

- the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, New Orleans, LA.
- Morsch, J. (1991). The problem of motive in hate crimes: The argument against presumption of racial motivation. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 82, 659-689.
- National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. (1996). *Anti-lesbian/gay violence in 1995*. San Francisco: Community United Against Violence.
- Nolan, J., & Akiyama, Y. (1999). An analysis of factors that affect law enforcement participation in hate crime reporting. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 15(1), 111-127.
- Paynter, R. L. (2000). Protecting all the people. *Law Enforcement Technology*, 27(4), 62-66.
- Pinderhughes, H. L. (1993). The anatomy of racially motivated violence in New York City: A case study of youth in Southern Brooklyn. *Social Problems*, 40, 478-492.
- Resisting Defamation. (1996). Hate crimes against whites are a serious problem. In P. Winters (Ed.), *Hate crimes: San Diego, CA*. Greenwich, Richardson, L. (1992, January 28). 61 acts of bias: One false light many different explosions. *The New York Times*, p. B1.
- Steadman, G. (1999, April). *Review of 12 cities' survey data: A test of hate crime data collection*. Paper presented at Hate Crimes: Their Definition and Measurement conference, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany.
- Umemoto, K., & Mikami, C. K. (2000). Profile of race-bias hate crime in Los Angeles County. *Western Criminology Review*, 2(2), 1-34.
- Walker, S., & Katz, C. M. (1995). Less than meets the eye: Police department bias-crime units. *American Journal of Police*, 14(1), 29-48.
- Weinstein, J. (1992). First Amendment challenges to hate crime legislation: Where's the speech? *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 11(2), 6-19.
- Wessler, S. (2000). *Promising practices against hate crimes: Five state and local demonstration projects*. Unpublished monograph, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Retrieved from www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/bja/181425.pdf
- When a hate crime isn't a hate crime: Racial hoaxes on college campuses. (1998/1999). *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 22, 52.
- White, J. V. (1996). Vindicating rights in a federal system: Rediscovering 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3)'s equality right. *Temple Law Review*, 69(1), 145-243.

QUESTIONS

1. What are the difficulties prosecutors face in proving motivation in hate crimes cases?
2. What is an example of an actuarial hate crime? Would you consider this a hate crime in the same sense as other crimes committed because of the offender's bias or hatred of the victim's group? Why or why not?
3. According to the research discussed in this article, why does police enforcement of hate crime laws vary between jurisdictions?
4. Consider the argument that implementing hate crime laws without considering the underlying societal dynamics of oppression can actually result in harming members of the groups that such laws are intended to protect. Why is this the case? Discuss using examples.
5. Why are members of some minority groups disproportionately represented among defendants charged with hate crimes? What are some possible explanations for this?
6. Is it possible that members of different ethnic groups vary in their likelihood of reporting their victimization as hate crime targets? If so, what are the implications of this for statistics on hate crimes?
7. According to research, what kinds of motivations have driven offenders to commit hate crimes? Are there any motivations you would add to the list?
8. Compare the popular perception of hate crimes with the reality of hate crimes shown by research. How do the two compare?
9. How might perpetrators' feelings of relative economic and social powerlessness be related to their commission of hate crimes?
10. Are most hate crime offenders members of extremist groups? Based on the research, how would you describe the typical hate crime offender?
11. Why are hate crime laws unlikely to be effective as a deterrent to hate crimes?
12. Discuss the arguments for and against the proposition that hate crime penalty enhancements will ultimately help (a) reduce hate crimes and/or (b) help victims of hate crimes.

8

AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS THAT AFFECT LAW ENFORCEMENT PARTICIPATION IN HATE CRIME REPORTING

JAMES J. NOLAN
YOSHIO AKIYAMA

These authors highlight the fact that police, as the gatekeepers of the criminal justice system, play a critical role in efforts to identify, report, and prosecute hate crimes. The authors identify a wide range of factors that influence police recognition and reporting of hate crimes, and they suggest strategies for improving police reporting of hate crimes.

In May 1994, at a beach resort in Delaware, five men wielding baseball bats and empty champagne bottles attacked and brutally beat three homosexual men as they sat talking together just past midnight on the resort's boardwalk. One of the victims suffered a fractured skull, causing paralysis and speech problems. The other victims also sustained severe head lacerations. The suspects are alleged to have attacked the men solely because they were homosexuals (Harvey, 1994).

In December 1995, three White soldiers from the prestigious 82nd Airborne Division stationed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, decided to harass Blacks. After a night of drinking, the men (alleged to be White supremacists) drove to a predominately Black section of Fayetteville where they selected an African American couple standing on the street and killed them with a 9mm pistol. It appears that the single motivation for this murder was that the victims were Black (Time, December 18, 1995).

EDITORS' NOTE: Nolan, J. J., & Akiyama, Y. (1999). An Analysis of Factors That Affect Law Enforcement Participation in Hate Crime Reporting. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 15, 111-127. © 1999 Sage Publications, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

Table 8.1 Law Enforcement Participation in Reporting Hate Crimes to the Federal Bureau of Investigation

Year	States	Agencies	Agencies Reporting at Least One Hate Crime (%)		U.S. Population Covered by Participating Agencies (%)
			Hate Crime (N)	Hate Crime (%)	
1991	33	2,215	739	33.4	29
1992	42	6,181	1,099	18	51
1993	47	6,865	1,326	19.3	58
1994	44	7,298	1,150	16	58

NOTE: Many police agencies that participate in the hate crime program report that no hate crimes have occurred in their jurisdictions.

Senseless, brutal crimes, like the ones described above, that are motivated by bias or hatred for a person or group are referred to as *hate crimes*. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) defines a hate crime as "a criminal offense committed against a person or property, which is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias against a race, religion, disability, ethnic/national origin, or sexual orientation" (U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1992, p. 14; Eisler, 1993). The motivation for the criminal offenses is what makes the offense a hate crime. A hate crime is not a separate type of crime. Instead it is a traditional crime, like murder, rape, burglary, robbery, and intimidation. The distinction is that these crimes are motivated by hatred that is deeply grounded in bigotry (J. Levin & McDevitt, 1994).

Hate crimes often have profound effects not only on the individual victims, but also on an entire group that shares the same characteristics for which the victim was targeted (Barnes & Ephross, 1994). Hate crimes also can tear at the very fabric of the community, regardless of the seriousness of the offense (Martin, 1995). In an attempt to gain a better understanding of the nature and scope of hate crimes occurring in the United States, political leaders, policy makers, victim advocacy groups, and others have expressed the need for national data. In response, on April 13, 1990, President George Bush signed into law the Hate Crime Statistics Act (the Act), requiring the attorney general to collect and report data on hate crime in the United States (U.S. Congress, 1990).

The task of collecting the data was given to the FBI and was incorporated into the existing Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. The FBI's Programs Support Section of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division has been responsible for collecting hate crime data from state and local law enforcement agencies since passage of the Act. The FBI compiles this information and publishes an annual hate crime report titled *Hate Crime Statistics* (U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1996). Supporters of the legislation believe that collecting hate crime data is extremely important for several reasons: (a) it raises the public's awareness of the existence of these crimes; (b) it provides baseline information for research and program development in this area; (c) it helps support the development of local, state, and federal anti-hate crime legislation; (d) it provides law enforcement professionals with both the information to prevent hate crimes from occurring in the first place, and the tools needed to work with communities in dealing with these crimes when they do occur; and (e) it encourages victims to come forward and ultimately get the support and assistance they may need.

Law enforcement participation in this initiative increased quickly during the first 4 years of the program but, by 1994, it seemed to have reached a plateau. Table 8.1 describes the law enforcement participation rates in hate crime reporting to the FBI from the passage of the Act through 1994.

In 1994, 7,298 law enforcement agencies participated in the hate crime program. At the time of this study, this was the highest number of

participating agencies since the program's inception. However, this number was still less than half of the more than 16,000 law enforcement agencies that report Index crimes to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting program. Also of interest is the large number of agencies that participate in the program but report that no hate crimes have occurred. Of the 7,298 participating agencies, only 1,150 (or 16%) reported hate crimes as having actually occurred in their jurisdictions. The remaining 84% of participating agencies reported that no hate crimes had occurred.

The Problem

Law enforcement agencies that do participate in hate crime reporting programs are often accused by private advocacy groups of underreporting these crimes. The New York City Gay and Lesbian (NYCGI) Anti-Violence Project's *Report on Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence in the United States* (1995) cited wide disparities between hate crime figures provided by local organizations versus those that were provided by law enforcement agencies. Comparing 1994 hate crime numbers, the group found that for every single antigay or antileshbian incident that police agencies reported, community agencies identified 4.67 such incidents.

Many victims do not report hate crimes to the police for one reason or another. The most frequently cited reason among victims of antigay or antileshbian violence for failure to report has incidents to police was fear of secondary victimization (i.e., insensitivity and abuse by police [NYCGI Anti-Violence Project, 1995]). However, according to the same source, victims of antigay or antileshbian violence did report crimes to the police 37% of the time. However, only 68% of these reports were officially labeled as bias crimes by police. This failure on the part of the police to correctly identify bias crimes as such was explored by Jack McDevitt (1987), a Northeastern University criminology professor, in research he conducted at the Boston Police Department. In his 1987 study, McDevitt examined 452 bias incidents handled by the Boston Police Department, and found that only 19 (4.2%) had been appropriately identified as bias incidents by reporting officers (B. Levin, 1992). It seems that the failure of

crime victims to report bias incidents to police, combined with police misidentification or failure to identify these crimes, add to the already burdensome and complex task of collecting meaningful data on hate crimes.

Law enforcement officers have reported informally several reasons why they misidentify or choose not to identify hate crimes. Some police officers, for example, have attributed their lack of participation to burdensome, albeit well-intentioned, departmental policies which sensationalize hate crimes.² The officers explain that when relatively minor crimes like simple assault or intimidation get labeled as hate crimes, the incidents can become so high-profile that they would have preferred not to have made such a distinction. Other officers have indicated that they personally do not believe that it is appropriate to treat hate crimes as something special. Instead, they believe that all crimes of similar magnitude should be treated the same.³ B. Levin (1992) writes that critics of police cite "personal prejudice as the main cause of misidentification." Levin also cites organizational conditioning as a problem. He writes, "Police officers are conditioned to identify crimes based on the severity of injury or the magnitude of property damage . . . not on the basis of motive" (p. 173). Levin contends that this organizational conditioning inhibits officers from understanding the subtleties and importance of bias crimes in the context of a larger, community-wide perspective.

Anecdotal accounts from law enforcement officers have also identified some of the factors that prevent or inhibit law enforcement agency participation in national hate crime data collection efforts. For example, some law enforcement agencies have attributed their lack of participation to insufficient resources. Higher public demand for service combined with shrinking budgets and manpower have prohibited some agencies from developing a mechanism to collect and report hate crime data. In some situations, law enforcement administrators have decided not to participate because they believe that the identification of traditional crimes as hate crimes could divide their jurisdictions along racial lines.

On the other end of the spectrum, information regarding factors that encourage participation

Table 8.2 Hate Crime Data Collection: The Sequence of Events

Step 1	Victim's report
Step 2	Police officer's record
Step 3	Police determine and verify hate bias
Step 4	Police agencies participate in hate crime program

have included increased public support, passage of the Hate Crime Statistics Act, and the support of well-established advocacy groups like the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the National Sheriff's Association (NSA), and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), to name just a few.

From these explanations one can see that there are a number of social forces that might prevent individuals and agencies from fully participating in a program to identify and report hate crimes. Some forces are based within the organization (e.g., resources, policies, and organizational culture). Others are based outside the organization (e.g., the political climate, local laws, or social norms). Still others are based on individual convictions (e.g., religious beliefs and personal commitment). Social forces that encourage participation also seem to lie both inside and outside the law enforcement organization. Although statistical data are available regarding the number of law enforcement agencies that collect hate crime data, no empirical data currently exists regarding the forces that either encourage or discourage either individual officers' participation or law enforcement agency participation in hate crime data collection. The study presented here attempts to fill this empirical void by examining the forces that affect hate crime reporting as they coexist in the social field of the law enforcement agency.⁴

The Scope of This Research

Once a hate crime occurs, several things must happen before the crime is counted as part of the national data. First, the victim must report the

crime to the police. Next, the police officer must record the crime by filing an incident report. Then, the police department must have a mechanism in place to review the incident to determine and verify a bias motivation. Finally, the police agency must participate in the national data collection program (see Table 8.2).

The primary foci of this study are the police officer recording of hate crime and police agency participation in hate crime data collection programs (Steps 2 and 4). The fact that a police officer might misidentify (e.g., fail to recognize a hate bias [Step 3]) is also considered. It is important to note that this research is based on hate crime as defined by the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990, and as set forth by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This means that *hate crimes*, as it applies herein, refers only to criminal acts: street crimes such as murder, rape, robbery, assault, intimidation, and the like.

METHOD

Focus group interviews and survey research were the two methods used in this study. The focus groups involved interviews with police officers and civilian specialists from six jurisdictions in two east coast states. The jurisdictions included two city police departments, two suburban county police departments, one state police agency, and one university police department. The 47 participants in the five focus groups were police administrators, midlevel managers, supervisors, detectives, patrol officers, and civilian specialists. The results of these interviews were used by the researchers to construct a survey instrument, the Hate Crime Reporting Climate Survey (HCRCs), for distribution to a larger sample of law enforcement professionals. The collection and analysis of HCRCs data comprised the second stage in this study. The 147 respondents to the HCRCs were selected from four jurisdictions, one in each region of the United States: Northeast, West, Central, and South. Two of the participating agencies were city police departments and two were suburban police departments. Two of the participating agencies reported hate crimes to the FBI in 1994, and two did not. The survey

Table 8.3 Comparison of Law Enforcement Agencies Participating in Study

Region/Type Agency	Population	Crime Rate	Violent Crime Rate	Property Crime Rate	Hate Crimes Reported	Total Police Officers
Northeast (suburban county)	717,879	6,241.4	1,001.3	5,240.2	93	1,487
West (city)	389,458	10,323.7	1,206.3	9,120.4	40*	569
South (city)	38,624	11,894.2	1,421.4	10,472.8	0	80
Central (suburban county)	121,799	2,572.3	201.15	2,371.1	0	169

NOTE: All crime figures were obtained from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Reporting Program. a. This agency collected hate crime statistics in 1994, but did not report them to the FBI. This figure was obtained directly from this city police department.

participants were also police administrators, midlevel managers, supervisors, detectives, patrol officers, and civilian specialists. Table 8.3 compares the police departments that participated in the survey across a number of variables, including population of jurisdiction, crime rate, hate crimes reported, and number of police officers. The agencies from the Northeast and West reported hate crimes in 1994. The police agencies in the South and Central regions did not.

RESULTS

Focus Group Findings

The focus group participants identified a number of significant variables that affect whether police officers properly identify and record hate crimes when they are reported by the victim. They also provided an enormous amount of insight regarding the variables that affect whether police agencies participate in hate crime reporting initiatives. The focus groups were organized to elicit information about forces that affect hate crime reporting. Information was collected and organized into four categories: agency encouragers, agency discouragers, individual encouragers, and individual discouragers. Agency encouragers and agency discouragers are the forces that affect (i.e., encourage or discourage) whether the police department participates in hate crime data collection. Individual

encouragers and individual discouragers are the forces that either encourage or discourage the individual police officer's active participation. Collectively, the focus group participants identified 30 variables that they believed could affect a police department's participation in hate crime data collection; 15 variables were identified as encouraging forces, and 15 were identified as discouraging forces. Likewise, there were 30 variables that the respondents identified that could affect the individual police officer's participation in the identification and reporting of hate crime. Fifteen of these variables were identified as encouraging forces, and 15 were identified as forces that discouraged participation. Table 8.4 provides a summary list of the encouraging and discouraging variables at the agency level, and Table 8.5 summarizes the variables at the individual officer level.

The researchers used the findings from the focus groups to develop the HCRCs. The purpose of the HCRCs was to assess the degree to which each of the 60 variables existed respectively within the participating police departments. The survey provided several important insights, including the recognition that each department had its own unique field of forces (i.e., the degree to which each variable from the focus groups existed in the department, and in what combination was different for each department). However, most useful was the ability to statistically reduce the 60 variables into 10 common factors. The findings from the factor analysis of the HCRCs data are presented in the section that follows.⁵

Table 8.4 Variables That Affect Whether Agencies Report Hate Crimes

Agency Encouragers	Agency Discouragers
Ability to assess intergroup tensions in community	Not deemed important by department
Desire to give support to communities	Perception on part of police that no problem exists
Belief that hate crime reporting will improve police/community relations	Insufficient support staff to process, record, and submit hate crime data.
Belief that police help set level of acceptable behavior in the community	Perceived as not being real police work
Understanding that community wants police to report hate violence	A belief that reporting hate crimes will make things worse for victim
Need to know extent of problem as first step to developing solutions	A belief that reporting hate crimes will make things worse for communities
Law community know that department takes hate crimes seriously	Perception that some minority groups complain unnecessarily
A belief that victims will get help	Not a priority of local government
Will help diffuse racial tensions within the police department	A belief that identifying a crime as a hate crime will have no effect on the outcome
The right thing to do politically	A belief that it is wrong to make these types of crimes special
The right thing to do morally	A belief that hate crime reporting will result in negative publicity for the community
Will help maintain department's good relationship with diverse groups	A belief that hate crime reporting supports the political agendas of gay and minority groups (which is seen as a negative thing)
Consistent with values of department	If creates too much additional work
A belief that identifying problem will keep others safe	Hate crimes are not as serious as other crimes (i.e., a lower priority)
Citizens appreciate the hate crime reporting efforts of the police	Agency does not have the adequate technological resources

Survey Findings

In the present study a relatively large number of variables (total of 60) were used to describe agency and individual encouragers and discouragers. Factor analysis was used to identify overarching factors (constructs) that connect and represent these variables. The researcher found that the 30 police agency variables loaded high on five common factors. These five factors are described as (a) shared attitudes and beliefs about hate crime reporting, (b) utility in community relations, (c) organizational self-preservation, (d) efficacy of police involvement, and (e) resource allocation. The 30 individual officer variables also loaded high on five common factors. These factors are described as (a)

supportive organizational policies and practices, (b) individual attitudes/beliefs about hate crime reporting, (c) professional self-preservation, (d) work-related difficulties, and (e) organization's commitment. Singularity and in combination, these 10 factors affect the levels at which law enforcement participates in hate crime reporting. The 10 factors are described below.

Agency-Level Factors

Shared attitudes/beliefs about hate crime reporting. Shared attitudes/beliefs about hate crime reporting refers to the attitudes and beliefs about hate crime reporting that are held within the agency. These are attitudes and beliefs that

Table 8.5 Variables That Affect Whether Police Officers Record Crime

Individual Encouragers	Individual Discouragers
Departmental policy mandates hate crime reporting	Belief that it is not viewed as important by department officials
Belief that early identification of problem is key to effective solution	Too much additional work
Belief that it is an important part of the job	Sometimes runs counter to officer's personal beliefs
Belief that it will help prevent problems	Belief that hate crimes are not serious
Belief that reporting hate crimes will prevent personal (officer) liability	Belief that hate crimes should not be treated as special
Belief that hate crimes are morally wrong	Little concern for some minority groups (e.g., homosexuals and others)
Encouraged to report by department officials	Not the job of the police (more like social work)
Encouraged and supported by supervisors and colleagues	Not recognized or rewarded for reporting hate crimes
A clear, understood, and accepted departmental policy	Informally encouraged to adjust complaints (to reports) because of the large number of calls for service.
It benefits victims and communities	Lack of common definition of hate crime
Internal checks to make sure officers do not misidentify hate crime	Incident will be blown out of proportion—unnecessarily become high profile
Recognized as good for investigating and recording hate crime	Officers already too busy; not enough police officers to investigate properly
Desire to be considered a good police officer	Personally opposed to supporting gay and minority political agendas
It is encouraged and rewarded by the department	Lack of training: How to identify and respond to hate crimes
Personal desire to comply with departmental policy	Victims do not want to assist in prosecution

are shared by most of the members of the agency. These attitudes/beliefs relate to whether the department membership perceives that citizens want them to report hate crimes, whether the community will appreciate the police department's efforts in this area, whether it is morally the right thing to do, and whether hate crimes should be treated as special—to name just a few.

Perceived utility in community relations.

This refers to the perception on the part of the police agency that hate crime reporting will be useful in the area of community relations—specifically if it will improve the police/community relationship. It also refers to the agency's belief regarding the utility of hate

crime reporting for assessing intergroup tensions in the community.

Organizational self-preservation. This refers to the department's desire to survive in its environment. This includes its desire to improve relations with diverse community groups and to remain consistent with the values that are held (and shaped) by the larger society in which the agency exists.

Efficacy of police involvement. Efficacy of police involvement refers to the belief on the part of the organization that police involvement in hate crime data collection can have a positive effect. This includes beliefs regarding whether identifying hate crimes will make things better

or worse for victims and communities, whether hate crime reporting is real police work, and whether hate crime reporting is helping victims or merely serving to advance political agendas.

Resource allocation. This refers to the department's desire to distribute resources toward priority areas. With limited resources, police departments must prioritize. If there is a perception that hate crime reporting is not a priority, then few resources (i.e., training and support staff) will be directed to it.

Individual-Level Factors

Supportive organizational policies and practices. This refers to the degree to which the organization's policies and practices support hate crime reporting. If the police agency does not have a hate crime reporting policy or has a policy that is not followed in practice, officers are not likely to recognize and record these crimes. However, if the police agency has a strong policy that is reinforced by an internal system of training, quality control checks, and recognition for reporting, then police officers are more likely to recognize and record these crimes at higher levels.

Individual attitudes and beliefs about hate crime reporting. This refers to the officers' personal beliefs about hate crime and hate crime reporting. These personal beliefs include whether hate crime reporting is effective, whether it is the job of the police to do it, or whether the officers believe hate crime is really a problem that needs to be addressed—to name just a few.

Professional self-preservation. Professional self-preservation refers to the officer's personal desire to survive and to be successful in the police environment. This includes the officer's desire to comply with departmental policies and to be considered a good police officer.

Work-related difficulties. This refers to the real-life difficulties experienced by the officers when trying to investigate hate crimes. These difficulties include additional effort that may or may not get recognized, pressure from supervisors and colleagues to quickly adjust citizens' complaints (with no report) because of a large

number of pending calls for police service, and the reluctance of victims to assist in the prosecution of hate crime.

Organization's commitment. This refers to the officers' beliefs about their organization's commitment to hate crime reporting. One measure of this commitment is the amount of training resources directed to hate crime investigation and reporting.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The problem presented at the outset of this study was that the law enforcement community, although fully committed to the collection and reporting of crime data to the UCR Program, does not fully participate in the collection and reporting of hate crime data. This problem exists at two levels, (a) the police officer level, and (b) the police agency level.

For a hate crime to be counted in the national data, it must first be recorded by the national officer. In other words, the officer must write a police report that correctly identifies the crime as a hate crime. Once the crime is recorded by the police officer it must be sent by the police agency to either the state UCR Program or to the FBI in order to be counted. In some cases police officers correctly identify and record a hate crime, but the agency does not submit this information to the national program. In other cases, police agencies might participate in the national data collection program, but report that no hate crimes had occurred in their jurisdiction because officers did not record or properly identify the crime. So, factors at both the police officer and the police agency levels were considered in this study.

The reluctance on the part of some police agencies and officers to fully participate in reporting hate crimes creates problems for those who count on reliable data to create policies, draft legislation, conduct research, direct police resources, and more. Without the full participation of the law enforcement community, it is difficult to use the existing national hate crime data in any meaningful way.

Questions are often asked: "Why do some police departments participate in hate crime reporting and others don't?" "How can we get

the police to fully participate in this effort?" Prior to this research the only information available regarding police participation in hate crime data collection was anecdotal accounts offered by individual officers. Experts in the field also have their best guesses as to why this phenomenon is occurring.

The research presented here explores this issue in some detail. The foundations of this research, including the interpretations of the results, are in force-field analysis (an application of Lewin's field theory) that holds the following assumptions:

1. Social phenomena, like hate crime reporting, can only be fully understood by examining them together in the social field and not as isolated parts.
2. Within a social field there are countervailing forces at work, both internal and external, that affect behavior.
3. A state of quasi-stationary equilibrium will occur within a social field that will stabilize behavior at a certain level.

Field theory provides not only the framework for assessing countervailing forces, but also a mechanism for identifying effective change strategies (Lewin, 1948; Cartwright, 1951).

To explore the field of forces that affect police officer participation in hate crime reporting, the researchers conducted a series of focus group interviews with a diverse group of police officers and civilian specialists from two states. Although it is possible that there could be an infinite number of variables that affect law enforcement participation, the focus groups identified 60 variables. These 60 variables were identified as either encouragers (driving forces for police participation) or discouragers (restraining forces inhibiting police participation). These 60 variables provided the substance of the HCRCs that was developed to learn more about the presence of these factors in law enforcement agencies. The HCRCs was distributed in four police agencies, one in each region of the country. The analysis of the results revealed two important findings that are outlined below.

This study was found to have its own unique combination of variables (or forces) that affect hate crime reporting behavior. By quantifying and analyzing these variables as a field of forces, one could easily identify strategies to change behavior in the desired direction. For example, if increased hate crime reporting is the goal, then specific encouragers (e.g., supportive departmental policies and systems for recognition and rewards) can be increased, and specific discouragers (e.g., lack of training and support staff) are decreased. These actions, then, are likely to result in an increased level of hate crime reporting. Similarities and differences in the presence of these hate-crime-reporting variables across police agencies could provide clues regarding the changes that might work to improve reporting behavior.

There are a small number of common factors that combine to affect law enforcement participation in hate crime reporting. There appear to be 10 factors that both alone and in combination significantly affect law enforcement participation in hate crime reporting. These factors are summarized in Tables 8.6 and 8.7.

The research findings have provided a thorough look at the forces present in police agencies that affect individual and organizational behavior and its relation to hate crime reporting. These findings point directly to forces both within police agencies and within individual police officers that either encourage or discourage hate crime reporting. This analysis suggests change strategies that could improve the level at which the law enforcement community participates in hate crime reporting.

The findings from this research have implications in two areas: (a) the formation of departmental policies and procedures, and (b) the development of hate crime training curricula.

Recommendations for Departmental Hate Crime Policies and Procedures

Based on the results of this study, the researchers make the following recommendations regarding departmental hate crime policies and procedures:

1. An organizational policy should be implemented requiring police officers to investigate

Each police agency has its own unique field of forces affecting behavior. Each police agency in

Table 8.6 Factors That Affect Law Enforcement Participation in Hate Crime Reporting

Agency Factors	Description
Shared attitudes/beliefs about hate crime reporting	Refers to organizational attitudes and beliefs, both negative and positive, about hate crime reporting. These beliefs include whether citizens want the police to report, whether the community will appreciate the police department's efforts, whether it is morally the right thing to do, or whether hate crimes should be treated as special.
Utility in community relations	Refers to the police organization's perception that hate crime reporting will be useful in the area of community relations.
Organizational self-preservation	Refers to the department's desire to survive in its social environment. It also refers to the organization's desire to improve relations with diverse community groups, and to remain consistent with organizational values (that are shaped by the culture of the society in which the agency exists).
Efficacy of police involvement	Refers to the organization's belief that police involvement can have a positive effect.
Resource allocation	Refers to the department's desire to distribute resources toward priority areas.

- and take official police reports in all cases where a bias motivation is suspected.
2. Policies should set forth formal, step-by-step procedures for the investigation and recording of reported hate crimes, the verification of the bias motivations, effective strategies for dealing with victims and affected communities, and the reporting of verified hate crimes to the UCR program.
 3. Policy statements should include explicit statements of values, specifically those relating to the recognition and appreciation of diversity within the jurisdiction and within the police department. These value statements should be consistent with organizational practices.
 4. Police officers who aggressively and effectively investigate hate crimes should be recognized and rewarded for their efforts.
 5. Data regarding the occurrence of hate crimes within the jurisdiction should be shared with community groups at face-to-face meetings between the police and community. This will let the community know that the police are aware that these crimes are occurring, and that they take them seriously.
 6. Training and personnel resources for hate crime investigations should remain a priority.

Inadequate training and resources in the area of hate crimes sends the message to employees that the program is not a priority.

Recommendations for Hate Crime Training

A hate crime training curriculum should include the following components:

Table 8.7 Factors That Affect Police Officers' Participation in Hate Crime Reporting

Individual Factors	Description
Supportive organizational policies and practices	Refers to the degree to which the organization's policies and practices support hate crime reporting. This includes formal and informal systems for recognition and rewards.
Individual attitudes/beliefs about hate crime reporting	Refers to the police officer's individual beliefs about hate crime and hate crime reporting.
Professional self-preservation	Refers to the police officer's desire to be successful in the police organization. This includes the desire to be considered a good police officer.
Work-related difficulties	Refers to the difficulties experienced on the job by the police officers as they try to investigate hate crimes. This might include busy case loads and a reluctance on the part of the victim to assist in the prosecution of hate crimes.
Organization's commitment	Refers to the officer's beliefs about their organization's commitment to hate crime reporting. One measure of this commitment is the amount of training resources directed to hate crime investigation and reporting.

- community's, and officer's perspective—real-life experiences should be the focus of these discussions whenever and wherever possible;
6. the effect of organizational culture on employee attitudes and behaviors, especially as it applies to law enforcement hate crime initiatives—this includes organizational change strategies where appropriate; and
 7. a social psychology segment that includes topics such as prejudice, discrimination, stereotyping, ethnocentrism, nationalism, interpersonal relations, and group dynamics.

These recommendations are based on the findings of this study and are presented to assist law enforcement in developing effective hate crime reporting strategies. For it is only with the full support of the law enforcement community that the nation will ever have comprehensive and valid hate crime statistics.

NOTES

- crime index. These crimes include murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, larceny theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson.
2. This refers to a telephone interview with a city police officer in an east coast state (1995).
 3. This refers to an interview with a state police trooper in an east coast state (1995).
 4. This study was conducted in 1996 in response to concerns about the relatively low level of law enforcement participation in the FBI's Hate Crime Data Collection Program (1996) (a part of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program). Since 1996, law enforcement participation in hate crime reporting has continued to increase at a moderate pace. However, efforts are still under way at the federal, state, and local levels to increase law enforcement participation in the national hate crime program.
 5. The results of the Hate Crime Reporting Climate Survey were examined several different ways using a number of robust statistical techniques (Akiyama, 1996). For example, survey responses were examined and compared between the four agencies—two of the agencies were actually participating in the hate crime program, and two were not. A between-item examination of survey responses was also conducted. Both studies resulted in a number of interesting findings. However, the purpose of this chapter is to release the most general findings that

were the results of the focus groups and the factor analysis of the survey data.

REFERENCES

Akiyama, Y. (1996). *The u statistic*. Unpublished internal research document. Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Barnes, A., & Ephrussi, P. H. (1994). The impact of hate violence on victims: Emotional and behavioral responses to attacks. *Social Work, 39*(3), 247-251.

Cartwright, D. (Ed.). (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers by Kurt Lewin*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Chua-eoan, H. (18 December, 1995). Enlisted killers. *Time*.

Eisler, B. (1993). The Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990. *Criminal Law Bulletin, 29*(2), 99-123.

Harvey, C. (1994). Attack prompts debate. *The Washington Times*.

Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990. Pub. L. 101-275.

Levin, R. (1992). Bias crimes: A theoretical & practical overview. *Stanford Law & Policy Review, Winter*, 165-181.

Levin, J., & McDewitt, J. (1994). *Hate crimes: The rising tide of bigotry and bloodshed*. New York: Plenum.

Lewin, G. (Ed.). (1948). *Resolving social conflicts*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Martin, S. E. (1995). A cross-burning is not just an arson: Police social construction of hate crimes in Baltimore County. *Criminology, 33*(3), 303-326.

New York City Gay and Lesbian (NYCGL) Anti-Violence Project. (1995). *Report on anti-gay/lesbian violence in the United States*. New York: Author.

U.S. Congress (101st Congress). (1990). *Hate Crimes Statistics Act*. PL 101-275. Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1992). *Training guide for hate crime data collection*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1996). *Hate crime statistics*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

QUESTIONS

1. In your opinion, is it the perpetrator's motivation or the discriminatory selection of a victim that defines an action as a hate crime?
2. If an offender deeply hates a person and attacks the person due to this personal animus, could the offense be considered a hate crime regardless of the demographic characteristics of the victim?
3. What is the Hate Crime Statistics Act? What requirements does it impose on the attorney general?
4. What factors might explain why many law enforcement agencies that participate in the collection of hate crime statistics report that no hate crimes occurred in their jurisdictions?
5. Why might police underreport or misidentify hate crimes? Discuss economic, social, political, organizational, and attitudinal reasons that can help explain underreporting.
6. What factors encourage police reporting of hate crimes, and what could be done to increase police reporting?
7. Could perceptions of lack of community support for hate crime reporting explain comparatively low rates of reporting in southern and central states?
8. What individual factors are significant in police officers' decisions to report hate crimes?
9. Why is accurate, reliable, and complete data on hate crimes important?
10. What recommendations do the authors make to improve police department policies and procedures for reporting hate crimes?
11. The authors recommend that police training include information on topics such as prejudice, discrimination, and similar issues. If you were designing a segment of the police curriculum so it reflected social psychological principles, what would it look like?

Part IV

HATE CRIME OFFENDERS

Who are the perpetrators of hate crimes? Why are hate crimes committed? The articles in this section approach these questions using diverse theoretical perspectives and a wide range of methods. Taken together, the results illustrate how developing an adequate understanding of hate crimes requires us to look past the characteristics of the perpetrators to the social context surrounding hate crimes. When we do this, we discover that hate violence often reflects extant societal and legal norms that legitimize violence against particular groups.