 provides an overall sample description.

Logistic regression analyses

A logistic regression model was tested examining the effects of all of the explanatory variables in differentiating the likelihood of victims experiencing emotional changes as a

Table 2. Logistic regression analyses assessing emotional changes in victims.

	OR	95% CI
Emotional changes (Yes)		
Physical changes		
Yes	1.40	[0.76, 2.61]
No[a]		
Economic changes		
Yes	**3.92****	[2.04, 7.53]
No[a]		
Mental changes		
Yes	1.44	[0.57, 3.64]
No[a]		
Type of hate incident		
Hate crimes	0.58	[0.27, 1.21]
Hate speech	1.23	[0.55, 2.78]
IUD[a]		
Offender known to victim		
Yes	**1.95***	[1.07, 3.55]
No[a]		
Victim nationality		
Non-national	0.49	[0.26, 0.92]
National[a]		
Victim race		
Black African	**4.19****	[1.47, 11.99]
White[a]		
Victim sex		
Female	0.74	[0.42, 1.32]
Male[a]		

OR: odds ratio; CI: 95% confidence interval; IUD: intentional unfair discrimination.
Reference category for the dependent variable is Emotional Changes (No).
[a]Reference category.
*$p < .10$; **$p < .01$.

consequence of their victimisation. The model produced confidence intervals (CIs) for the estimated odd ratios. Odds ratios (ORs) with CIs including the neutral value of 1 are deemed non-significant in this method. The overall model was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 48.357$, $p = .00$), indicating that the explanatory variables collectively differentiated whether or not the victim suffered emotional changes. As seen in Table 2, the following variables are statistically significant in the model.

Victims who experience economic consequences as a result of their victimisation are significantly more likely to suffer emotional changes (OR = 3.92, CI = [2.04, 7.53]). This result is robust in the context of all other explanatory variables in the model. Emotional changes are almost twice more likely to occur if the victim knows the offender (OR = 1.95, CI = [1.07, 3.55]). Finally, Black Africans are significantly more likely than White persons to experience emotional changes as a result of their victimisation (OR = 4.19, CI = [1.47, 11.99]).

Taken together, the model portrays that victims are at a higher vulnerability for emotional consequences if they have also experienced economic changes, if they know the offender and if they

identify as Black African. No significant effects were observed for nationality, gender, type of hate incident, and mental and physical changes experienced.

Discussion

In line with the hypotheses, the results confirm that Black Africans are at a higher vulnerability for emotional consequences as a result of hate victimisation than Whites. Black Africans' heightened vulnerability for emotional consequences as a result of hate victimisation could be attributed to possible re-traumatisation, mirroring the discrimination, oppression, and exploitation experienced during apartheid (Hamber, 1998; SAHRC vs Qwelane court proceeding, as cited in Judge & Nel, 2018). The structural violence and economic impoverishment during apartheid still determines social hierarchies, and access to resources, and opportunities (Hamber, 1998; Hardiman et al., 2007; Williams, 2012). This relates specifically to the varied SES[7] within South Africa and the racialised inequality in the South African labour market, where Black Africans are reported to earn the lowest wages (Statistics South Africa, 2020). In addition, the rise of poverty and unemployment in a low- and middle-income country like South Africa could affect previously disadvantaged communities.

   In terms of the current investigation, SES could greatly influence the availability of relevant resources such as psychologists or counsellors, which may contribute to enhanced emotional consequences and a lack of effective coping after victimisation. This supports Ruane's (2010) identification of language and class as barriers to accessing psychological services. Furthermore, individuals from a lower SES background, living in communities classified as dangerous, are at higher risk for emotional problems based on feelings of vulnerability, anger, and reduced belief in the benevolence of the world (Bell & Perry, 2015). The feelings correlate with a higher prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anger, depressive symptoms, and anxiety among victims of hate incidents (McDevitt et al., 2001). This becomes even more problematic when considering that only 26 of victims included in the current investigation solicited psychosocial health care. Another contributing factor in accessing psychosocial services is that psychology and psychological services in general are still perceived as largely Eurocentric and discounting of unique African epistemic traditions (Nobles & Cooper, 2013). As a result, Black Africans are less likely to solicit psychosocial health care, leaving them at risk for enhanced emotional consequences. Thus, there is a need for decolonisation of health care provision, specifically psychosocial health care, and increased Afrocentric theorising in this space (Nobles & Cooper, 2013).

   Evidently, economic and social positioning has a strong relationship to emotional consequences. As confirmed in the model, emotional and economic changes produced the strongest relationship. The relationship is interpreted as multi-directional, as emotional changes could result in economic changes and changes in economic status could also cause emotional consequences for victims. A combination of economic and emotional consequences could manifest as a decrease in productivity at work and poor labour force participation. The World Health Organization (2011) similarly purports that economic crises and disruptions negatively affect protective factors and increase psychological risk factors for victims, their families, and larger communities. As economic changes predominantly refer to job loss, which affects pride and assessment of success (Nel et al., 2013), evidently, an individual's sense of achievement and ultimately their identity is impacted. Thus, economic disruptions affect victims on a deeper psychological level.

   The results also suggest that an individual is at a higher risk of experiencing emotional consequences, if they know their offender. This confirms McQuade's (2014) assertion that assaults by acquaintances are less likely to be expected by the victim, which might trigger intense feelings of shock. The relationship between the victim and the offender is an important contextual factor

influencing emotional and behavioural responses during specific crimes (McQuade, 2014; Walters & Hoyle, 2011). For example, there is a greater prevalence of PTSD and increased symptom severity if the offender was acquainted with the victim. Acquainted offenders may be more familiar with the routine and lifestyle of victims, which predisposes victims to repeat and ongoing victimisation (Walters & Hoyle, 2011). Victims may therefore be preoccupied with fear of re-traumatisation, while mourning a loss of trust within an established relationship, which portrays the prolonged emotional consequences in cases where the offender is known to the victim (McQuade, 2014; Walters & Hoyle, 2011).

Contrary to the hypotheses, sex and type of incident had no significant effect on emotional consequences for victims. In the broad, it has been established that hate incidents hurt more than parallel incidents without a bias motive, thus the type of incident is not related to the severity of emotional changes in victims (Ignaski, 2001; Nel & Mitchell, 2019). In relation, Cuerden and Blackmore (2020) found that the level of emotional impact is not differentiated by the type of hate incident. Thus, the type of incident does not predict individuals' experiencing emotional consequences among this particular cohort. Likewise, sex is not significant in relation to emotional consequences and it can be assumed that women and men experience similar emotional consequences. Expectations of varying emotional responses to trauma between men and women (Deng et al., 2016) are not supported in this investigation.

The exclusion of certain variables during the model building phase means that the research only includes conclusive interpretations on emotional consequences across specific demographic markers; for example, sexual orientation and gender identity had to be excluded based on the high number of missing cases when analysed in combination with other variables. The exclusion of certain variables also meant that the sample size decreased considerably. Furthermore, the specific nature of data collection employed does not allow generalisability of results. Finally, it ought to be noted that there is some indication in the literature that unequal groups could lead to an OR bias away from one group. Regardless, the results are pioneering in contributing to enhanced understanding of the emotional consequences of hate incidents in South Africa. Excluded variables highlight further avenues for research engagement. A validation study of the monitoring tool, towards strengthening its credibility and applications, may similarly present another research opportunity.

Conclusion

Current analyses enable greater understanding into victim experiences of emotional consequences as a result of hate victimisation. The investigation provides nuanced information on the nature and impact of hate incidents in South Africa, as this research alongside the original HCWG study (Mitchell & Nel, 2017; Nel et al., 2013) are the first of their kind in this context. Thus, the results of this study are very timeous and useful in informing current legislative and policy responses to address hate incidents across the country, which are not yet able to respond appropriately to hate incidents or effectively minimise such occurrences. The results indicate the necessity of multi-level responses to effectively offset hate victimisation, including hate crime legislation in the broad, which will send a clear message that such incidents will not be tolerated.

In addition, the results provide motivation for prioritising psychosocial health care services and targeted interventions to victims of hate incidents to not only alleviate distress but to empower at-risk individuals and their communities. The interplay between the variables in the model allows deeper considerations into the types of interventions necessary in situations of hate victimisation. As a Learned Society, PsySSA, as member of the HCWG, may have an ongoing role in hate studies in the broad, given the severe emotional and psychological consequences and need for psychosocial intervention. To realise social transformation, we need to acknowledge South Africa's legacy

of inequality and prejudice, and we need an informed and unified strategy that ensures enjoyment of basic human rights and equal access to essential services for all citizens.

ORCID iD

Juan A Nel iD https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9013-5563

Notes

1. A strong case is made in recent victimology studies for using the term 'survivor' over 'victim'. The authors, however, think that at the time data was collected the conceptualisation as victim of a hate incident held a stronger connotation than the term survivor, especially in relation to emotional consequences. The word victim is also central to the Prevention and Combating of Hate Crimes and Hate Speech Bill (Department of Justice and Correctional Services, 2018), as well as the Victim Support Services Bill (Department of Social Development, 2019).
2. The Hate Crimes Working Group (HCWG) is a multi-sector network of civil society organisations covering a cross-section of vulnerable sectors and people at risk of prejudice-motivated attacks. The working group was established in late 2009 with the common goal of lobbying for interventions to address hate crimes in South Africa and has been playing an essential role in advocating and lobbying for legislative changes significant to hate incidents (Nel et al., 2013).
3. The racial terms 'Black African', 'Coloured', 'Indian', and 'White' were created through apartheid laws to refer to various race/population groups. There are heightened concerns regarding race categorisation and reporting on race in the current climate informing the authors' decision to do so consistent with the categories identified by Statistics South Africa. These terms are used because of their significance as a result of the differential manner in which apartheid laws impacted, and continue to impact, on the lives of various groups of South Africans and usage does not imply acceptance of apartheid assumptions. The researchers also recognise the role of self-identification in response to the race variable.
4. The definitions employed in this article emanate from those applied in the original study by the HCWG that informs this specific enquiry. These definitions were conceptualised in the absence of any related definitions in South African law and policy at the time.
5. The Hate and Bias Crime Monitoring Form is based on research that commenced in 2010, while development and piloting of the Monitoring Form commenced in 2011 and was spearheaded by the HCWG.
6. The User Guide: Hate and Bias Crime Monitoring Form includes in-depth explanations on the usage of the form and is supported by a Glossary of Terms.
7. Within this investigation, socio-economic status (SES) is understood as a proxy for other demographic variables like race, income, occupation, and geographic location, for example.

References

Bell, J. G., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay, and bisexual hate crimes. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *62*(1), 98–120.

Boeckmann, R. J., & Turpin-Petrosino, C. (2002). Understanding the harm of hate crime. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*(2), 207–255.

Breen, D., Lynch, I., Nel, J. A., & Matthews, I. (2016). Hate crime in transitional societies: The case of South Africa. In J. Schweppe & M. A. Walters (Eds.), *The globalization of hate: Internationalizing hate crime* (pp. 126–141). Oxford University Press.

Breen, D., & Nel, J. A. (2011). South Africa – A home for all? The need for hate crime legislation. *South African Crime Quarterly*, *38*, 33–43.

Cuerden, G. J., & Blackmore, B. (2020). Barriers to reporting hate crime: A Welsh perspective. *The Police Journal*, *93*(3), 183–201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258X19855113

Deng, Y., Chang, L., Yang, M., Huo, M., & Zhou, R. (2016). Gender differences in emotional response: Inconsistency between experience and expressivity. *PLOS ONE*, *11*(6), Article e0158666. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4928818/

Department of Justice and Constitutional Development and Foundation of Human Rights. (2013). *Policy framework on combating hate crimes, hate speech and discrimination*. Department of Justice and Constitutional Development.

Department of Justice and Correctional Services. (2018). *Prevention and combating of hate crimes and hate speech bill*. https://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/hcbill/B9-2018-HateCrimesBill.pdf

Department of Social Development. (2019). *Victim support services bill*. https://static.pmg.org.za/Victim_Support_Services_Bill.pdf

Hamber, B. (1998). Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: Violence and transition in South Africa. In F. Bornman, R. Van Eeden, & M. Wentzel (Eds.), *Violence in South Africa* (pp. 349–370). Human Sciences and Research Council.

Hardiman, R., Jackson, B., & Griffin, P. (2007). Conceptualising foundations for social justice courses. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 45–51). Routledge.

Hardy, S., & Chakraborti, N. (2016). *Healing the harms: Identifying how best to support hate crime victims*. https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/healing-the-harms-of-hate-report

Ignaski, P. (2001). Hate crimes hurt more. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*(4), 626–638.

Judge, M., & Nel, J. A. (2018). Psychology and hate speech: A critical and restorative encounter. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *48*(1), 15–20.

McDevitt, J., Balboni, J., Garcia, L., & Gu, L. (2001). Consequences for victims: A comparison of bias-and non-bias-motivated assaults. *American Behavioural Scientist*, *45*(4), 697–713.

McQuade, K. M. (2014). Victim-offender relationship. In J. S. Albanese (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of criminology and criminal justice* (1st ed., pp. 1–5). John Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118517383.wbeccj131

Mellgren, C., Andersson, M., & Ivert, A. (2017). For whom does hate crime hurt more? A comparison of consequences of victimization across motives and crime types. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517746131

Mitchell, Y., & Nel, J. A. (2017). *The hate and bias crimes monitoring form project: January 2013 to September 2017*. The Hate Crimes Working Group.

Nel, J. A., & Mitchell, Y. (2019). Victims of hate crime. In R. Peacock (Ed.), *Victimology in Africa* (pp. 271–292). Van Schaik.

Nel, J. A., Van Wyk, H., & Mbatha, K. (2013). *User guide: Hate and bias crime monitoring form*. The Hate Crimes Working Group.

Nobles, W. W., & Cooper, S. (2013). Bridging forward to African/Black psychology. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *39*(3), 345–349.

Perry, B. (2003). Where do we go from here? Researching hate crime. *International Journal of Criminology*, *3*, 45–47.

Pieterse, T., Stratford, V., & Nel, J. A. (2018). Relationship between symbolic violence and overt violence in hate incidents in South Africa. *African Safety Promotion*, *16*(2), 31–43.

Republic of South Africa. (1996). *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996)* (Government Gazette 38). Government Printers.

Ruane, D. (2010). Obstacles to the utilisation of psychological resources in a South African township community. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *40*, 214–225.

Statistics South Africa. (2020, 4 February). *How unequal is South Africa?* http://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=12930

Walters, M. A., & Hoyle, C. (2011). Exploring the everyday world of hate victimization through community mediation. *International Review of Victimology*, *18*(1), 7–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758011422472

Williams, T. K. (2012). *Understanding internalized oppression: A theoretical conceptualization of internalized subordination* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Massachusetts.

World Health Organization. (2011). *Impact of economic crises on mental health*. http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/134999/e94837.pdf