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Introduction

Brutality against mankind is an understatement when trying to conceptualize major events in the twentieth century in violence and hatred against one another of epic proportions across the globe. Dating back to the early 1900’s when 1.5 million Armenians living in Turkey were eliminated from their historic homeland by the Turks, to the Nazi Holocaust in Germany that killed nearly 6 million Jews, to the Rwandan Genocide of 1994 of nearly 800,000 deaths, and also to the massacre in Bosnia-Herzegovina which resulted in genocide that was committed by the Serbs to eliminate the Muslims in Bosnia (The History Place, 2000). A common theme in each one of these events is that they all were the result of pure hatred toward another identifying group. Compared to the aforementioned events, the United States of America has remained relatively untouched when considering the number of deaths; however, the United States did have its fair share of violence and attacks. A deep rooted history with slavery that divided the northern, more conservative part of the country against the southern, pro-slavery part erupting in a Civil War that ended in 1865, coupled with the greatest attack on US soil in modern history with the 9/11 attacks, and you have some extremely profound underlying issues that could be examined in an analysis of hate crime in the United States. Marshall Medoff in his paper published in the American Journal of Economics and Sociology reflects upon the devastating consequences of hate, and states that hateful behaviour “has the potential to become a major social problem in the twenty-first century” (Medoff, 1999). The future of America will rely heavily upon the race/ethnic/minority relations, and it is imperative that we focus on cultivating these relationships properly by understanding the factors that transform hate into violence. In this paper, we will examine the effects of different variables such as Unemployment Rate, Poverty Rate, and Per-Capita Income in order to determine if there is a
correlation between these variables and the number of incidences of hate crimes reported, both at the state level and at the Federal level. The data will be compiled via the FBI annual Uniform Crime Reports. We will also study various programs and policies put in place to combat hate crime, and examine their effectiveness on the number of incidents of hate crime.

Before we proceed into analyzing and interpreting the data, the first part in this paper will stress the importance of determining exactly what a hate crime is, and why it is a relevant and important topic for continued study. In the second part, we will move on to consider the victims of these crimes and the impact it has on the identifying group. Third, we will examine the various offenders and speculate upon reasons why they commit these crimes. The fourth part of the paper is the most important part of the analysis: what are the variables that determine the number of incidences of hate crime and does the number of agencies within a state show a relationship with the number of crimes. We will attempt to define these variables and consider if statistically significant correlations exist when running our regression. Finally, we will sum up and conclude the paper with some remarks about what we would like to see further examined in the future so that we can develop a more profound understanding of hate crime.

**Defining hate crime and its importance**

Most everyone can agree that a hate crime is an exceptionally undesirable offence, and one can be assured that it has quite a profound effect upon its victims. But what exactly is a hate crime? To the common person, this can seem all too obvious and one could be tempted to define hate crime as simply a crime in which the offender hates the victim. This is clearly not the case as most crimes involving hatred between parties would not fall under the legal definition of
hate crime. The simplest, most elementary definition of a hate crime would be a “criminal act that is motivated, at least in part, by the group affiliation of the victim” (Gerstenfeld, 2013, p.11). In numerous academic literatures on this topic, scholars are quick to classify victims into six generally accepted groups; typically, these will include race, religion, sexual orientation, gender, ethnicity, and disability. However, as we will recognize throughout this text, there are infinite exceptions to the rule; such as what exactly is constituted as a hate crime. Is gang violence, terrorism, or even political violence a hate crime? In Rwanda, does a Tutsi killing a Hutu because of his political preference constitute a hate crime? In which category does this fit in? In addition, there are difficulties in distinguishing noncriminal and criminal acts of bias. One can run into problems when non-criminal acts of bias and freedom of speech conflict; such as an American newspaper printing magazines proposing the extortion of all Muslims in the US. Is this a hate crime, or simply an act of free speech? One needs to be careful in being quick to restrict the exercise of freedom of speech because of the First Amendment in US law. As we can see, it is an extremely difficult task in classifying a crime as a regular crime or a crime motivated by bias and prejudice.

**Birth of Hate Crime**

Where did this idea of hate crime come from? It has only been in relatively recent years that crimes motivated by bias and prejudice became a social problem and started to get attention. The actual term “hate crime” became popular in the 1970’s in the United States during the peak of various social rights movements such as the black civil rights movements, the women’s movement, and the gay and lesbian movement. It turns out that these movements were instrumental in the development of hate crime legislation in the United States. The main
emphasis of the Black civil rights movement was discrimination in all areas of social life including employment, education, voting, and public accommodations (Gerstenfeld and Grant, 2004, p.25). Participating discriminating entities were seen as the cause of such a problem, and the violent demonstrations were seen as a symptom.

The Birth of Hate Crime Policy in the US

The principle reason behind such a large concentration of social movements in favour of minority groups was that there really was a big push to try and convince the government to pass new legislature that protects these vulnerable minority communities. Because of the vast support these activists groups were receiving, by 1990, the first piece of nationally significant legislation came into fruition. In 1990, the Hate Crime Statistics Act was signed into legislature by George Bush and it required the Attorney General to collect data “about crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity” (FBI, "About Hate Crime Statistics", 2009). The Attorney General then passed the duties down to the Director of the FBI, who was now in charge of implementing procedures for collecting and managing the hate crime data. In 1994, the Hate Crime Sentencing Act was introduced which promoted increased sentencing for federal cases where there was proof of victim prejudice with respect to one of the recognized bias motivations. However, there still only exists limited federal legislation with respect to hate crime; it has primarily been left up to the states to come up with their own laws.
**Value of a Hate Crime**

It is pretty clear that society can be affected greatly from an incident of hate crime; therefore it is certainly a plausible statement to say that the value of a hate crime can be greater than the value put on a normal crime. Further in this paper under the sub heading “Economic Perspective”, we will present reasons why a hate crime differs from a regular crime, and why a hate crime deserves more attention than it currently does.

Just like the data collection, there is a wide variation in statutory provisions among different states with respect to different identifying groups. To highlight a specific example, California has statutory provisions in place that cover all six major identifying categories (Race, Religion, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation, Gender, and Disability); however, in the neighbouring state of Oregon, the categories of Gender and Disability are not covered under state hate crime law (State Hate Crimes Statutory Provisions, 2014). For the complete list of the varying hate crime laws by state, see Appendix 1. This presents a major problem because certain identifying groups may be covered in one state but not covered in another.

As a result of the Hate Crime Sentencing Act in 1994, penalty enhancements have been introduced at the state level. This means that in certain states where a crime is committed, if there is evidence that the crime was committed with one of the participating bias motivations, the penalty of the existing crime can be increased. Ceteris paribus, imposing an increased sentence when convicted with a hate crime would indicate in increased value that society places on the crime. However, when looking at the probability of actually being convicted with a hate crime, it is much less than the probability of being caught committing a regular crime. Therefore, depending on the strength of all of these variables, their effect is ambiguous when determining the value of a hate crime as opposed to a regular crime.
Hate Crimes requiring their own laws

The relatively new area of hate crime legislation has given rise to numerous controversial arguments in favour of and against having separate hate crime legislation. As we saw earlier, it can be extremely difficult distinguishing what exactly constitutes a hate crime, so we could be quick to conclude that applying laws for these hate crimes is no easy task. Advocates for hate crime legislation raise valid arguments as to the importance of passing new legislation; however many of their assertions have been the result of inconclusive, unreliable data in their research to support their claim.

Weisburd and Levin raise the point that victims of hate crimes suffer more psychological damage than victims of regular crimes. After being victimized, they suffer from feelings of low self-esteem, depression, and they lose the sense of personal security in their lives. This can lead to difficulties in trusting those who are around you and being able to maintain a normal social life (Weisburd & Levin, 1994). I believe we all can sympathize with the side effects of being victimized, but at the same time, these claims are extremely difficult to support empirically. As well, even if it is plausible, the next step is determining if the degree of suffering from these side effects is greater than the degree of suffering experienced by victims of just a regular crime. Many scholars, including criminal justice professor Brian Levin, assert that hate crime not only affects the victim and their family, they affect the entire identifying community (Levin, 1999). This is certainly plausible, and I can definitely attest to these claims. I am half-Black, and when the murders of Trayvon Martin and Michael Brown broke into the news, it had a larger emotional impact on me than what I would’ve felt in the case of an ordinary murder. It is not because I don’t respect the other races; it is because the victim and I share a common
characteristic; our racial background. It is the same principle that applies to international economic development. The recent outbreak of Ebola did not necessarily become popular or newsworthy in the US until there was a case in the US. Before that, there was hardly any coverage in the media, even though the epidemic had been going on for nearly 30 years prior.

In addition to discussing why hate crimes deserve separate laws upon the basis of psychological effects, there are numerous scholars that have studied the symbolic effects of laws. There is a certain sense of importance when something is written in the law. It portrays underlying values of the society and it teaches and reiterates the social norms. Having hate crime laws sends a message that “expresses strong social condemnation of bias crimes” (Beale, 2000). Sara Sun Beale, a Law professor at Duke University, presents a case that having hate crime legislation will imply a reassurance to those groups, of victims targeted by hate crime, of their equitable position within society. In fact, applying this type of legislation is “seen as reinforcing the community’s commitment to equality among all citizens” (Beale, 2000, p.1254). Having a section within the law books dedicated to bias motivated crime sends a symbolic message for good reason. For the most part, no matter what identifying group a victim relates to, being a victim of hate crime sends a clear message of not being wanted in the community, not being valuable enough to occupy the same area as another group, and also to not be outspoken or else risking being harmed. As a counter to such a unique form of crime, society needs to counter act this behaviour with a clear and equally powerful message that legitimizes the intolerance for such conduct.

For many advocacy groups of hate crime legislation, having a representation in the criminal law books not only legitimizes their cause, but also is used as a reference for their
claims. There have been attempts to do so, such as a study conducted by Bill Dixon and David Gadd in the United Kingdom. Their study consisted of interviews with perpetrators and data collected through focus group discussions with the locals. They concluded two such theories as to why the hate crime laws introduced in the UK, via the creation of the Crime and Disorder act of 1998, have not been as effective as advertised. One theory is that simply the message that the act is trying to convey is not strong enough to communicate that bias-motivated crime is unacceptable. The other theory is that the message they are communicating is being drowned out by other contradicting government policies (Dixon & Gadd, 2006). It can definitely seem plausible that instituting these legislations will have a long term effect on the reduction of prejudice; however, just like every other proposal, it can be extremely difficult to quantify and prove empirically.

**Data Collection**

The data that is used to generate these hate crime statistics are collected and reported via numerous law enforcement agencies throughout the United States that participate in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. These participating law enforcement agencies voluntarily report their statistics to the FBI every year of how many of these crimes have been reported in their respective jurisdiction. Figure 1 displays the number of participating law enforcement agencies that have been established in the United States. Over the past 10 years, the number of participating agencies increased from 11,909 in 2003, to 15,016 in 2013, an increase of 26%.
As represented in Figure 1, we can clearly see that there is a rising trend in the number of participating law enforcement agencies over the last 10 years, and history only suggests that it will continue to increase in the future. However, when we consider the changes in population and adjust the data in terms the number of participating agencies per 100,000 population, we receive a much different result. In Figure 2, we see that the number of participating law enforcement agencies remains much unchanged over the last 10 years. In 2003, there were 4.94 agencies per 100,000 while in 2013; there were 5.09 agencies per 100,000. So, we notice that even though the aggregate number of participating agencies had increased by 26%, when taking into account an increasing population, the real increase is only a mere 3%. Upon realization of such a mere increase in the real number of agencies, we were interested in finding if there was any
correlation between the number of agencies and the number of hate crime incidents reported. Theory would suggest that when there are more agencies available to report a hate crime incident, there should be an increase in the number of hate crimes reported simply due to the fact that these agencies are more readily available.

![Figure 2: Hate crime reporting agencies per 100,000, 2003-2013](image)

**Data Source:** Hate Crime Statistics, 2003-2013

However, empirical evidence did not support the theory that having more participating agencies will produce more hate crime incidents reported. In fact, the opposite seemed to occur. On average, as the real rate of participating agencies increased, the total number of hate crime incidents per 100,000 has been decreasing, as can be seen in Figure 3. According to the FBI Uniform Crime Reporting website, in 2003, there were 7,489 hate crime incidents reported to 11,909 participating agencies. In 2013, only 5,928 incidents were reported to 15,016 participating agencies.
This raises a number of issues when contemplating the credibility of the statistics presented by the FBI as a result of any intra-agency problems. The Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR) is a nationwide effort to “generate reliable information for use in law enforcement administration, operation, and management” (Uniform Crime Reporting Statistics, 2009). According to the official UCR website, they claim that their data is used by all sorts of professionals, such as criminologists, legislators, and municipal planners for a variety of research and planning purposes. The main flaw behind this program is that the very foundation of the data is gathered from voluntary reporting practices. Following the conditions stated under the Hate Crime Statistics Act, the FBI is mandated to generate these annual reports that detail the total number of hate crimes reported via collecting data from the participating law enforcement agencies. However, due to the voluntary nature of reporting by these agencies, the
data suffers from a chronic case of underreporting. This is an important concept to keep in mind when offering statements or coming to conclusions that are based off of this data.

Unfortunately, it is near impossible to create a data set with completely accurate statistics for a number of reasons. The ambiguity in precisely defining exactly what constitutes a hate crime contributes directly to the plague of underreporting. If there is ambiguity surrounding the definition, law enforcement officers would be more inclined to not report it. This does not mean that the country is not being proactive about it, in fact, there are many programs and organizations dedicated to educating law enforcement officers. The Anti-Defamation League is the nation’s leader in developing programs that help law enforcement officers understand and recognize various activities and behaviours of various hate groups as well as “crafting legal and legislative responses” to bias motivated behavior (“How to Combat Bias and Hate Crimes”, 2003).

For example, in Table 1, we examine the disparities in the total number of hate crime incidents between various states. The three states listed on the left side have been historically racially tense states, while the states listed on the right are the more traditional, northern states. Just by looking with the bare eye, it becomes evidence that the data must be flawed. This is to be expected with the lack of a precise definition of hate crime and when participation is voluntary. Although the states of Alabama and Mississippi technically participate, clearly they do not participate fully. It’s hard to believe that there have only been four reported hate crime incidents in Mississippi in 2013.
Reasons for such a high variability of the statistics and a very low number of actual hate crimes being reported are quick and easy to come by. The basis among most of the reasons revolves around mistrust in police or a belief that the police are not able to do anything about it. According to a news study, the percentage of people that believe the police are not able to or won’t help out with a reported hate crime attack has risen from 14% in 2003 to 24% in 2011 (Potok, 2013). As we can see, it is not only the underreporting by law enforcement agencies that contribute to a lack of true representative statistics, but also the population’s lack of reporting incidences to these agencies adds to the problem. Although hate crimes against Blacks and Latinos have among the highest reported incidences, these victims are more likely not to report their incidences to the police in fear of being mistreated by police and possibly be concerned with being deported. As well, the gay and lesbian community may rightly perceive the police as being homophobic (Potok, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Hate Crime Incidents</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Hate Crime Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2,994,079</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3,970,239</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>4,849,377</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2,839,099</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>4,649,676</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5,457,173</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Hate Crime Statistics, 2013

An Economic Perspective

As we have seen earlier, the lack of testability in the majority of these sociological theories why hate crimes deserve their own laws is an apparent flaw. In this case, it is imperative that we present a formal model that can explain law enforcement’s presence in relation to hate crimes and the effects of hate crime legislation on controlling hate crimes. This
model was created by Li Gan, Roberton Williams, and Thomas Wiseman from Texas A&M University, University of Maryland, and University of Texas, respectively. Their model is similar to the model presented by Gary Becker, in which potential criminals weigh the benefits they receive from committing a crime and compare it to the cost that they would incur (effort and potential punishment) in order to decide what action they will take. They present five possible reasons how a hate crime can differ from a regular crime, with each of them possibly explaining the need for more government effort in regards to hate crime (Gan, "A Simple Model of Optimal Hate Crime Legislation", 2004).

A lower weight on the utility of hate criminals

As a society, due to the relative newness of hate crime legislation, we may put less emphasis on hate criminals than we do on regular criminals. In other words, when talking in terms of social welfare, we assign less weight to the utility that the hate criminals receive than we do to the weight we assign to regular criminals. Edward Glaeser, an Economics professor at Harvard, suggested that an alternate, effective strategy of combatting hate crimes would be for the government to publicize images in the media of attacks on minorities that were hate related (Glaeser, 2005). This will generate a “hate the haters” mentality. Because of this, non-criminals will gain utility from making potential hate criminals worse off, which would then, theoretically, reduce the incentive of committing a hate crime and also increase the cost of doing so.

Hate Crime as a Negative Externality

Not only does a hate crime affect the direct victim, but it can also cause other members of that minority group to feel indirectly threatened or sympathize with the victim. Even
members from the offender’s group can be affected by feeling ashamed for what their group member has done to another individual. In a report by the U.S Department of Justice, hate crimes are “most likely to create or exacerbate tensions, which can trigger larger community-wide racial conflict, civil disturbances, and even riots” (Hate Crime, 2014).

**Avoidance as a Negative Externality**

As a way to avoid becoming the victim of a hate crime, members of targeted minority groups may engage in avoidance strategies. One way this could be accomplished would be by hiding their identity and trying to pass as a member of a non-targeted group. In a society that values multiculturalism and diversity, “efforts like this to hide one’s identity will create a negative externality” (Gan, 2004). Having contact with a diverse range of minority groups is imperative to reduce hatred toward these groups because it makes committing hate crimes against one of these minority group more costly, since you risk losing all your contacts within that community. However, if these targeted groups use avoidance as a way to deal with victimization, the potential to build this diverse range of contacts diminishes.

**Harder to avoid being a victim of a hate crime**

It is much more difficult to avoid being targeted by a hate crime simply because of the relatively permanent nature of who a person is. For example, to reduce the chance of one being robbed, not flashing fancy jewelry or wearing luxury clothes will certainly help. With a hate crime, one simply cannot change the colour of their skin to reduce their chances of being racially profiled. This, in turn, increases the marginal cost of the avoidance effort by potential hate crime victims.
**Number of potential victims are smaller**

An offender usually doesn’t pick at random the minority group that they will target; most likely it is premeditated. This causes the number of victims potential victims targeted to be substantially less in the case of hate crimes as opposed to a regular crime.

**Enforcing Hate Crime Laws**

With the response of legislators towards hate crime peaking in the late 1980’s to early 1990’s, the attention then turned to law enforcement agencies as “the principal problem area with respect to hate crime” (Gerstenfeld & Grant, 2004, p.35). In the late 1990’s, the issues of who and what should be covered under these relatively new laws have largely been agreed upon, and now it was time to address the structural changes that needed to take place at the organizational level. As mentioned earlier, there have been many studies conducted and many attempts to create a precise definition of hate crime that envelopes all of its components. This presents a problem in the way that law enforcement agencies conduct their training and responding practices. Without a clear definition, it is to be expected that hate crime policing is quite variable across jurisdictions and even across different divisions within the same jurisdiction. As we saw in Figure 3, racially divided, notorious states such as Alabama and Mississippi have reported such a low number of incidents that it automatically raises a red flag when reviewing the data. I use the term “racially divided” in this context because of the dark history these southern states have had with slavery and the civil rights movement. A key example to point out that these states still remain somewhat racially divided is looking at the demographics of schools. After 1970, most schools, because of federal legislation, were forced to
become integrated. However, in the early 2000s, judges freed these schools from federally mandated integration laws, and many of these schools have reverted back to their original ways as if they had never been forced to integrate in the first place. It is said that in Alabama, one in three black students attend a predominately black school (Hannah-Jones, N., 2014).

Hate crimes in the legislature have come a long way from simply being a popular social movement back in the 1970’s. From the time these movements first started gaining momentum, to its introduction into the legislature, and from establishing judicial theory to the organizational implementation of this theory into the law enforcement agencies, hate crime has legitimized itself within the legislature.

**Theory of Hate Crime**

*Hate Crime as Envious Behaviour*

In the paper, “An Economic Analysis of Hate Crime”, by Lewis Gale, Will Heath, and Randy Ressler of the University of Louisiana Lafayette, they attempt to explain the number of hate crime incidents using a number of variables. They define hate crime as a result of envious behavior. Most crime perpetrators involve themselves with delinquent behavior for personal gain or profit and can be indifferent with respect to the well-being of their victims (Gale, 2002). This is the key distinction that separates a hate crime from a regular crime. When a delinquent conducts a hate crime, the principal motivation is not personal gain. More so, they are trying to make the victim as worse off as possible by demonstrating a willingness to expend their resources to make sure that this happens. An envious person is characterized as the type of person willing to reduce the welfare of another individual by expending their own resources.
So, relating to the subject of hate crime, if the income gap between the minority and the majority race were to decrease, the number of hate crime incidents aimed toward the minority group members by the majority group would likely increase. On the other hand, when the income differential increases between the minority and the majority group, it would be likely that the number of hate crime incidents geared towards the majority group would increase; more so if the minority group feels that this is the result of pure discrimination.
The Victims

As a way to develop a deeper understanding of the context of hate crime, we will examine the characteristics of victims of these types of crime. In generating our analysis, we have compiled data from two primary sources in order to provide us with broader knowledge and understanding of the real issues. The first source that we will use is data compiled from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting resource. This is the official reporting source that collects extremely detailed data that is gathered through the voluntary process of law enforcement agencies throughout the country. The second source we will use comes from the Bureau of Justice Statistics’ National Crime Victimization survey. The NCVS collects and gathers its data via surveys that are given out to the public. In order to provide some sort of consistency, the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report and the National Crime Victimization survey collect their data based on the same definition of hate crime. This stems from the Hate Crime Statistics Act (28 U.S.C § 534) which defines hate crimes as crimes that “manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, gender and gender identity, [emphasis added] religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity” (Hate Crime Statistics Act, 2011).

We must be cautious when interpreting the data used from each of these sources because they both have their drawbacks. As we discussed earlier, the flaws from using data from the FBI is that hate crimes are one of those crimes that suffer from extreme underreporting. As well, when reading data from the NCVS, it is important to take note that different people may have different tolerances or perceptions of what they perceive as a hate crime. These differences can be extreme and therefore should not be the sole basis on which one bases their conclusion from.
For example, when looking at Figure 4, we can see the disparity quite clearly. The dark orange line represents the FBI reported incidents collected from the Uniform Crime Report. The light orange line represents the number of estimated hate crime victimizations from the NCVS. In 2004, according to the National Crime Victimization survey, there was an estimated 281,670 hate crime victimizations while according to the FBI, there was only a mere 7649 reported incidents; a difference of almost 37 times more than what the FBI had reported. It is surprising that the number of reported hate crimes to the FBI has been trending downwards between 2004 and 2012, while data in the NCVS has varied over the years but indicates a slight trending increase.

Characteristics of the victims of hate crimes

What groups of people are most likely to be the target of hate crime? When describing the various characteristics of hate crime victims, we will use data from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report. First, we will focus our attention on race, and then we will examine the other characteristics of hate crime victims which includes religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and disability.

**Race**

When studying or talking about hate crime, it is highly unlikely that a conversation will carry on too long without the issue of race coming up. This is because bias motivated crimes based on racist intentions are the most common type of hate crime, which in turn, has made it also the most recognized form. The majority of news outlets will cover stories of racial prejudice because it is a topic that people feel very strongly about. A person is not able to change their race; therefore it is considered a permanent identifying characteristic of oneself which can explain the sensitivity and passion that arises when discussing a subject such as race.

As Table 2 clearly shows, bias motivated crimes by race compose a significant percentage of the amount of total reported hate crimes. In 2007, the FBI collected data on 7,624 reported hate crime incidents, and of those, 3,870 were based on racial prejudice; over 50% of all reported hate crimes. Although aggregate reported hate crimes were down slightly in 2013, the percentage of bias motivated crimes by race was still an astounding 48% of the total reported hate crimes. One reason to account for such a large percentage to be racially motivated is simply that these types of crimes may be easier to spot and report. As we discussed earlier about the
ambiguity around the defining characteristics of hate crimes, racially motivated hate crimes can be slightly easier to spot and to report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total reported hate crimes</th>
<th>Bias motivated crimes by race</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7,624</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7,783</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6,604</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6,628</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>2,917</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Hate Crime Statistics, 2007-2013

When analyzing the data even more, we unveil even more staggering characteristics of this data set. While the number of bias motivated crimes by race as a percentage of the total reported hate crimes hover around 50% from the years 2007 to 2013, the majority of these cases are aimed at the Anti-Black/African-American minority group. In Table 3, we can see that of the 3,780 racially reported hate crime incidents in 2007, 2,658 of these were classified with an Anti-Black/African-American bias; a percentage of nearly 69%. During these years, the percentage reached its lowest point in 2012, while in 2008; the US experienced its highest percentage of Anti-Black/African-American bias at an astounding 72%.
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Hate Crimes by Race</th>
<th>Anti - Black/African American</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3870</td>
<td>2658</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3199</td>
<td>2284</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3135</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2917</td>
<td>2076</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2797</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2871</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: *Hate Crime Statistics, 2007-2013*

Various social and political factors possibly can be attributable to such a large percentage of racial prejudice aimed toward African Americans. The United States has a notoriously dark history when it comes to slavery and racial discrimination. Up until the mid-1800s, black slaves were shipped in from Africa to work for and serve the White slave masters where they were treated horrendously. Even after slavery was abolished, the United States remained racially segregated. This provided the breeding grounds for creating a racially tense environment where Blacks were targeted and classified as an inferior minority; a culture that still exists in some parts of the country, especially in parts of the south.

In addition to a racially segregated past, there are more modern factors as to why such a high percentage of racially driven hate crimes are aimed towards Blacks/African-Americans. Perhaps it is that of poor financial circumstances, racial stereotypes in the media, as well as a person’s previous experiences with African Americans (*Gerstenfeld & Grant, 2004*). It is
important to note that the year that experienced the highest percentage of anti-Black hate crime was also the same year that the United States entered a recession. During this time, its citizens experienced a period of great financial instability which could then result in scapegoating by those that are worse off. Blaming others for the decrease in a person’s well-being definitely has the potential to escalate to violence.

When analyzing data from the NCVS, the results were inconsistent with those generated from the FBI Uniform Crime Report data. In Figure 5, the vertical bars represent the proportion of the total amount of bias motivated hate crimes by each race. The data is divided into three categories; Anti-White, Anti-Black, and Anti-All Other. According to the FBI, during the years 2004 and 2012, Anti-Black hate crime was reported nearly 2.5 times more than any other race. However, according to data collected via the National Crime Victimization Survey in 2004 and

![Figure 5: Hate Crime Victimization by Race](image)

2012, the victimization of Blacks only accounted for 4% and 13% of the total amount of hate crimes, respectively (NCVS). This difference is staggering considering the magnitude of it. A hypothesis as to why this difference might occur would be the collection method of the data from the survey. This suggests that when collecting data, the vast majority of respondents were not of the Black race. This is concerning because if one is not careful in analyzing the data critically, this could lead to the belief that there is no such violence or crimes of hatred towards the Black minority groups, when in fact, as history and recent times have demonstrated to us, this is not the case.

Religion

The growth that religious attention has received over the last decade or so has been somewhat beneficial to provide a heightened awareness of religious diversity within our culture (Chakraborti & Garland, 2009, p.36). This diversity is welcomed by some who believe that freedom of expression is a foundational cornerstone of our society. However, this diversity may impose negative implications for various communities of faith that are targeted based on their religious beliefs. Especially in recent years since the Oklahoma City bombings and the terrorist attacks of 9/11 in the USA.

Inconsistent with my initial thought that Muslims would be the highest targeted minority group when talking about religiously motivated hate crimes, the highest reported group were those from the Jewish community. Over the years 2007 to 2013, the Jewish community consistently ranked as the most reported religious minority group tallying up over half of all religiously motivated hate crimes. As described in Table 4, Anti-Jewish hate crime has remained a significant proportion of all religious hate crimes. In 2007, the FBI gathered data on
969 Anti-Jewish crimes composing a percentage of 69.2% of the total. We mentioned earlier in the paper talking about reasons why the Blacks experienced the highest percentage of total racially driven hate crimes. When talking about the Jews with respect to the total amount of hate crimes by religion, we see that a similar pattern as emerged here. The percentage peaked right around the time when the recession hit the US in 2009, experiencing an astonishing 71.5% of all religiously motivated hate crimes being Anti-Jewish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Hate Crimes by Religion</th>
<th>Anti-Jewish</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Hate Crime Statistics, 2007-2013
When talking about all the other religions, the numbers are quite minuscule in comparison. In 2013, 60% of all religiously biased reported incidents were attributed towards the Jewish population. Figure 8 illustrates that the second highest religious group to have hate crime committed toward them was the Islamic religion with a reported 135 incidents, accounting for 13.1% of total incidents in 2013. When looking back at the data starting from 2007 to 2013, we recognize a pattern in which Anti-Jewish and Anti-Islamic/Muslim consistently rank as the two most frequent religious groups to be reported. As mentioned earlier, Anti-Jewish reported incidents peaked in 2009 at an astonishing 71% of total incidents.
In Figure 9, we can see that Anti-Islamic/Muslim reported incidents peaked in the most recent year, 2013, at 13.1% of total incidents. When looking at a linear trend over the past 6 years, we recognize a negative relationship between Anti-Jewish and Anti-Muslim reported incidents. In recent years, national awareness of the American War in the Middle East has increased and tensions between the two regions have escalated. With recent terrorist attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria on the Western world and with no signs of slowing down, we would expect more hate crime incidents toward groups identifying with the Islamic religions in the future. This prediction stems from a theory discussed earlier in the paper, claiming that when people feel threatened by a minority group or feel that that minority group is gaining too much power relative to them, envious behavior begins to arise and thus making them more likely to commit a hate crime against that group.

Data Source: Hate Crime Statistics, 2007-2013
Sexual Orientation

Within the category of hate crime with a bias motivation of sexual orientation, the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report includes all Anti-Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Transgender incidents, as well as Anti-Heterosexual and Anti-Bisexual. In recent years, the attention and awareness of the LGBT movement has been gaining traction. Up until 2000, the law in 40 states defined marriage as a relationship between a man and a woman, thus having provisions that limited marriage only to those couples of the opposite sex (Same Sex Marriage Laws, 2015). However, through many court cases and appeals, by the end of 2014, there were 37 states and the District of Columbia that recognize same-sex marriage.

Figure 10: Hate Crime Incidents based on Sexual Orientation by Year, 2007-2013

Data Source: Hate Crime Statistics, 2007-2013
As we notice in Figure 10, there seems to be no such trend in the number of hate crimes based on sexual orientation. In 2008, the number of reported incidents based on sexual orientation peaked at 1,297 during when the US experienced a recession. In 2012, we notice that the total number of reported incidents drastically fell to 1,135. Remember that we must take into account the discrepancies and drawbacks of using FBI data from its Uniform Crime Report. It suffers from a severe lack of underreporting and flawed data reporting practices.

**Disability**

A disability hate crime incident can be defined as an act that is perceived to be based on prejudice toward the victim because of their disability. One of the most vulnerable disabled groups was those that had mental health problems, learning difficulties, or visual impairments. These groups lack severe self-defense capabilities and can be taken advantage of very easily. In Figure 11, we see that the US experienced its highest number of reported hate crime incidents with a bias motivation of the victim’s disability in 2009, a total of 96 incidents. Compared with the other victim’s categories, disability as a bias motivation is quite small. Between the years 2007 and 2013, the average yearly hate crime incidents attributed to the disability category as a percentage of total hate crime incidents was 1.14%. Making up such a small percentage of total hate crime, it’s understandable that there is very little literature out there that covers this topic.
The Offenders

We have so far developed an understanding about who the victims of hate crime are. Now, to further expand on the topic, we will discuss the role of the offender. Who are the perpetrators of hate crime? What are their motivations for doing so? Why are they committing these types of crime? When people think of the characteristics of those who commit hate crime, a very narrow set of images and emotions come to mind. Many would picture white rednecks clothed in all white, standing around a burning cross shouting out racist remarks. Or, some may think of rough motorcycle gangs, composed of bald headed, fully tattooed men riding around the city committing hatred upon various minority groups.

However, contrary to popular belief, the majority of hate crimes are not committed by large scale hate organizations. The everyday general public all have a possibility of becoming a perpetrator; most of who have an objective in mind, however in some cases, may be
unconsciously engaging in hateful behavior. First, we will examine four various motivations as to why someone would engage in committing a hate crime; these include excitement, defensive, mission, and retaliatory (Gerstenfeld & Grant, 2004, p.109). A common theme throughout each of these categories is bigotry, but in addition, they each have their respective differences in the underlying conditions that lead to an attack.

**Excitement**

In these instances, the offenders often display a desire for excitement. The lack of thrill and stimulation in their lives has led for them to seek it elsewhere. In a study done by McDevitt, Levin, and Bennett using data from the Boston Police Department during 1991 and 1992, they found that 66% of the cases of hate crime were motivated by excitement. This is a significant proportion of the total amount with the majority of cases involving youth looking for a thrill. Of these cases, 91% reported that they left their own communities to look for a victim that fitted their vision of being different from them (Gerstenfeld & Grant, 2004, p.110). This characteristic is elementary when compared to other, more serious motivations. However, it is worth consideration because of the fact that the age demographic that takes up the majority of cases in this category are the youth. This brings up consideration that the youth are lacking stimulation and appropriate structure in their lives, and thus they are turning to these other, more hateful types of stimulation.

**Defensive**

The second motivation is has the characteristic of a defensive act. The offender usually will notice something that they believe is an intrusion of one of their core beliefs, and thus acts upon this belief to try and correct. For example, it could be that they believe that a “particular group
of people who are considered a growing threat to resources and a cause of problems occurring in their life (Gerstenfeld & Grant, 2004, p.113). In most cases, this feeling of intrusion sparks anger with them, therefore causing them to take out their anger against the other party. In the study done by Levin and McDevitt, they state that a defensive motivation differs from an excitement or thrill seeking motivation in that acts of defensiveness are usually committed on the offender’s turf. Whereas with thrill seeking, the offender will seek out victims on the victim’s turf. Crimes of this defensive nature happen because the victim will stumble upon the offender.

*Retaliatory*

The third type of hate crime that Levin and McDevitt identified was that of a retaliatory motivation. This type of crime is not necessarily instigated by the offender, but more so as a response or an answer to something that they heard or that they saw. For example, a person hears that a hate crime has been committed towards a member of the same identifying group. Because of this, now this person would go out and commit a hate crime against the supposedly offending group.

*Mission*

The final type of hate crime that Levin and McDevitt identified was that of a person on a mission. Usually with a permanent commitment to their bias, these types of offenders tend to come from a troubled past and usually possess some type of mental instability. In addition, they are more likely to have either current or previous involvement with an organized hate group.
The Model

As we have seen throughout the paper, there is a degree of ambiguity surround the characterization of a hate crime. What if the motive is non-hate related, but rather of an envious nature and greed was their motivation? If a hatred slur is yelled at the victim while the crime is being committed, does this constitute a hate crime? It certainly is ambiguous because greed may be the largest driving factor in their actions. So, as we have learned, hate is a necessary condition but not an adequate condition for it to be classified as a hate crime. In addition to this ambiguity, hate crime data suffers from an extreme case of underreporting, at the federal level and even at the local level. The Hate Crime Statistics Act in 1990 enacted the creation of the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting program to collect hate crime statistics. However, at the state level, reporting is voluntary. For example, it wasn’t until 2002 that Alabama reported its first hate crime. Even at the local law enforcement office level, reporting to the state is voluntary, therefore some agencies don’t participate. This is the reason why the population covered is almost always less than the actual population of the state. In addition to the voluntary nature of reporting, the general public also doesn’t report every single crime that they believe was motivated by hate. Either because they feel the crime was too small and it’s not worth the trouble to report it or because if they do report it, they have been threatened with consequences. So, it is with caution that we make any conclusions by results generated from this model.
Model Specifications and Empirical Framework

In order to provide more observations into our analysis, we decided to break the U.S. into four regions; Northeast, Midwest, South, and West. We use data from the FBI’s Hate Crime Statistics to include into the regression. To maintain consistency throughout the years, the territories of Guam and Puerto Rico were not included into the analysis as the data on these territories was not consistent, nor reliable. Table 5 presents the definitions of the variables that we used.

Equation 1:

\[
\text{HateCrime}_{it} = \beta_1 + \beta_2\text{Income}_{it} + \beta_3\text{Unemploy}_{it} + \beta_4\text{BWIncome}_{it} + \beta_5\text{Poverty}_{it} + \beta_6\text{Agen}_{it}
\]


Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota

South: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia

The dependent variable, \( \text{HateCrime}_{it} \), is the number of hate crime incidents that were reported by law enforcement agencies. We converted the aggregate total into a rate of incidents per 100,000 populations. This way, we were able to obtain a value that is comparable across regions and compensates for the differences in a region’s population. It is interesting to note that as the number of people covered per agency remains, on average, relatively the same at around 83,000, Figure 12 displays that the total number of hate crime incidents has a declining linear trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{HateCrime}(IN) )</td>
<td>State bias motivation crime incidents reported to participating agencies, adjusted per 100,000 population covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Income}(Y) )</td>
<td>State per Capita Income, adjusted in 2013 U.S dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Unemploy}(U) )</td>
<td>State unemployment rate, seasonally adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B\text{WIncome}(BW) )</td>
<td>Mean per capita income differential between White U.S households and Black U.S households, adjusted in 2013 U.S dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Poverty}(PR) )</td>
<td>State poverty rate, percentage of population living at or below the defined poverty rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Agen}(PPA) )</td>
<td>Number of participating law enforcement agencies per 100,000 population covered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To provide some background on the regional differences between these variables, the following graphs provide an overview of each variable, by region along with our predicted hypothesis.

Data Source: *Hate Crime Statistics, 1998-2013*

Data Source: *United States Census Bureau, 1998-2013*
Figure 13 presents the per capita income of each region between the years 1998 and 2013. Our hypothesis for this variable would be that as per capita income rises, the number of hate crime should fall. We can make the assumption that a higher per capita income can be caused by more educational attainment. With more education, we would expect that people have greater awareness and understanding of a variety of backgrounds and would be more accepting of people different than them.

Figure 14: Unemployment Rate, by region, 1998-2013


Figure 14 presents the unemployment rate of each region between the years 1998 and 2013. Our hypothesis would be that as the unemployment rate increases, so too would the number of hate crimes. This would be because when someone is unemployed, they have more time on their hands to plot a crime or develop a hatred for other groups. This stems from the paper written by Gale, Heath, and Ressler where they classify hate crime as result of envious behavior. If someone is unemployed but a person of a different identifying group isn’t and is prospering, this becomes a breeding ground for jealousy, and thus would be more inclined to develop a hatred for that group.
Figure 15: White to Black Income Differential*, 2013 dollars, by region, 1998-2013

![Graph showing the White to Black income differential by region from 1998 to 2013.]

**Data Source:** United States Census Bureau, 1998-2013

*Calculated by: Per Capita Income (Whites) – Per Capita Income (Blacks)*

Figure 15 presents the White to Black income differential (2013 dollars) by region between the years 1998 and 2013. We would expect as the White to Black income differential gap closes, that we should experience an increase in hate crime. As mentioned earlier in the paper, hate crimes against Blacks make up a significant proportion of the total amount of hate crime, and thus as hate crimes against Blacks increase, so too shall the total amount of hate crimes.

Figure 16: Poverty Rate, by region, 1998-2013

![Graph showing the poverty rate by region from 1998 to 2013.]

**Data Source:** United States Census Bureau, 1998-2013
Figure 16 presents the poverty rate by region between the years 1998 and 2013. We would expect that when the poverty rate increases, hate crimes shall increase as well. This also plays into the jealousy hypothesis because when you have more people in poverty, there is a greater chance of jealousy aimed towards those that are not in poverty, and thus hate crimes should be more prevalent.

**Figure 17: Agencies per 100,000 population, by region, 1998-2013**

Data Source: Hate Crime Statistics, 1998-2013

Figure 17 presents the number of participating law enforcement agencies, by region, per 100,000 population. Our hypothesis is that as the number of agencies increase, the number of reported hate crime should also increase as well. This is due to the fact that when there are more places to report a hate crime, it can decrease the cost of reporting a hate crime simply because they wouldn’t have to travel as far.
Results and Analysis

In Table 6 we present the estimation results from running a pooled regression of Equation 1 between the four previously stated regions. Due to statistical reasons, we omitted the Poverty variable because of the high correlation poverty has with other variables presented in the model, such as the Income variable. The updated equation can be found in Equation 2.

Equation 2:

\[ \text{HateCrime}_{it} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{Income}_{it} + \beta_3 \text{Unemploy}_{it} + \beta_4 \text{BWIncome}_{it} + \beta_5 \text{Agen}_{it} \]

After running the regression, the majority of our previous hypotheses were proven correct and statistically significant. BWIncome has a statistically significant negative relationship with hate crime incidents, meaning that as the income gap between Whites and Blacks gets smaller, the number of hate crime incidents will increase. Agen proved a statistically significant positive relationship with hate crime, supporting our hypothesis that as the number of law enforcement agencies per 100,000 increases, the number of reported hate crime incidents will increase as
well. With Unemploy, there was a statistically significant negative relationship with hate crime, signifying that when the unemployment rate increases, the number of hate crimes will decrease. The way to conceptualize this would be to say that unemployed people are likely to be focused on trying to find jobs, and the opportunity cost of losing out on a potential job is too great to be jeopardized by a hate crime incident on their record. The Income variable proved a statistically significant positive relationship with hate crime, meaning that as per capita income rises, so too does the number of hate crimes. This outcome did not support the original hypothesis, but we will attempt to conceptualize it. Stemming from a previous hypothesis of hate crime as envious behaviour, when per capita income rises, there are greater chances of jealousy brewing among those that may not be experiencing such income rises.

**Table 6: Estimation Results, USA, 1998-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-13.23511</td>
<td>3.406225</td>
<td>-3.885507</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW_.?</td>
<td>-0.000133</td>
<td>4.62E-05</td>
<td>-2.888047</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA_.?</td>
<td>0.338979</td>
<td>0.128187</td>
<td>2.644398</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U_.?</td>
<td>-17.74306</td>
<td>6.042673</td>
<td>-2.936293</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_.?</td>
<td>0.000406</td>
<td>7.03E-05</td>
<td>5.775529</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>BWIncome</th>
<th>Agen</th>
<th>Unemploy</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>-0.000133</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>-17.743</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t-Statistic)</td>
<td>(-2.888)</td>
<td>(2.644)</td>
<td>(-2.936)</td>
<td>(5.775)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to seek more information about these variables with respect to their regional differences, we ran the regression using cross-section specific coefficients instead of common coefficients. The results in Table 7 were quite intriguing due to a large amount of statistically insignificant coefficients. By region, only Unemploy seemed to generate a statistically significant result while also having our expected hypothesis proven correct. For all the other regions, it was only the statistically significant positive relationship in the west region for agencies per 100,000 that brought back a usable result. Increasing the number of agencies in the West will show an increase in the number of reported hate crimes in that region.
Table 7: Estimation Results, by Region, 1998-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BWIncome</td>
<td>-0.0001</td>
<td>0.0000892</td>
<td>0.0000966</td>
<td>-0.00012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.841)</td>
<td>(0.592)</td>
<td>(-0.421)</td>
<td>(-1.899)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agen</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>0.2579</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.372)</td>
<td>(0.539)</td>
<td>(-0.245)</td>
<td>(2.283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemploy</td>
<td>-28.023</td>
<td>-36.0157</td>
<td>-22.5</td>
<td>-15.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.975)</td>
<td>(-4.749)</td>
<td>(-2.786)</td>
<td>(-1.783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.00000912</td>
<td>0.0000779</td>
<td>0.0000546</td>
<td>-0.00012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.079)</td>
<td>(-0.847)</td>
<td>(-0.502)</td>
<td>(-1.226)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The weaknesses that we have explained in reporting hate crimes may explain why we are unable to conclude much via a region by region regression. The statistical insignificance of many of the variable’s coefficients reside in the voluntary and insufficient nature of the reporting of the crime itself as well as simply not having enough observations for the amount of variables. What we began the essay hypothesizing was that the South would experience more hate crime simply due to its notoriously dark and racially divided history. Even though the South ranks second among other regions in the number of Agencies per 100,000 (Figure 17), it consistently ranks last, by afar, in terms of the number of hate crimes per 100,000 population (Figure 18). This speaks to the issue of a high variability in performance between different law enforcement agencies in the reporting aspect.

The reliable data problem has been well documented through this paper, and should be a point of emphasis in future discussions and analyses. Further research should focus on developing reliable data collection methods in order to better understand the problem at hand. Understandably, fixing the data collection method is only one half of the equation. The population, as a whole, needs to be educated about the importance of reporting hate crimes and should take part responsibility to the inconsistent, unreliable nature of the data. In this technology driven and information craving era, it certainly should be focal point of developing reliable data collection methods in order to better understand, not just hate crimes, but any other problems of interest. Due to increased efforts in part by scholars and government to bring more attention to hate crimes, it is encouraging to see a heightened sense of awareness and motivation to develop a thorough understanding on the workings of hate crimes.
Appendix 1

**STATE HATE CRIME STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>AK</th>
<th>AZ</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>KY</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>MO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias-Motivated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Action</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, Religion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1, Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other *2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source:** (State Hate Crime Statutory Provisions, 2014)
|                               | MT | NE | NV | NH | NJ | NM | NY | NC | ND | OK | OR | PA | RI | SC | SD | TN | TX | UT | VT | VA | WA | WV | WI | WV |
|-------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Bias-Motivated Violence and  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
| Intimidation — Criminal Penal|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Civil Action                  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
| Race, Religion, Ethnicity *1  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
| Sexual Orientation            | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
| Gender                        | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
| Disability                    | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
| Other *2                      | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |

**Data Source:** (State Hate Crimes Statutory Provisions, 2014)
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