

XENOPHOBIA, ISLAMOPHOBIA, AND ANTI-SEMITISM IN NYC LEADING UP TO AND FOLLOWING THE 2016 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: A REPORT ON DISCRIMINATION, BIAS, AND ACTS OF HATE EXPERIENCED BY MUSLIM, ARAB, SOUTH ASIAN, JEWISH, AND SIKH NEW YORKERS



**XENOPHOBIA, ISLAMOPHOBIA, AND
ANTI-SEMITISM IN NYC LEADING
UP TO AND FOLLOWING THE 2016
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION: A REPORT
ON DISCRIMINATION, BIAS, AND ACTS
OF HATE EXPERIENCED BY MUSLIM,
ARAB, SOUTH ASIAN, JEWISH, AND
SIKH NEW YORKERS**

Authors

The New York City Commission on Human Rights with Somjen Frazer and Erin Howe, Strength in Numbers Consulting Group, Inc.

About the New York City Commission on Human Rights

The New York City Commission on Human Rights (the “Commission”), led by Chair and Commissioner Carmelyn P. Malalis, is the City agency responsible for enforcing the New York City Human Rights Law (the “City Human Rights Law”), one of the most comprehensive anti-discrimination laws in the country. The City Human Rights Law prohibits discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations based on race, color, religion/creed, age, national origin, alienage or citizenship status, gender (including sexual harassment), gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, pregnancy, military service, marital status, and partnership status. In addition, the City Human Rights Law affords protection against discrimination in employment based on unemployment status, arrest or conviction record, credit history, caregiver status, and status as a victim of domestic violence, stalking, and sex offenses. In housing, there are additional protections based on lawful occupation, family status, any lawful source of income, and status as a victim of domestic violence, stalking, and sex offenses. The City Human Rights Law also prohibits retaliation, discriminatory harassment, and bias-based profiling by law enforcement.

The Commission has three primary divisions: The Law Enforcement Bureau (“LEB”), the Community Relations Bureau (“CRB”), and the Office of the Chairperson. LEB is responsible for the intake, investigation, and prosecution of City Human Rights Law violations, including those that raise systemic violations. CRB, through borough-based Community Service Centers in all five boroughs, helps cultivate understanding and respect among the City’s many diverse communities through pre-complaint interventions, conferences, workshops, and training sessions, among other initiatives. The Office of the Chairperson houses the legislative, regulatory, policy, and adjudicatory functions of the Commission and convenes meetings with the agency’s commissioners.

If you have experienced or witnessed discrimination, bias, or harassment at work, home, or in public spaces report it to the NYC Commission on Human Rights at (718) 722-3131.

About Strength in Numbers Consulting Group

Strength in Numbers Consulting Group, Inc. (www.sincg.com) is a small MWBE-certified social justice research and evaluation firm located in New York City. Strength in Numbers Consulting Group specializes in working with the most marginalized groups to do participatory research projects driven by community needs and accountability to those most affected by the work. Strength in Numbers wishes to thank Kevin Montiel and J. Andrew Graber for their diligent support and data checking.

Message from the Chair and Commissioner Carmelyn P. Malalis



When I joined the NYC Commission on Human Rights in 2015, I made it a priority to lift up the experiences of New Yorkers particularly vulnerable to discrimination and harassment. With this directive in mind, the Commission has

made concerted efforts in the last three years to reach out to communities that have historically had difficult or distant relationships with government, as well as to communities that have often lacked visibility or resources. In this current historical moment, our approach stands in stark contrast to the actions taken by the federal government since January 2017, which have been directed at vilifying and excluding these communities, contracting their rights, and in some instances, erasing any mention of their existence.

With more and more people looking to local government to support and stand up for communities marginalized by the federal government’s rollbacks to civil rights or targeted by its xenophobic bans, the Commission has sought to center these communities’ narratives through forums and events located at the hearts of these communities. We have launched

inclusive public education campaigns intended to combat the erasure of these communities and doubled down on our aggressive civil law enforcement efforts by our Law Enforcement Bureau. By the end of 2016, reports to the agency had increased by over 60%, and we recognized that the Commission had to use absolutely every tool at its disposal to help empower these communities and call out and address discrimination and harassment in all its forms, from everyday microaggressions to physical acts of hate violence. To that end, in 2017, we resurrected one of the Commission’s most historically impactful tools - data collection and reporting - by undertaking research projects that fulfill its mandate to study the problems of prejudice, intolerance, bigotry, and discrimination and issuing our findings in reports that can be utilized by the Commission to more effectively combat bias and can be shared with the public so that communities can pull from useful data when seeking funding and other resources.

This survey project represents one of our first efforts in this area under my leadership. Alarmed by upward trends in incidents of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate impacting Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers, we initiated a study to give us more insight into what these communities were experiencing, where they were experiencing it, and what steps they were taking in response. In addition, it was important to us that we be able to identify actions that the Commission, other public entities, community based organizations, faith groups, and others could take in order to address the issues that emerged from the survey project.

Our hope is that this report and those that follow will serve as a resource for our partners in government and communities across the City, allowing us to reduce the frequency of these incidents and empowering community members to report them to appropriate entities. The survey process itself has already enabled us to expand and strengthen our relationships with Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh organizations and their members, a development we hope will make the Commission an even more effective partner in City Human Rights Law enforcement, community outreach, and policy engagement. We have also gathered data to support conclusions that human rights advocates have surmised, but have been under attack by groups intent on maintaining white supremacy. For example, as the report notes, Black Muslims surveyed as part of this study reported experiences with employment discrimination and physical violence with particularly high frequency. This finding is just one item that we hope to explore this year as part of the Commission's increased focus on racial justice and, specifically, anti-Black racism.

It is difficult to overstate the challenges facing so many New Yorkers in this current climate. Xenophobic, Islamophobic, racist and anti-Semitic hate groups and individuals have been unabashed in revealing their long-standing patterns of racial oppression and religious discrimination. Xenophobic immigration policies, including discriminatory travel bans threaten local families with roots across the globe.

Amidst this dispiriting landscape, the human rights warriors at the Commission and I remain

steadfast in our commitment to doing everything we can to counter these encroachments on dignity, respect, and inclusion. To report discrimination and harassment, call 311 or the Commission's Infoline at (718) 722-3131 and to report a hate crime to the NYC Police Department, call 911. We are confident that by working with our agency, community, faith-based, and other partners, we will be able to advance the goals of equity and justice that are at the heart of our mission. I hope you continue this work with us.



Carmelyn P. Malalis,
Chair and Commissioner

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the findings of a survey conducted by the New York City Commission on Human Rights in which the Commission surveyed 3,105 Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers about their experiences of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate between July 2016 and late 2017, a timeframe that encapsulates the climate pre- and post-election and the aftermath of Federal news announcements threatening some of these and other communities, including a travel ban affecting Muslim majority countries, ending the Temporary Protected Status (TPS) and attempting to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival (DACA) program for millions of immigrants living in the United States.

The report is the first of its kind in New York City to rigorously document the experiences of these communities across a wide variety of topics, including experiences of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate as well as whether and how these groups report those experiences and outcomes. The survey also reflects an extensive input process. Commission staff who liaise with these communities and a wide variety of community stakeholders—including direct service providers, faith-based organizations, and advocacy groups—were consulted and provided critical input throughout the survey process. To address the experiences of individuals and their obstacles in reporting bias incidents, the report also lays out action steps to address bias and harassment experienced by individuals as well as recommendations on how to encourage victims to report incidents to the Commission.

KEY FINDINGS:

Not surprisingly, the survey found that Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers experience high rates of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate.

- Nearly two in five (38.7%) survey respondents had experienced “verbal harassment, threats or taunting referring to race, ethnicity or religion,” with one in four (26.6%) reporting they had experienced it more than once.
- Roughly one in ten (8.8%) survey respondents had experienced physical assault that they knew or suspected was a “result of race, ethnicity or religion.”
- Nearly one in six (16.6%) survey respondents experienced some form of racial, religious, or ethnic discrimination-related problem in their employment in either a current job or while seeking a job.
- Highly visible members of these communities, including people of color and those who wear religious clothing are particularly at risk for verbal harassment, threats, physical assault, and employment discrimination.
- Over one in ten (10.5%) survey respondents indicated that they had experienced property damage or vandalism.
- Nearly one in seven (13.9%) survey respondents experienced being unfairly denied services at a business because of race, ethnicity or religion.
- When asked about discrimination in public accommodations, survey respondents most frequently identified being followed by a security guard or salesperson in a store (17.5%)

and being purposefully pushed or shoved on a subway platform (13.6%).

Rates of reporting bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate to community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, the Commission, the NYPD, or elsewhere remain low.

- Overall, less than one in three (29.2%) survey respondents who experienced discrimination or harassment reported at least one bias incident to a community-based organization, a faith-based organization, the Commission, the NYPD, or somewhere else.
- The most common place where verbal harassment (8.1%) and physical assault (18.4%) were reported was to the NYPD.
- About three in ten (29.1%) survey respondents who experienced any employment discrimination reported it to a community-based organization, faith-based organization, the Commission, or elsewhere.
- Barriers to reporting included believing no one would take the report seriously (23.5%), concerns about reprisal or other bad consequences when reporting physical assault (11.2%), and actual attempts to report that were not taken seriously (9.2%).

Experiences of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate can have serious consequences for the mental health of those who experience them.

- Over half (51.3%) of those who experienced being unfairly fired and over one third (36.7%) of those who experienced physical assault

screened positive for probable depression.

- More than one in four (26.2%) survey respondents who experienced being verbally harassed were associated with increased odds of depression.
- More than one in three (36.6%) survey respondents that had their religious clothing forcibly removed were associated with depression.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION:

- Create a network of community- and faith-based organizations for those who experience bias-related harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate to the Commission.
- Partner to refer cases with organizations to encourage increased philanthropic support for community-based and faith-based organizations that serve and support local communities of Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers to connect clients to the Commission, other City agencies, and other organizations that can provide legal, mental health, and other forms of support.
- Investigate the experiences of Black New Yorkers, whom the findings indicate had heightened experiences of physical violence and employment discrimination.
- Plan and develop a bystander-intervention training for delivery to City employees who work directly with the public on how to de-escalate bias incidents and what resources to offer those who have been involved in such incidents.

- Address the mental health needs of Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers to combat the negative impacts of the bias incidents covered in this report.
- Focus outreach and legal resources on impacted communities in order to educate New Yorkers about their rights, and encourage vulnerable communities to report incidents to the Commission, including:
 - Creating a workshop for vulnerable communities developed by the Commission's Bias Response Team that highlights the full spectrum of incidents, outlines the Commission's resources, and explains the various options for reporting.
 - Undertaking more focused community outreach to religious communities, especially those who are highly visible and often targeted for bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate.
 - Continuing the deployment of mobile clinics with attorneys and process intakes onsite at community-based and faith-based organizations.
 - Continuing public outreach to organizations through media campaigns, community events, days-of-action, and resource fairs to educate people about their rights under the law and how to report discriminatory acts and experiences.

These findings are intended to be used by the Commission and other City agencies, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, policy makers, elected officials, and City residents. The report highlights ways

for community members to seek and get help in order to ensure their rights are protected.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
HOW TO USE THIS REPORT	2
PURPOSE AND GOALS	3
ESTIMATING THE SIZE OF MUSLIM, ARAB, SOUTH ASIAN, JEWISH, AND SIKH COMMUNITIES IN NYC	3
METHODS	4
ASKING SENSITIVE QUESTIONS ABOUT IDENTITY	4
Gender, Sexual Orientation, Race, Ethnicity, and Religion	4
WHO TOOK THE SURVEY?	6
Education, Income, and Employment	6
Geography, National Origin, and English Language Proficiency	7
RACE, ETHNICITY, AND RELIGION IN THE SURVEY	7
VERBAL HARASSMENT	9
PHYSICAL ASSAULT	9
HARASSMENT OF FAMILY AND FRIENDS	10
PROPERTY DAMAGE AND DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS	10
OTHER CLIMATE ISSUES	11
EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION	11
REPORTING BIAS HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION, AND ACTS OF HATE	12
REPORTING VERBAL HARASSMENT AND PHYSICAL ASSAULT	12
REPORTING EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION	13
NEGATIVE MENTAL HEALTH CONSEQUENCES OF BIAS INCIDENTS	14
CONCLUSIONS	15
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH	15
ACTION STEPS	15
I. Ongoing Commission Actions	16
II. Recommendations for Future Actions	16
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	21
APPENDIX 1	22
EXTENDED METHODOLOGY REPORT	22
WORKS CITED	22

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, the New York City Commission on Human Rights (the “Commission”) published a report entitled “Discrimination Against Muslims, Arabs and South Asians in New York City since 9/11” using data collected by the Commission after observing an increase in complaints to the NYPD Hate Crimes Task Force following the attacks on the World Trade Center. This study found that 69% of the 956 respondents had experienced one or more incidents of bias and/or discrimination; of those, the most common type of incident respondents indicated in the survey was bias-related harassment (37%), followed by employment discrimination (26%). Nearly four in five (79%) said their lives were negatively affected by 9/11.¹

In 2016 and 2017, pre- and post-2016 Presidential Election, the Commission observed an increase in such reports from similar communities by the media and through advocacy organizations. As a direct result of community consultations convened by the Commission in late 2016 and early 2017, and in response to the lack of comprehensive local data about the scope and frequency of bias-motivated harassment, discrimination, and violence across at-risk communities throughout the City and the perceived underreporting of such incidents, the Commission began to develop its survey project initiative for groups being unfairly targeted by the wave of negative national rhetoric that characterized the 2016 election cycle—Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh (MASAJS) New Yorkers (“the Survey”).

While many marginalized groups in New York City are vulnerable to bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate, the MASAJS groups were selected because the Commission had identified, as a direct result of roundtable discussions and listening sessions with community leaders and members conducted in late 2016 and early 2017, that these groups have been experiencing heightened risk of these types of incidents. The research project was animated by reports of anti-Muslim

rhetoric and climate, including racism against Arab and South Asian communities (MASA is a common acronym used to describe Muslim, Arab, and South Asian communities). Anti-Semitic vandalism and reports of harassment and bullying that emerged early in the project led to the inclusion of Jewish communities. During the community engagement process, Sikh community leaders advocated for their inclusion as a group separate from those already identified, given their distinct visible identity and vulnerability to discrimination and hate. Specifically, in the post-9/11 context, Sikh communities have been targets of Islamophobic and xenophobic violence, so they were added as well.

GLOSSARY

Focus group respondents had strong feelings about how language is used to describe their own and others’ identities. The research consultants and advisors at the Commission have created this guide to understanding how language describing identities is used in this report:

- With the exception of those who selected “African American”, we refer to national origin without commenting on citizenship or identity as “American”
- When we use shorter labels to refer to race, ethnicity, or religion, we use the full description in the first instance and the shorter title thereafter
- Regions of the world are defined using the 2017 United Nations country categorization, although “West Asia” is referred to here by its more commonly used term “Middle East”
- Respondents who identified as Arab for the purposes of the survey are also included in the category “Arab, Middle Eastern and Central Asian”; when referring to Arab respondents, the word “Arab” is used. When referring to the larger group, “Arab, Middle Eastern and Central Asian” is used
- Respondents who identified as South Asian for the purposes of the survey are also included in the larger category of “South, Southeast and East Asian”

¹ The Commission did not study the experience of these populations between that report (2001-2002) and this report (2016-2017) even though increases in number of bias incidents may have happened during this period of time.

HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

This report is written with a wide variety of audiences in mind who may wish to use it in many different ways. Some terms used here and some ways of talking about survey data may be more familiar to some audiences than others.

Readers will notice that the authors of this report sometimes use statistics when comparing one group to another. These are often phrased as “Group A was more likely to report this outcome than other respondents (X% vs. Y%). The numbers in the parenthesis refer to the prevalence of the outcome (sometimes called the “frequency” with which respondents reported this outcome) group A (X%) compared to the respondents who are not members of group A. Most often, group A will be a religious or ethnic group or other demographic category. Sometimes the comparison will be made within people who experienced some sort of incident of interest to this report compared to those who did not experience that incident. For example, the report states “Experiences of verbal harassment were also associated with increased odds of depression, with over one quarter of those who had been verbally harassed screening positive for probable depression compared to less than one in six of those who had not been harassed (26.2% vs. 14.4%).”

Many readers will wonder whether this means that verbal harassment causes depression. Because this survey is one snapshot in time, the report cannot establish whether the verbal harassment existed prior to depression. However, given the existing researchⁱ on the association between bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate and subsequent experiences of depression and the lack of literature suggesting depression causes verbal harassment, it is not unreasonable to consider that it may be more likely that verbal harassment causes depression, rather than that the two co-occur but have no causal relationship. The report nonetheless follows the scientific convention of using the word “association” rather than “cause”, allowing readers to draw some of their own conclusions about causality.

Some readers will wonder whether these comparisons are “statistically significant.” All comparisons using the phrase “more than”, “less than”, “more prevalent” or “more likely” are significant at the .10 level or less. Statistical significance refers to the certainty with which we can understand that the difference is not due to chance; thus a statistic with p=.10 has a 10% likelihood of being wrong due to chance. More details about how statistics were tested and selected for publication are included in Appendix I.

PURPOSE AND GOALS

Most important, the survey findings were intended to be used to make recommendations to City agencies, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, policy makers, elected officials, and city residents in general about how to keep themselves and others safe during a time of increased complaints of bias incidents.

The survey was designed to quantify MASAJA New Yorkers’ experiences of verbal harassment, physical assault, bullying, and discrimination in employment, public accommodations, and other contexts that can be reasonably attributed to racial, ethnic, or religious bias. It was also intended to quantify reporting of those bias incidents and characterize the outcomes experienced by those who had experienced them.

Estimating the Size of Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh Communities in NYC

It is difficult to estimate the size of the population of Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh communities in New York City. According to the Asian American Federation, the top neighborhoods for people of South Asian descent include those in City Council Districts 23, 24, 25, 28 and 32, which are all in Queens (especially the Southern and Eastern parts of Queens)ⁱⁱ. The largest percentage of Muslims are also in Queens (5%), while Arabs are more prevalent in Staten Island (2.7%) and Brooklyn (1.5%) than in other boroughs. Jewish religious affiliation is most common in Brooklyn (11%) and Manhattan (8%)^{iv}. As of 2008, the most recent year for which estimates are available, the Sikh Coalition suggests that there are 50,000 Sikhs in New York City, or approximately 0.6% of the residents of the City^v.

Estimate	Foreign-Born South Asian ^{*vi}	Arab Ancestry Number ^{vi}	Arab Ancestry Percentage ⁱⁱⁱ	Jewish Religious Affiliation in New York City ^{iv}	Muslim Religious Affiliation in New York City ^{iv}
NYC	280,556	103,649	1.21%	7%	3%
Bronx	18,723	11,489	0.79%	2%	2%
Brooklyn	70,120	39,460	1.50%	11%	4%
Manhattan	24,767	16,431	1.00%	8%	1%
Queens	155,436	23,581	1.01%	4%	5%
Staten Island	11,510	12,688	2.67%	2%	6%

* Includes Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Iran, Kazakhstan, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan and “Other South Central Asia”.

METHODS

The study began with a review of scholarly literature and community-based research as well as testimonials gathered by the Commission on bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate against MASAJIS communities. In addition to the literature review, topics for inquiry were suggested by community consultations, including 15 focus groups. The focus groups resulted in design of a survey; data collection occurred from October 12 - December 4, 2017. The survey asked Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers age 16 and older about their experiences of bias incidents, whether or not (and to whom) they reported those incidents, how they were treated in public accommodations, and details of their religious observance and demographic information. All incidents were asked about with reference to the timeframe “July 2016 to the present”, so findings refer to approximately 15 months of time.

ASKING SENSITIVE QUESTIONS ABOUT IDENTITY

Gender, Sexual Orientation, Race, Ethnicity, and Religion

Respondents could select as many genders and racial and ethnic identities as they felt applied to them.

Because race, ethnicity, and religion defined the sample for this survey, the first question on the survey was about whether the survey respondent identified as Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and/or Sikh. Respondents could check all that applied to them. Follow up questions for Jewish and Muslim respondents asked whether there was a particular branch of their religion they were affiliated with, and which, but respondents were not required to select a specific branch.

Because people may identify with more than one race or ethnicity, follow up questions were asked about other racial or ethnic groups to whom the respondent might belong, and respondents could select all answers that applied to them in the online version of the survey, these answers were then used to present the most relevant follow-up questions about race, ethnicity, and religion. For example, South Asian respondents received a set of follow up questions about race and ethnicity that included a preselected “Asian or Asian American” box. Those who identified as Jewish were asked follow up questions about the branch of Judaism they follow, if any, and similar questions were asked of Muslim respondents, while those who had not yet indicated a religion were asked about other religions.

In cover sheets for focus groups, many respondents declined to answer questions about their sexual orientation. The researchers and advisors at the Commission decided to test an alternative version of a question about sexual orientation, asking first if respondents identified as heterosexual or straight, something else, or preferred not to say. Those who identified as “something else” were asked follow up questions.


The survey covered participants’ experiences across multiple areas of city life. It included a screener to assure the respondent was Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and/or Sikh, lived in one of the five boroughs of New York City, and

was age 16 and older, demographic information (other religion, race, and ethnicity information, gender identity, sexual orientation, income, nativity, and nativity of parents), and several types of incidents that were commonly recalled by focus groups: verbal harassment; physical assault; harassment of family and friends; property damage, and discrimination in public accommodations and in employment; reporting and other climate issues. This report includes information about the demographics of the respondents as well as general trends with respect to the type, frequency, and reporting of incidents. Information about interactions in specific settings will be shared in a future report.

The survey was intended to take an intersectional approach; that is, to collect sufficient data to understand not only the experiences of being Muslim, Arab, Jewish, and Sikh but also their experiences as individuals with multiple identities (such as gender, age, race, and religion).

As such, survey questions were analyzed in relation to one another (bivariate and multivariate analysis) as well as on their own.

The complete survey, taken by 79.6% of respondents, was available online and a shorter version, taken by the remaining 20.4%, was available on paper. The survey was administered in nine languages.² Over four in five (82.8%) respondents took the survey in English, with smaller numbers taking it in Bengali (4.8%), Arabic (4.6%), Russian (3.4%), French (2.3%), Punjabi (1.7%), and All Other (0.5%).






² Additional languages included Hindi, Urdu, and Yiddish. The percentage of respondents taking the survey in these languages is not displayed due to small sample sizes. For further information about sample size criteria, see Appendix I.

For more information about the methods used in the survey, please see Appendix I.


The respondents who took the survey on paper were much more likely to take it in a non-English language. They were older, more likely to be foreign born, and were more likely to indicate that they spoke English “not well” or “not well at all.” They were also slightly more likely to be men or boys, Black or Arab and Muslim. They disproportionately lived in the Bronx.

WHO TOOK THE SURVEY?

Over three thousand qualified respondents (3,105) took the survey. The majority (50.4%) were Muslim.³ Nearly one third (31.5%) were Jewish, with over one in four (28.6%) being South Asian American, and 14.5% being Arab American. About one in ten (10.3%) were Sikh.



New Yorkers of all ages took the survey, with 6.1% being 16 or 17 years old and over one in ten (10.7%) being sixty-five years or older. The largest group of respondents were individuals age 25-34 years old (25.9%).



Just over half (55.8%) of respondents were female, 43.3% were male, and 1.2% were trans and/or gender nonconforming.

Among those who provided valid information about sexual orientation, 87.0% identified as heterosexual or straight. The most prevalent sexual orientation other than heterosexual or straight was queer (4.8%), followed by bisexual (3.9%), gay or homosexual (3.6%), and lesbian (1.8%).

Nearly three in ten respondents (29.2%) had children under 18 living with them. Of those children, 62.5% were enrolled in public school.

Respondents age 24 and under were asked if they had been enrolled in high school at a public school at any time since July 2016. 50.5% of those who were 16 or 17 had been as had 23.8% of 18-24 year olds.


Education, Income, and Employment

About one in five respondents age 25 or older had a high school degree, GED, or less education (20.1%), while 27.4% had a four-year college


³ Respondents could select more than one category of eligibility for the survey; thus, percentages add up to more than 100.

degree and a further 36.2% had a master's degree, doctorate, or equivalent professional degree. Over half (53.8%) of those over age 18 and under age 65 were employed fulltime, while nearly one in five (19.4%) were employed part time.

About one in five respondents was low income, with 19.5% reporting incomes below \$20,000 in 2016. About one in four (25.5%) had incomes above \$100,000.




Geography, National Origin, and English Language Proficiency



The largest number of respondents came from Brooklyn (30.1%), with a further 24.4% from Queens, and smaller numbers from Manhattan (21.5%), the Bronx (15.4%), and Staten Island (8.6%). No group recruited for the survey was evenly distributed throughout the five boroughs. For example, 61.6% of Arab American respondents lived in Brooklyn, as did about one

third (32.1%) of Muslims. Nearly half (49.0%) of South Asian respondents lived in Queens (more than any other borough) as did 60.1% of Sikh respondents. Jewish respondents most frequently said they lived in Brooklyn (37.2%) or Manhattan (37.0%).

Over half (56.7%) of respondents were foreign born and over one in ten (12.3%) spoke English "not well" or "not well at all."




Of those who were foreign born, about three out of five (62.0%) had been in the United States for more than ten years. About four percent (3.8%) had been in the United States for under one year. Of those who were foreign born, the largest number were from South Asia (60.2%), while smaller numbers were from the Middle East and North Africa (15.7%) and Sub Saharan Africa (7.1%).

Of those that were US born, about seven in ten (71.7%) had at least one foreign born parent.

RACE, ETHNICITY, AND RELIGION IN THE SURVEY

The most common racial and ethnic groups were South Asian (28.6%), Arab American, Middle Eastern or Central Asian (20.9%, of whom 76.6% were Arab), white (19.5%), Ashkenazi (19.4%), and Black/African American (11.9%).

Xenophobia, Islamophobia, and Anti-Semitism in NYC Leading Up to and Following the 2016 Presidential Election: A Report on Discrimination, Bias, and Acts of Hate Experienced by Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers



In addition to the 50.4% who identified as Muslim, the 31.5% who were Jewish, and the 10.3% who were Sikh, 2.7% were Hindu, 0.9% were Christian, and many also identified as not religious, atheist, or as other religions (this question was asked only in the online version of the survey).


Among Jewish respondents, many identified as not religious (or secular) Jews (24.6%), as Reform (18.3%), Conservative (17.1%) or religious without a specific branch of affiliation (15.3%). Others belonged to more observant groups, such as Orthodox (12.0%) and Hasidic (2.4%) groups.

The most prevalent branch of Islam selected by respondents was Sunni (64.0%), with smaller numbers having no specific branch of affiliation (20.9%), with smaller numbers selecting Shia (3.8%) or Nation of Islam (3.7%) as their affiliation.

Nearly all (95.8%) of the respondents who identified as Black, African American, or African were also Muslim. Nearly five in six Arab American, Middle Eastern or Central Asian respondents were Muslim (84.7%), as were about six in ten (58.2%) of South Asian respondents.

Respondents to the survey varied in their level of religious observance, with about two in five

never attending services (13.0%) or attending a few times per year (27.0%), while nearly half (46.5%) attended once per week or more often. Muslim respondents were more likely than those of other religions to say they attended religious services once per week or more often (57.7%) than other respondents (34.8%).



Orthodox (80.7%) and Hasidic (64.7%) respondents more commonly responded that they attended services at least once per week compared to other branches of Judaism reflected in the survey, while Muslims who did not affiliate with any specific branch of religion, Sunni Muslims, and Nation of Islam respondents were all similarly likely to attend once per week or more often.


Respondents to the online survey were asked if they wore four types of religious clothing outside of their home.⁴ Muslim women were asked how frequently they wore a hijab and Muslim men were asked the same question about the kufi. Sikh men and women were asked how frequently they wore a turban and Jewish men, a kippah or yarmulke (please note that all percentages are calculated among those who were asked about each religious garment, not among the total sample).

The religious clothing most frequently indicated by respondents was the hijab, with four out of five (82.0%) Muslim women respondents saying they wore it on at least some occasions, and 58.8% saying that they always wore it.

⁴ Focus groups suggested these four types of clothing were the most highly visible to potentially hostile strangers. While there are many other types of religious clothing, it was decided that using four indicators rather than a comprehensive list would be the most efficient and effective way to understand how visibility affected experiences of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate.

Xenophobia, Islamophobia, and Anti-Semitism in NYC Leading Up to and Following the 2016 Presidential Election: A Report on Discrimination, Bias, and Acts of Hate Experienced by Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers

Similar percentages said they wore a kippah or yarmulke (61.5%), turban (56.4%), or kufi (56.2%). A greater proportion of those who wore a turban said that they always wore it (35.2%) than the kippah or kufi, while the kippah was most frequently stated as worn “rarely” (22.2%) compared to the turban (5.5%) and kufi (17.9%).



VERBAL HARASSMENT

Nearly two in five (38.7%) survey respondents had experienced “verbal harassment, threats or taunting referring to race, ethnicity or religion.” Of those who answered questions about the frequency with which they experienced verbal harassment since July 2016, about one in four (26.6%) had experienced it more than once.

Arab (49.7% vs. 36.8% non-Arab) and South Asian respondents (41.9% vs. 37.4% non-South Asian) were more likely to say they had experienced verbal harassment than non-Arab and non-South Asian respondents. Among religious groups, Sikh (48.6% vs. 37.6% non-Sikh) and Muslim (42.0% vs. 35.4% non-Muslim) respondents were more likely to say they experienced verbal harassment. Arab Muslims were 71% more likely to say they had experienced verbal harassment than respondents who were neither Arab nor Muslim (50.1% vs. 37.0%). **A Sikh young person (under 35) has nearly twice the chance of experiencing verbal harassment compared to other respondents (55.0% vs. 29.3%). Jewish respondents who were highly observant were more likely than other Jewish respondents to experience verbal harassment;** for example, those who attend services more than once per week were more likely than those who never attend (39.2% vs. 21.0%) to say they had experienced verbal harassment. Nearly half (48.4%) of those who wore any

religious garments discussed in the survey had experienced verbal harassment, compared to 34.2% who did not wear religious garments.

Transgender respondents frequently indicated experiences of verbal harassment (55.6%); male and female respondents did not differ from one another in their responses about the frequency of verbal harassment. Experiences of verbal harassment were more common among younger respondents; for example, 57.8% of 16-17 year olds said this had occurred, as did 46.8% of 25-34 year olds, while 17.9% of those age 65-74 responded that they had experienced verbal harassment.

PHYSICAL ASSAULT

Just under one in ten (8.8%) respondents had experienced a “physical assault that you know or suspect is a result of race, ethnicity or religion.” Black respondents were more likely to say they had experienced physical assault than were those of other racial and ethnic backgrounds (12.6% vs. 7.7%). Arab (10.0%) and South Asian (9.8%) respondents also reported physical assault more frequently than other racial and ethnic groups, but the difference was not statistically significant. While information about the location of the assault was not collected, respondents who live in the Bronx were more likely (14.0%) than residents of all other boroughs (7.8%) to experience physical assault.

Overall, survey respondents who were men or boys were more likely to say they had experienced physical assault than women or girls (11.0% vs. 6.9%). Nearly three in ten (29.7%) of trans and gender nonconforming respondents had been physically assaulted.

In terms of religion, elevated numbers of Muslim (12.7%) and Sikh (13.7%) respondents who were men or boys had experienced physical assault. Respondents who wore religious clothing were also at elevated risk (12.3% vs. 6.7%) compared to those who did not.


Black, predominantly Muslim, women living in the Bronx were at notably high risk for bias motivated assaults, with fully one in five (19.4%) having experienced physical assault.

HARASSMENT OF FAMILY AND FRIENDS

Over two in five respondents (40.6%) had a family member or close friend who had experienced verbal harassment within the past fifteen months.

About one in six respondents had experienced a close family member or friend being physically assaulted (16.7%).


Arab and South Asian respondents, more frequently responded that they had experienced both harassment and assault among their friends and families than their non-Arab and non-South Asian counterparts (see graph below).




PROPERTY DAMAGE AND DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

All respondents who took the online survey were asked about how frequently they had experienced “property damage or vandalism with words or images targeting your race, ethnicity or religion” within the timeframe of the survey and over one in ten indicated that they had (10.5%). They were also asked if they had been “unfairly denied services at a business because of race, ethnicity or religion” within the timeframe of the survey, which about one in seven had (13.9%).


More Muslim (17.9%) and Sikh (18.0%) respondents, particularly those Sikhs who wore turbans (23.0%) indicated they had been denied service compared to other groups.



Respondents were also asked about two incidents that were frequently discussed in focus groups: being followed by a “security guard or salesperson in a store” (17.5%) and being purposefully pushed or shoved on a subway platform (13.6%). These questions were not asked specifically about race, ethnicity, or religion; however, the prevalence of each varied by race and religion.



For example, Black (28.3%), Arab (26.0%), and South Asian (19.6%) respondents were much more likely than white respondents (7.5%) to say they had been followed by a security guard, as were Muslim (22.7%) and Sikh (22.6%) respondents compared to other religions (11.2%). Respondents who stated that they wore religious clothing were also more likely to say that they had been followed by a security guard (22.6% vs. 14.6%) compared with those that did not.




While Muslim respondents had only slightly above average experiences of being shoved on a subway platform (16.0% vs. 11.7%), those who identified themselves as Arab (20.4% vs. 12.5%) and wore religious clothing (18.7% vs. 9.4%) were far more likely to experience this, especially if they were women, **meaning that more than one in four Muslim Arab women wearing a hijab had been pushed or shoved intentionally on a subway platform (27.4%).**

Finally, those who said they wore religious clothing were asked if anyone had tried to forcibly remove that clothing (5.8%). Sikh respondents more frequently agreed that this had happened to them than those of other religions (11.2% vs. 4.9%) who wore religious clothing.

OTHER CLIMATE ISSUES

In addition to asking about direct experiences of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate, the survey asked respondents to indicate how bothered they were by a variety of indicators of the general climate of New York City with regards to discrimination, immigration, and vandalism.




Respondents were also asked how much each of the following bothered them: hearing about other people’s experiences of discrimination (83.5%), hearing about policies about immigration (79.8%), and seeing vandalism or property damage targeted at their own race (63.9%) or religion (70.5%). Responses refer to those who were “very” or “somewhat” bothered.

Jewish respondents were more likely to say that they were “very” or “somewhat” bothered by vandalism or property damage targeting religion (80.4% vs. 64.8% non-Jewish), while Arab (70.0% vs. 63.0% non-Arab) and Muslim (66.7% vs. 61.8% non-Muslim) respondents were more likely to say that they were very or somewhat bothered by vandalism or property damage targeting race.

Younger respondents and respondents who were women or girls were also more likely to say they were bothered by each of these things.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION



About one in six respondents had experienced some form of racial, religious, or ethnic discrimination-related problem in their employment (16.6%) in either a current job or while seeking a job within the past 15 months. For example, 8.3% had been prevented from observing their religion and 4.0% had been told they must give up wearing religious clothing in order to keep their job. Three percent of employed respondents said that they had been fired because of race, ethnicity, or religion, while 6.7% had their job duties changed and 7.4% were not promoted.

South Asian (19.4%) and Muslim (18.7%) respondents were more likely to respond that they

had experienced employment discrimination of some kind than were non-South Asian (15.4%) and non-Muslim respondents (14.8%), as were those who wear religious clothing (19.4% vs. 15.0%) and those who were under age 35 (19.0% vs. 14.1%). Respondents who lived in the Bronx were also more likely to respond that they had experienced employment discrimination (20.8% vs. 15.8% non-Bronx residents) compared with those in other boroughs.

Muslim and Sikh respondents composed nearly the entire sample of those who had been told to give up wearing religious clothing, and Muslim respondents were most likely to indicate that they had been prevented from observing their religion at work (10.2% vs. 6.6%). **Being fired due to race, ethnicity, or religion was indicated more often among Black (5.4% vs. 2.6%), Muslim (4.5 vs. 1.7%), and foreign born (4.1% vs 1.3%) respondents compared to those who were not Black, not Muslim, or not foreign born.**

Among respondents who indicated they were seeking a job at some time since July 2016, nearly one in four (23.6%) had not been hired because of race, ethnicity, or religion, while 8.6% of job seekers who wore religious clothing had been told by a prospective employer that they must give it up if they wished to take a job. **Not being hired because of race, ethnicity, or religion was more common among Orthodox and Hasidic Jewish respondents compared to respondents who were not Orthodox or Hasidic (55.6% vs. 22.8%).**


REPORTING BIAS HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION, AND ACTS OF HATE

Nearly one in three (29.2%) of those who had experienced verbal harassment, physical assault, being fired, not being promoted, having job duties changed, being unfairly not hired, or being told to give up wearing religious garments reported at least one bias incident to a community-based organization, a faith-based organization, the Commission, the NYPD, or somewhere else.


REPORTING VERBAL HARASSMENT AND PHYSICAL ASSAULT

Although far fewer survey respondents indicated that they had experienced physical assault than experienced verbal harassment, a larger proportion of those who had been assaulted reported it (27.3% vs. 38.4%). The NYPD was the most common place to report physical assault (18.4%).


The most common place where verbal harassment (8.1%) and physical assault (18.4%) were reported was to the NYPD. Similar proportions of people experiencing verbal harassment (4.5%) and physical assault (4.3%) reported to a faith-based organization, while more reported physical assault to community-based organizations (6.8% vs. 4.1%) and to the Commission (6.3% vs. 2.4%) than reported verbal harassment to these respective places.



Among those who had experienced at least one incident, **Sikh respondents were also less likely to report any incident (21.4% vs. 30.2% non-Sikh) and to report verbal abuse (19.6% vs. 28.2% non-Sikh).**




Respondents who indicated that they had experienced verbal harassment or physical assault and had not reported it to any group were asked the reasons they did not report these things. The top reason selected was that it had not occurred to the respondent to report it; however, while the second most prevalent reason for not reporting verbal harassment was that it was not serious, nearly one in four who did not report verbal assault or physical assault thought no one would take them seriously (23.5%). About one in ten were worried about reprisal or other bad consequences among those who had experienced but did not report verbal harassment (11.4%) and physical assault (11.2%).




REPORTING EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

About three in ten of those who had experienced any employment discrimination reported it to a community-based organization, faith-based organization, the Commission, or elsewhere (29.1%).

Fewer than one in ten of those who responded that they had experienced any kind of employment related bias reported it to the Commission (9.7%).



A larger percentage of respondents who had experienced being fired (53.2%) reported it compared to each of the other types of employment discrimination, followed by forced job changes (38.8%) and being prevented from wearing religious clothing (35.0%).



About one third (34.0%) of those who had been unfairly fired reported to the Commission, while slightly fewer reported to a faith-based organization or community-based organization (29.8%).

Among those who had experienced employment discrimination, white people were more likely to report it (40.0% vs. 26.7% non-white). **Those who were under age 35 were less likely to report employment discrimination compared to those age 35 or older (21.9% vs. 38.2%).** Respondents who lived in Queens were less likely to report employment discrimination compared to those of other boroughs (18.2% vs 32.3%).


About two in five respondents who said they had experienced unfairly not being promoted (42.5%) or having an unfavorable job change (40.6%) said that they did not report these

things because they were concerned about reprisal or other bad consequences.


NEGATIVE MENTAL HEALTH CONSEQUENCES OF BIAS INCIDENTS

All of the bias incidents described in this report were associated with experiences of depression.⁵ Fully half of those who had been fired because of race, ethnicity, or religion selected answers that indicate depression (51.3%) compared to just 16.2% of those who had not.


Those who experienced employment discrimination of any kind were more likely to screen positive for probable depression (33.8% vs. 15.1%).



Experiences of verbal harassment were also associated with increased odds of depression, with over one quarter of those who had been verbally harassed screening positive for probable depression compared to less than one in six of those who had not been harassed (26.2% vs. 14.4%) and with physical assault (36.7% vs. 17.0%).



Discrimination in public accommodations (37.9% vs. 15.9%) and experiences of bias harassment and discrimination such as experiencing vandalism or property damage targeted at your race, ethnicity, or religion (37.1% vs. 17.0%) were also associated with depression.



Among those who wore religious clothing, having it forcibly removed was associated with depression (36.6% vs. 21.1%).

CONCLUSIONS



2018 Vaisakhi celebration. Photo credit: Adrienne Nicole Productions

Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers experience unacceptably high rates of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate. Nearly two in five (38.7%) survey respondents had experienced verbal harassment, while 8.8% had experienced physical assault. Highly visible members of these communities, including people of color and those who wear religious clothing are particularly at risk. This suggests that in addition to existing mechanisms for preventing these incidents, widespread training in evidence-based, effective bystander intervention programs should be increased.

Meanwhile, rates of reporting remain low. Even serious, bias-motivated physical assaults are reported by just over one in four who experienced them (27.3%). Barriers to reporting include believing no one would take the report seriously (23.5%) of those who experienced physical assault and did not report it, concern about reprisal or other bad consequences (11.2%), and trying to report but not being taken seriously (9.2%). This suggests how vital it is to educate communities, particularly those who under-report, about the importance of reporting, creating reporting mechanisms based in community organizations, and improving responses to any reports of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate by city agencies and others.


Experiences of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate can have serious consequences

for the mental health of those who experience them, with over half (51.3%) of those who experienced being unfairly fired and over one third of those who experienced physical assault (36.7%) screening positive for probable depression. This highlights the significance of training front line workers who take reports of these events in Mental Health First Aid or another training shown to be effective at reducing mental health symptoms related to trauma and increasing the network of affordable, accessible mental health services available for those who experience bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

As with most surveys of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate, this survey relies on self-reporting. It wasn't designed to ask for a description of the location of an incident or for a detailed description of any specific incident because the level of analysis is the recent experience of individual people, not individual incidents. Unlike surveys that follow the same individuals over years and explore their experiences over that time, this survey captures experiences at a single moment. For this and other reasons, this survey does not definitively state what factors cause what outcomes. Instead, as noted above, it notes associations between phenomena.

ACTION STEPS



2017 Iftar in the City. Photo credit: Adrienne Nicole Productions

⁵ The depression screener used in the survey is the Patient Health Questionnaire 2 item measure (PHQ-2). For more details, see Appendix 1. The score ranges from 0 to 6 and the cutoff for "probable depression" is ≥ 3 . The two questions ask respondents how frequently they felt "little interest or pleasure in doing things" or "down, depressed or hopeless" in the last two weeks. The screener has a sensitivity of 83% and a specificity of 92% for major depression.

The data in this report shows the frequency of incidents of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate experienced by members of the surveyed communities during the time period the study took place. Our current national climate, in which racist, Islamophobic, xenophobic, anti-Semitic, and anti-immigrant rhetoric is increasingly normalized worsens this situation and makes it a daily life struggle for these communities. At the same time, the survey results uncovered barriers to reporting that prevent members of these communities from accessing resources that address incidents of discrimination and harassment and prevent further incidents from occurring. Furthermore, the mental health implications cannot be ignored. These findings throw into sharp relief studies undertaken by academic researchers demonstrating that experiences with discrimination are not merely unpleasant, fleeting indignities but rather consistent features of interactions among individuals and with public and private entities that have an ongoing negative impact on targeted groups.

- **Deployment of mobile clinics** where agency attorneys process discrimination complaints onsite at community-based and faith-based organizations.
- **Promoting messaging across multiple platforms that challenges racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia, and anti-Semitism, highlights the full spectrum of bias incidents, and encourages reporting to the agency.** In the past, the Commission has developed ground-breaking campaigns such as “You Have Rights NYC” that specifically feature common instances of immigrant, religious, and race discrimination in the Trump era and can use such past efforts as a model for messaging and resources for ongoing outreach.
- **Highlighting of positive outcomes in discrimination cases.** The Commission regularly publicizes in media and at events positive case outcomes, such as damages awarded, penalties assessed, or restorative measures undertaken. The Commission plans to continue to do so with a particular focus on cases involving the types of bias incidents referenced in this report. This will help to illustrate for the public the benefits of reporting, encouraging members of targeted communities to consider coming forward.

I. Ongoing Commission Actions



2018 Interfaith Seder. Photo credit: Kelly Williams Photography

In recent years, the Commission has already been deploying a range of initiatives and strategies to help address the challenges faced by these communities. As the national climate has deteriorated, the Commission has brought its communications, outreach, and enforcement power to bear to counter biased rhetoric and actions. Based on the results of these surveys, in coming months, the agency will redouble these efforts and target them as necessary.

Some of these initiatives include:

II. Recommendations for Future Action



2018 Interfaith Seder. Photo credit: Kelly Williams Photography

While the steps outlined above are important parts of a strategy for addressing the disturbing trends in harassment and discrimination documented in this report, further action is

necessary. Below we outline additional steps for implementation by stakeholders who are interested in partnering with the City government and the Commission to reduce the frequency and impact of these incidents.



2018 Interfaith Seder. Photo credit: Kelly Williams Photography

Focus outreach and legal resources on impacted communities in order to educate New Yorkers about their rights and encourage vulnerable communities to report incidents to the Commission, by:

- **Creating a workshop for vulnerable communities** developed by the Commission’s Bias Response Team that highlights the full spectrum of incidents, outlines the Commission’s resources, and explains the various options for reporting. The presentation will also highlight positive outcomes of discrimination cases to encourage reporting from affected communities and will be shared with individuals in impacted communities and community organizations that serve them.
- **Partnering with community and faith-based organizations to build a referral network for those who experience bias-related harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate.** Many New Yorkers are still reluctant to report directly to government entities. To address this, the Commission would develop partnerships with trusted community and faith-based organizations who are likely to be the first point of contact for community members who have experienced discrimination, bias, or acts of hate. The Commission would train and equip these organizations with the information needed to identify and refer potential violations of the City Human Rights Law to the agency for further screening and investigation.

- **Developing a bystander-intervention training** for delivery to City employees who work directly with the public. Such a training would educate frontline workers on how to de-escalate bias incidents and what resources to offer those who have been involved in such incidents. The Commission could partner with one of the many organizations that have already developed such curriculum when resources are available.
- **Undertaking more focused community outreach to observant religious communities.** Given the findings relating to the targeting of religiously observant individuals, especially those who due to their highly visible religious observance are often targeted for bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate, the City government should assess and increase outreach public services available to faith and community organizations serving such populations and ensure a consistent presence in such communities.
- **Ensuring a consistent Commission presence at community-based resource fairs or events** to share information about what the Commission does and what to expect if they report experiences with discrimination and harassment.
- **Offer City and Mayoral staff training about the City Human Rights Law and the experiences of communities surveyed in this report.** Commission-led trainings should include information on recent trends relating to bias incidents and applicable protections under the City Human Rights Law.
- **Prioritizing continued research efforts at the Commission with a particular attention to intersectional experiences and their intrinsic vulnerabilities.** The Commission would expand the scope of research projects, like this one, that explore forms of bigotry and their impact. Such explorations should focus on intersectional experiences such those of LGBTQ religious or black religious New Yorkers.
- **Continuing the dialogue with communities and organizations to track how they have utilized the findings from the survey.** The Commission would work with communities and organizations serving MASAJC communities to track how the data collected in the survey has been applied in fundraising, advocacy, and organizing efforts.

Xenophobia, Islamophobia, and Anti-Semitism in NYC Leading Up to and Following the 2016 Presidential Election: A Report on Discrimination, Bias, and Acts of Hate Experienced by Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers



2017 Iftar in the City. Photo credit: Adrienne Nicole Productions



2018 Vaisakhi celebration. Photo credit: Adrienne Nicole Productions

Investigating the experiences of Black New Yorkers. While the subsample of Black New Yorkers in this survey is far from representative of all Black New Yorkers, findings concerning their particular experiences of physical violence and employment discrimination demand further research. The Commission should, through qualitative or quantitative research, further investigate the particular experiences of African, African-American, Afro-Caribbean, Afro-Latinx, and other New Yorkers who identify as Black or as having African ancestry. Such a process would help to elucidate how discrimination based on race, religion, and other categories combine to result in the particular vulnerabilities that are documented in this study as well as other experiences that may be unique to New Yorkers from these groups. Such research could also explore how changes in the national political and social landscape in recent years have impacted the broader community of Black New Yorkers.

Partnering with fundraising organizations to encourage increased support from philanthropies for community-based and faith-based organizations that service and support local communities of Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers. Such funding could include resources for more frontline staff to conduct outreach on these issues and connect staff to the Commission, City agencies, and other organizations that can provide legal, mental health, and other forms of support.

Creating steady opportunities to hear more from Sikh communities, in light of survey findings suggesting that members of these communities are least likely to report that they had experienced bias incidents compared to the other groups surveyed. This could involve tracking and monitoring bias incidents against these specific communities and efforts to better understand why they are less likely to report bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate. This can be explored through town halls, round tables, listening sessions and other community focused events. These forms of consistent, highly-visible engagement can encourage New Yorkers in Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish and Sikh communities to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission or a faith or community based organization.

Address the mental health needs of Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh New Yorkers to combat the negative impacts of the bias incidents covered in this report. The Commission will work alongside ThriveNYC to figure out ways to support Muslim, Arab, South Asian, Jewish, and Sikh Communities impacted by discrimination and bias incidents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The New York City Commission on Human Rights thanks the many faith leaders, elected officials, organizers, advocates, and community groups that helped distribute the survey so widely. Our deepest gratitude is owed to the community members who shared their experiences of bias harassment, discrimination, and acts of hate. Specifically, we want to acknowledge the following individuals and organizations for their outreach efforts:

#GetOrganized Brooklyn, Adhikaar, African Advisory Council of the Bronx, African Communities Together, African Life Center, African Muslim Youth NY, African Services Committee, Al Haram Masjid, Al-Noor High School, An-Noor Social Center, Arab American Association of NY, Arab American Family Support Center, Asian Anti-Violence Network, Asser Levy Park, Avodah, Murad Awawdeh, Baba Makhan Shah Lubana Gurdwara Sikh Center, Bait'ul Aman Islamic Center, Bangla Bazar Jame Masjid, Bangladesh Heritage American Inc., Bangladeshi-American Community Council, Beit Al-Maqdis, BlueCross BlueShield Community Center, B'nai Jeshurun, Brighton Beach Neighborhood Association, Bronx Community College - African Students Association, Bronx Immigration Partnership, Bronx Islamic Cultural Center, Brookdale Village Senior Center, Center Against Domestic Violence, Center for Constitutional Rights, Chhaya Community Development Corporation, Club 76 Senior Center, Columbia School of Social Work Asian Pacific Islander Caucus, Columbia University Sewa, Community Info Days at Tappan Park, Congregation Beit Simchat Torah, Council of Peoples Organization (COPO), Council on American Islamic Relations NY, Crown Heights Central, Crown Heights Community Mediation Center, CUNY CLEAR, Desi Senior Center, Khader El-Yateem, El Centro, Footsteps, Jonathan Greenspun, Gurdwara Sikh Cultural Society, Harlem Havruta, Hazon, Hostos College, Humanity in Action, India Home, International Community High School - Bronx, Islamic Center at NYU, Islamic Center of North America Mosque, Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA) - Queens Center, Islamic Mission of America/ Dawood Mosque, Islamic Society of Bay Ridge, Jahajee Sisters- Indo Caribbean Alliance, Jamaica Muslim Center, Jamaica Muslim Center - Masjid Al-Mamoor, Sabeeh Jameel, Jewish Association Serving the Aging (JASA), Jewish Community Center of Bensonhurst, Jewish Community Center of Harlem, Jewish Community Center of Staten Island, Jewish Community Relations Council of New York (JCRC-NY), Jewish Queer Youth (JQY), Jewish Theological Seminary, Jewish Voice for Peace - NYC, Jews for Racial and Economic Justice (JFREJ), John Jay College of Criminal Justice - African Students Association, Kehilat Sephardim of Ahavat Achim, Keshet, Kolot Chayeinu/Voices of Our Lives, Lab/Shul, Khalid Latif, Madina Masjid Islamic Council of America, Manhattan Sikh Association, Maria's Senior Day Center, Marlene Meyerson Jewish Community Center of Manhattan,

Masjid Al-Ihsan, Masjid Aqsa-SALAM, Masjid At-Taqwa, Masjid Rahmah, Muslim American Society NY, MAS Youth Center, MPower Change, Muslim Community Network, Muslim Sisters of Staten Island, National Domestic Workers Alliance, Neighborhood Housing Services, New York Immigration Coalition, Pan African Community Development Initiative, Faiza Patel, Parkchester Library New York Public Library, Peace Decembar, Preet Kaur Viridi, Queens College Hillel, Queens College Muslim Students Association, Queens Solidarity Coalition, Rama Issa-Ibrahim, Repair the World NYC, Pinny Ringel, Riverdale Children's Theater, Sadhana, Sakhi for South Asian Women, Sapna NYC, Sauti Yetu Center for African Women and Families, Amanda (Miryem-Khaye) Seigel, Sephardic Community Center, Shetu Inc., Shir HaMaalot, Shri Guru Ravi Dass Temple, Sikh Association of State in Staten Island, Sikh Coalition, Sikh Cultural Society, Silberman School of Social Work at Hunter College, South Asian Youth Action, Southeast Queens Muslim Collective, Amandeep Singh, Simran Jeet Singh, Staten Island Housing Court, Staten Island NFP Association, Inc., Syed Enterprises Inc, Tarab, Temple Emanu-El of Staten Island, Temple Israel, The Caribbean Equality Project, The City College of New York, The Pavilions at Tyson Lane, T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights, UJA-Federation of New York, United Sikh Association at Baruch College, United Sikh Association at NYU, Weekly Bangalee, WomanKind, Women for Afghan Women, Yankasa Association, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, YMCA New American Welcome Center, Boro Park YM-YWHA, Central Queens YM-YWHA, Samuel Field YM-YWHA, Shorefront YM-YWHA of Brighton-Manhattan Beach, The Riverdale YM-YWHA, Public Advocate Letitia James, Assembly Member Pamela Harris, Brooklyn Borough President Eric Adams, Council Member Brad Lander, Council Member Carlos Menchaca, Council Member Daneek Miller, Council Member Daniel Dromm, Council Member Jumaane Williams, Council Member Debi Rose, Council Member Justin Brannan, Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer, Mayor's Community Affairs Unit, Mayor's Office for International Affairs, Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs, NYC Commission on Gender Equity, NYC Department of Probation, Public Advocate Letitia James, Queens Borough President Melinda Katz.

We acknowledge that many Commission staff contributed to this project and helped the survey reach so many communities in the City. We offer specific appreciation to Harbani Ahuja, Carmen Boon, Kajori Chaudhuri, Widad Hassan, Seth Hoy, Jo Kaur, Alexander Korkhov, Rosa Lee, Beth Miller, Christelle Onwu, Sapna Raj, Rasel Rahman, Brittany-Jade Saunders, Dana Sussman, Edwin Tablada, and Andrew Teixeira.



APPENDIX 1

EXTENDED METHODOLOGY REPORT

Depression Screener: The score ranges from 0 to 6 and the cutoff for “probable depression” is ≥ 3 . The two questions ask respondents how frequently they felt “little interest or pleasure in doing things” or “down, depressed or hopeless” in the last two weeks. The screener has a sensitivity of 83% and a specificity of 92% for major depression. The depression screener used in the survey is the Patient Health Questionnaire 2 item measure (PHQ-2).^{vii}

Sample Size Criteria: During the consultation phase of this project, it was agreed that statistics with fewer than 20 respondents in the denominator and five in the numerator would not be shared publicly. This is for two reasons: first, it was of the utmost importance that no one could figure out who took the survey and how they responded. Second, statistics based upon very small numbers are unreliable.

Comparative Statistics: There were far more comparative statistics of interest to this report than could be discussed in a short document such as this one. The comparative statistics selected for inclusion were not only those which reached the level of statistical significance, but which also had *real-world*, practical significance and which showed *large* differences.

WORKS CITED

- i. Jones, L. M., Mitchell, K. J., Turner, H. A., & Ybarra, M. L. (2018). Characteristics of bias-based harassment incidents reported by a national sample of U.S. adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 65, 50-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.02.013>
- ii. Asian American Federation (2016) Snapshot of Asian Americans in New York City council districts. Retrieved from <http://aafny.org/cic/briefs/NYCouncil2016.pdf>
- iii. New York City Planning (2015) B04006: People reporting ancestry. Retrieved from https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/planning/download/pdf/data-maps/nyc-population/acs/ancest_2015acs1yr_nyc.pdf
- iv. Jones, R. P. (2016). Religion in New York City's Five Boroughs. Retrieved from <https://www.ppri.org/spotlight/religion-new-york-citys-five-boroughs/>
- v. The Sikh Coalition. (2008). Making our voices heard: A civil rights agenda for New York City's Sikhs. Retrieved from <http://www.sikhcoalition.org/documents/pdf/RaisingOurVoicesReport.pdf>
- vi. New York City Planning. (2015). C05006: Place of birth for the foreign-born population. Retrieved from http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/planning/download/pdf/data-maps/nyc-population/acs/pob_2015acs1yr_nyc.pdf
- vii. Moriarty DG, Zack MM, Kobau R. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Healthy Days Measures - population tracking of perceived physical and mental health over time. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2003;1:37. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-1-37.

