Empirical Study of Hate Crimes in the United States:
A Systematic Test of Levin and McDevitt's Typology of Offenders

Rayna E. Momen

Thesis submitted to the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Sociology: Applied Social Research

S. Melissa Latimer, Ph.D., Chair
James J. Nolan III, Ph.D.
Ronald Althouse, Ph.D.

Division of Sociology and Anthropology

Morgantown, West Virginia
2008

Keywords: Hate Crimes, Offenders, Typology
Copyright 2008 Rayna Momen

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to test Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of Offenders* theory using NIBRS data. Analysis of data from the National Incident-Based Reporting System on hate crime offenders (1995 - 2000) reveals that for thrill-seeking offenders 1) white adults age 18 and older are significantly more likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals, and 2) that white adults age 18 and older, suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs are significantly more likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals known to the victim, at the victim's residence/home. For defensive offenders, the following result was found 1) white offenders known to the victim, age 25 and older were significantly more likely to commit hate crimes at the victim's residence/home. These results show partial support for Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of Offenders* theory, suggesting that there is some overlap with the two offender types tested. In addition, results support the assertion that Levin and McDevitt's typology needs revised.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this work to the late Kenneth Joseph Ervin.

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

INTRODUCTION

Crimes motivated by bias have received increasing attention in recent years, especially due to the rising number of incidences, the move toward reporting, and the establishment of laws carrying harsher penalties for perpetrators of these crimes. Greater visibility of minority groups in the fight to gain equal rights and protections have also played a role. For the purposes of my study, bias is defined as "A performed negative opinion or attitude toward a group of persons based on their race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity/national origin" (Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines 1999:2). A bias crime is defined as "A criminal offense committed against a person or property which are motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias against a race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnic/national origin; also known as Hate Crime" (Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines 1999:2). Even where offenders mistake a victim as a member of a particular group, the resulting crime is still considered a bias crime because bias still motivated the offense (Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines). I use the terms hate crime and bias crime interchangeably throughout this study.

Although there is a growing body of literature on the subject of hate crimes, little is known about hate crime offenders. Levin and McDevitt (1993) examined hate crime offenders in greater depth, developing a *Typology of Offenders* theory in which they propose three major types of offenders based on the motivations behind the crimes: thrill-seeking, defensive, and mission. Their work, based on 452 case files of hate crimes reported to the Boston Police Department from 1983 to 1987, highlights the characteristics of likely offenders, motivating factors leading to attacks, as well as the primary targets of victimization. Since this theory was first developed, it has not been systematically tested. Levin and McDevitt (1993) posit, "In the

past, hate crimes have too often been discussed as if they were all of one type. While it is true that they are all motivated by bias or bigotry, such attacks actually include a wide variety of criminal behaviors, vastly different in their severity and in their impact on the broader community" (Levin and McDevitt 1993:x). Although my research tests this offender typology, I would suggest that such a focus is also limiting. In focusing specifically on hate crime offenders, I may be overlooking other significant factors with respect to hate crimes that typologies based on bias motivation may reveal.

Although hate crime laws exist, not all states have such laws, and of those that do, not all minority groups are explicitly protected. For example, despite their frequency and often severity, crimes against persons based on sexual orientation are not protected in all jurisdictions. Therefore, closer examination of attacks against these groups is warranted. According to Willis (2004), victims of hate crimes based on sexual orientation bias are more psychologically affected as a result than are victims of crimes where no bias motivated the offense. According to the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (2007), only eleven states have hate crime laws which include crimes that are based on both gender identity and sexual orientation, twenty-one states plus the District of Columbia have hate crimes laws which include crimes that are based on sexual orientation, thirteen states (including West Virginia) have hate crime laws which do not include crimes based on either gender identity or sexual orientation, and five states do not have hate crime laws which include crimes based on any characteristics.

According to Levin (2002), "Beginning in the mid-1980s, the term hate became used in a much more restricted sense to characterize an individual's negative beliefs and feelings about the members of some other group of people because of their race, religious identity, ethnic origin,

gender, sexual orientation, age, or disability status" (p. 1). Further, the FBI did not begin

gathering hate crime data on a national level until the 1990's (Levin 2002). The U.S. Congress

passed the Hate Crime Statistic Act (HCSA) on April 23, 1990, placing the attorney general in

charge of both the establishment of guidelines and collection of data "about crimes that manifest

evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity, including where

appropriate, the crimes of murder, non-negligent manslaughter; forcible rape; aggravated assault,

simple assault, intimidation; arson; and destruction, damage, or vandalism of property" (HCSA,

S(b)(l)). The term prejudice is defined as "a hostile attitude directed specifically toward the

members of an out-group," including, "any unreasonable attitude that is unusually resistant to

rational influence" (Levin 2002:1).

One thing that is problematic about the reporting of hate crimes is that it is difficult to

establish bias as a motivating factor. The data which do exist inaccurately reflects the actual

number of incidences that are committed against vulnerable groups. In order to increase the

accuracy of reported hate crimes it is imperative to implement more programs that train law

enforcement officers on how to effectively conduct investigations to determine if bias is a

motivating factor. Bouman (2003) contends that members of the law enforcement community

should be adequately trained in "understanding the role of investigator, identifying a hate/bias

crime, classifying an offender, interviewing a victim, relating to a community, and prosecuting

an offender" (p. 21-22).

According to Planck, many hate crimes incidences go unreported, while the actual

"crimes against gays and lesbians are becoming more violent" (Planck 1997:27). Further,

legislation needs to be passed that is inclusive of all minorities across all jurisdictions in order to

provide equal protection, and in turn, crime records that more accurately reflect bias crime incidence.

Race is also a common motivating factor in bias crimes, and although it is protected under such laws in some jurisdictions, crimes against racial minorities are on the rise. African-Americans have often been victims of what Levin and McDevitt (2002) term defensive hate crimes, as a manifestation of resistance to predominately white communities becoming inhabited by people of color. However, some researchers contend that racial minorities are disproportionately punished by the very laws said to protect them. As Uviller (2000) highlights based on statistics offered by Jacobs and Potter, authors of *Hate Crimes: Criminal Law and Identity Politics*:

> A rather small proportion of violent crime is inter-racial (20%). Fifteen percent of these violent crimes are black on white, only 2% the other way around. Ninety-two percent of murdered African Americans and two thirds of white victims are killed by members of their respective races. Robbery has the highest proportion of interracial actors (37%) and of these, the overwhelming number are black on white (31% as compared with 2% white on all other races combined). If cross racial hostility is proportionally distributed both ways (as I suppose it to be), far more blacks will find themselves more severely punished by the hate crime laws than whites (p.765)

I present research to address these limitations by looking at bias crime offenders more in depth. By seeking a greater understanding of what motivates these offenders, we can potentially reduce the number of incidences by implementing deterrent strategies centered on education and awareness. Using Levin and McDevitt's typology theory I examine the factors that influence certain people to commit hate crimes. In developing a model that highlights contributing factors leading to bias crimes, the legal system would be better able to determine adequate punishments for offenders. In passing legislation that requires equal protection for all bias crime victims, law enforcement would be better able to identify such crimes, and be less apt to discriminate against

victims based on their own biases. This in turn will help to counter misperceptions that it is acceptable to incite crimes against minorities. Discrimination is "considered… as prejudice's behavioral counterpart" and will be defined "as hurtful, harmful, destructive behavior toward others because they are perceived to be members of a particular group" (Levin 2002:2).

Special training is necessary in order to accurately investigate bias crimes because of the difficulty in establishing bias as a motivating factor. Because offenders target victims based on perceived membership in an "out-group" whose members are vulnerable in that they are less likely to receive equal protections under the law, it is an especially significant area of study. In some places more severe punishments are handed out to offenders who commit such crimes as society increases its awareness and acknowledgment of the devastating effects these crimes have not just on individuals but on whole communities. It is especially important to highlight the extent to which bias-motivated crimes often illicit fear in any member of the victim group, and as such, raises the level of tension among both minority and majority groups. For this reason, bias crimes have been likened to forms of terrorism, making them even more necessary to examine. According to Levin and McDevitt (1993), "In effect, an attack inspired by bigotry says in unequivocal terms to each and every member of the victim's group that 'the same thing could happen to you'" (Levin and McDevitt 1993:x).

Significance of the Study

This study is important for several reasons. Levin and McDevitt's typology theory has not been systematically tested. Examining it in greater depth provides more insight into their theory and suggestions for future research. Further, the NIBRS dataset has not been tested on hate crimes prior to this study. Utilizing this dataset which contains a rich source of information

on hate crimes is especially important as it was designed to eventually replace the UCR

Summary Reporting System and will continue to be used by more agencies across the nation.

Conducting research which examines potential relationships among variables that might support

Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of Offenders* theory is important for several reasons: studying

factors that could determine the types of people more likely to commit hate crimes can aid in the

development of programs aimed at educating these higher risk groups, providing effective

alternatives that can fill voids such as the need for acceptance and how to counter peer pressures

without fear of reprisal; examining motivations behind committing such crimes is also useful in

terms of educating about the benefits of human diversity rather than focusing on how we are

different, teaching people about human emotion, how to address their feelings, fears, etc. and

how to better channel thoughts that lead to behaviors before they become destructive to both the

self and to others. In focusing on the targets of victimization, namely members of minority

groups, we can give them a voice in making greater strides in the legal system to push for equal

protection across jurisdictions, and to organize to gain greater visibility.

 It would be beneficial for researchers to conduct more systematic analyses on hate crime

data from sources at local, state, and national levels. The more data that are collected, and the

greater the accuracy, the more information that will be revealed about the scope of the problem

and the degree of attention that is needed in order to address it. The data I am using are from The

National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), and are not entirely generalizable. The

NIBRS is "A unit-record reporting system which is being implemented to replace the traditional

UCR Summary Reporting System (SRS). NIBRS provides for expanded collection and reporting

of offenses and arrests and their circumstances" (Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines

1999:3).

This study should be especially important to law enforcement officials. Reduction of hate crimes is the ultimate goal, which might be achieved through implementation of programs that aim to deter potential offenders by increasing education on diversity as well as awareness on "hate" and how it can manifest in potentially dangerous ways. In this respect my study could lend support to the societal benefits of designing such programs if the theory is confirmed and we are able to better predict who will offend and why, and who will be victimized. Lobbyists could also benefit from the findings by having more leverage to get legislation passed which could enforce harsher penalties for hate crime offenders. Criminal justice personnel should be especially interested in this research because legislation and prosecution are two areas where society is lacking in terms of helping to combat this serious problem. Greater accuracy in identifying bias as a motivating factor, coupled with harsher penalties for known offenders could aid the field of criminal justice significantly in their efforts at reducing such crimes. Professionals and educators might be able to work with at-risk populations found to be more likely to commit bias crimes, providing more accurate information on minority groups and helping to counter prejudice. Deterrence is the ultimate goal. Identifying what factors influence some people and not others to commit such crimes can aid in implementing measures that will help to reduce the number of bias crimes committed in larger society.

Purpose

The purpose of this quantitative secondary analysis is to test Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of Offenders* theory using NIBRS data. To test this theory systematically, I examined variables linked to thrill-seeking and defensive hate crime offenders. For thrill-seeking offenders, I am examining the relationship between offender's race, offender's sex, offender's age, number of offenders in incident, offender's suspected alcohol/drug use, relationship of victim to

offender, location of incident, and bias motivation. To test the theory for the defensive offender,

I examined the relationship between offender's race, offender's sex, offender's age, victim's

race, relationship of victim to offender, and location of incident using the same dataset.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The theory I used was the *Typology of Offenders*. First developed by Jack Levin and Jack

McDevitt in 1993, it was used to examine the factors that influence what makes a hatemonger

more likely to commit a hate crime. The term hatemonger refers to a person who attempts to

incite or perpetuate hatred because of bias toward a person based on difference, such as race

(Levin 2002). At present, Levin and McDevitt's theory has not been systematically tested by

other researchers.

This theory initially suggested that there are three basic types of perpetrators who commit

hate crimes as sparked by circumstances involving people who are different. The three types of

hate crime offenders are: thrill-seeking, defensive, and mission. Upon reanalysis of the original

data for which the offender typology was conceived, a fourth type, termed retaliatory, was

proposed (Levin et al 2002). In thrill-seeking hate crimes there does not have to be a specific

event that causes perpetrators to have a bias-motivated response. Rather, perpetrators, looking

for a thrill, seek out places where members of out-groups are typically known to congregate in

order to find targets. This comes with both psychological and social payoffs. Thrill-seekers often

commit these crimes to gain approval and acceptance from peer groups. A leader may actually

hold intense biased feelings for a victim; however other group participants may be easily

manipulated into conforming so as not to appear weak. Committing hate crimes in groups brings

a sense of security as well as inspiration to the individuals involved (Levin and McDevitt 2002).

According to Levin and McDevitt (2002), "Most thrill attacks take the form of vandalism, intimidation, and assault" (p. 71). Thrill-seeking hate crimes are committed against both property and people. Assaultive hate crimes, though not as common, can turn deadly. It can be seen as a game where the perpetrators thrive on establishing a sense of dominance and control over victims who are different. Typically victims of thrill-seeking hate crimes "are chosen more or less on a random basis. Thus interchangeability occurs not only within a target group–for example, among Blacks, Jews, or Asians–but across groups as well. Almost any vulnerable and easily identified victim will do" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:69). According to Levin and McDevitt (2002), "The culture of hate is important for singling out the victims of thrill hate attacks and justifying the violence perpetrated against them" (p. 69). Perpetrators attack members of minority groups seen as inferior to them. They may justify their actions based on the negative portrayal of such out-groups by the dominant culture. This leads them to believe that "Nobody will care if we attack the members of this group, and we might be applauded!" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:69). Due to the randomness of many thrill-seeking hate crimes, offenders can be hard to apprehend.

However, thrill-seeking hate crimes might be easier to deter because there is rarely any economic motivation or gain for committing such crimes. Threats of punishment could help to reduce the incidence of such crimes especially since the gains are superficial and are "little more than 'bragging rights.'" Deterrence at this level is crucial because if left unpunished such amateur criminals may eventually move on to more violent crimes that go beyond satisfying boredom or excitement.

9

Couples and even groups commit such crimes (in large numbers it is referred to as "wilding") (Levin and McDevitt 2002). As far as victims go, homosexuals and bisexuals are the primary targets of most thrill-seeking hate crimes, often resulting in serious injuries. According to Levin and McDevitt (2002)

> Although members of any 'inferior' group will usually do, gays are most frequently targeted as the victims of thrill-motivated attacks. They usually receive serious injuries when bashed. Comparisons of national and several state reports on the percentage of assaulted hate crime victims from each group (as opposed to being victims of harassment or vandalism) indicates that gay, lesbian, and bisexual victims were the most likely to be assaulted when compared with other hate crime victim groups (p. 72)

Levin and McDevitt (2002) postulate:

> Gays make particularly 'good' victims for groups of bored young men looking for a thrill: First, gays are known to congregate in certain areas of major cities and are thus relatively easy to find. Second, gays may represent a particularly difficult psychosexual threat to teenage males who are in the process of establishing their sexual identity. Finally, gays may be particularly reluctant to report attacks against them (p. 72)

Victims who are gay may hesitate reporting such crimes for fear of being ostracized by family members or friends who did not know they were gay. This is an example of *secondary victimization* described by criminologists Berrill and Herek as "the negative response of others to a crime victim because of his or her sexual orientation" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:72). In other cases, crimes against homosexuals do not get reported because of the lack of consensus on whether these victims should be protected under the law. This can be seen as a consequence of homophobia and its pervasiveness in larger society. Notably, Levin and McDevitt suggest that perpetrators who bash people based on perceived minority sexual orientation are said to be characteristically different than those who bash based on skin color or ethnicity. They state that "Unlike offenders who bash the members of ethnic and racial groups, those who target gays are

10

more typically 'average young men' without criminal records who come from any of a number of different lifestyles, backgrounds, and social classes" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:72-3). They feel marginalized regardless of their background and feel that bashing gays will help lessen their sense of powerlessness. In addition,

> …gay bashing ("Let's go beat up some queers") has actually become a fad or sport among certain high school students. In the typical case, two or more young men arm themselves with knives, bottles, hammers, or baseball bats and then target a part of the city in which they suspect that large numbers of gays congregate or reside. The intruders rush in, assault their unsuspecting victim, and rush out again (Levin and McDevitt 2002:73).

It is possible that such adolescents in this vulnerable stage of life can actually be considered "temporary sociopaths" when lashing out against members of minority groups. Adolescents are pushed and pulled in different directions while attempting to find themselves. While in the process of growing up, they are restricted from certain rights. It can be a confusing stage, and some young people find themselves easily swayed to participate in thrill-seeking behavior that they might never have considered as adults. This theory suggests that perpetrators in thrill-seeking hate crimes generally tend to be young males acting in groups who seek out victims, often perceived to be homosexuals, by traveling outside their neighborhood community. Although being under the influence of alcohol or drugs is not characteristic of all thrill-seeking hate crimes, such abuse has been highlighted in a number of cases. The acts are more random and may result from a desire to fit in and be accepted primarily due to a dependence on peers. Although adults can also be perpetrators of hate crimes, adult offenders differ in at least one way. According to Levin and McDevitt (2002), "They usually don't regard their hate offense as a game or sport committed for the fun of it. Instead, they sense that a personal threat is being

11

directed against them and are deadly serious in what they consider to be an appropriate reaction" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:75). This leads us to the second form of hate crime in the typology.

Originally termed reactive hate crimes until the category was renamed in 2002 (based upon closer examination of the motivating factors), defensive hate crimes differ from thrill-seeking crimes in a number of ways. They are not committed out of thrill or excitement. Rather, "hatemongers seize on what they consider a precipitating or triggering incident to serve as a catalyst for the expression of their anger. They rationalize that by attacking an outsider they are in fact taking a protective posture, a defensive stance against intruders" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:77). Such perpetrators see outsiders as threats and themselves as protectors of their community, even attacking based on symbolic threats to turf, such as an increase in whites dating outside of their race. Unlike thrill-seekers, perpetrators of defensive hate crimes do not travel outside of their neighborhood or workplaces to commit such crimes. Their behavior is motivated by perceived threats within these sacred environments. Such perpetrators tend to be older due to having established residences.

According to research conducted by Green and colleagues, "hate crimes occur most often in what they call 'defended' White neighborhoods-predominantly White areas of a community that have experienced an in-migration of residents of color" (Levin and McDevitt 2002: 80). Many defensive hate crimes have had economic motivations, for example, a white male feeling threatened by a Latino male getting a promotion ahead of him. The literature strongly supports this assertion: "Building on Green's notion of defended neighborhood shows that bigots might defend any aspect of their lives they feel especially entitled to hold. Given the competitive nature

of the workplace, for example, it comes as no surprise that many defensive hate crimes also occur on the job" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:80).

According to Levin and McDevitt (2002), "Although the members of almost any group of 'outsiders' can be targeted, the primary victims of defensive hate crimes are people of color" (p. 78). Defensive hate crime offenders target specific individuals or groups as opposed to choosing victims at random. Offenders see specific individuals as intruding on their territory–for example, a black male who moves his family into a predominately white neighborhood. To further illustrate this point, "According to a survey conducted by the Klanwatch Project, a unit of the Southern Poverty Law Center in Birmingham, Alabama, about half of all racially inspired acts of vandalism and violence are directed at Blacks moving into previously White neighborhoods" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:80).

Perpetrators in defensive hate crimes usually have no association with organized hate groups, and "have no prior history of crime or overt bigotry" (Levin and McDevitt 2002:78). The motivating factor is an incident that elicits a very powerful and negative response in an individual who may not have previously experienced such a threat. As Levin and McDevitt (2002) note, "In its narrow sense, the term 'defensive' refers to behavior designed to protect against an attack" (p. 87). According to Levin and McDevitt (2002), "Though particular victims are selected, there is still an element of interchangeability–any member of the victim group who dares to pose a threat will be targeted for abuse" (p. 79). Such crimes send messages to certain groups that if they cross certain boundaries they will be targeted until the threat subsides.

Some of the literature links hate crimes with forms of terrorism. Further, society's emphasis on classifying people based on such broad categories as race leaves little room for the

13

variation that exists within these groups. Because hate crimes threaten entire groups, any

individual who belongs to or is perceived to be a member of a minority group is increasingly

vulnerable to such victimization. Levin and McDevitt (2002) make this connection with regard to

defensive hate crimes, stating that, "As such, these crimes are in their intended effect very much

like acts of terrorism, meant to send a signal by means of fear and horror. If the original criminal

response fails to elicit the desired retreat on the part of the victim, then the offender frequently

escalates the level of property damage or violence" (p. 79). Such crimes affect potential victims

as well, by sending messages to minority groups that they too will be targeted if they impose on

the in-group's "turf", and although it is only a small number of community members who may

hold these prejudiced feelings, most will end up being labeled as racists after such incidents

occur. Victims are in especially frustrating positions, knowing why they are being targeted and

that victimization will likely continue unless they choose to retreat, even though they are simply

attempting to go about a normal life routine.

It is also found that defensive hate crimes are more likely to occur when programs have

been implemented to increase neighborhood diversity, such as a plan to draw more black

families into a once all-white neighborhood. Some residents perceive this as giving minorities

special treatment. Such crimes may even be instigated by the infiltration of whites into minority

areas: whites may feel that they are entitled to an area even when historically inhabited by

minorities, perceiving the increasing minority presence as a threat to the historical dominance of

their majority group. They may still attempt to take over the area through intimidation and

violence.

According to Levin and McDevitt (2002), "Defensive hate crimes are generally aimed against particular 'outsiders'–those who are regarded as posing a personal challenge to a perpetrator's workplace, neighborhood, or physical well-being. The attack tends to be narrowly focused. Once the threat is perceived to subside, so does the criminal behavior" (pp. 88-89). In general, offenders of defensive hate crimes tend to be older people who commit crimes within their neighborhood communities against people who are different, most often based on race because of a perceived threat of territorial intrusion or more simply out-group membership.

The third offender type in Levin and McDevitt's typology is mission. This is the rarest kind of hate crime, and is committed by those who believe it is their duty to rid the world of an entire group of people perceived to be at the root of the world's problems. Such perpetrators seek to eliminate all members of out groups, not just one or two. Mission hate offenders do not attack in response to any real threat or event, rather their intention is to eliminate all members of an out-group who they feel is responsible for their misfortunes. Perpetrators of mission hate crimes often have severe mental disorders and exhibit conspiratorial thoughts. Convinced they are doing a service to the world, they set out to attack before it is too late. Hallucinations may lead perpetrators to attribute their own personal failures directly to an entire category of people, such as all blacks. Blame plays a central role. In general, the offender in mission hate crimes tends to be an individual with a mental disorder who blames entire categories of people for their problems, or who is convinced through hallucinations that they must rid the world of whole groups of people.

A fourth type of hate crime, termed retaliatory, was proposed by Levin et. al (2002). It involves offenders provoking bias motivated attacks in reaction to prior real or perceived attacks

15

on members of their own group. The incident can be seen as an act of vengeance: offenders take matters into their own hands to send a message that the original perpetrator or members of their group should pay for what they did. They may seek out the actual perpetrator of the initial crime, or more generally, members of the same group in order to seek revenge (Levin et al. 2002). According to Levin et al. (2002), "Attacks based on revenge tend to have the greatest potential for fueling and refueling additional hate offenses" (p. 309) Defensive hate crimes may also be retaliatory. Once an act of violence is initiated by one group against another, a whole rash of violent incidences may be carried out as an act of revenge.

Hate crimes can be seen as the ultimate expression of prejudice, where innocent people are victimized merely for being different. According to Levin and McDevitt (2002):

> Hate crimes represent one endpoint on the continuum of prejudice and bigotry. For economic as well as psychological reasons, there are countless individuals who feel resentful. They have suffered some loss in self-esteem or status and are eager to place the blame for their loss elsewhere – on those groups and individuals portrayed in the culture of hate as weak, immoral, or uncivilized (P. 97)

Some offenders, for reasons such as perceived threat to their turf, loss of power or status, attack people they feel are to blame in order to seek revenge, while others attack based on the need for acceptance or a rush of adrenalin. As Levin and McDevitt (2002) have noted, the culture of hate plays an important role in shaping how members of society feel about particular groups of people, especially when the overpowering messages convey minority groups as subhuman, thereby deserving of victimization. In their earlier work they posit, "Whether or not intended as such, we are in the midst of a growing culture of hate: from humor and music to religion and politics, a person's group affiliation – the fact that he or she differs from people in the in-group –

is being used more and more to provide a basis for dehumanizing and insulting that person"

(Levin and McDevitt 1993:34).

Hypotheses

From Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of Offenders* theory I hypothesized the following:

Thrill-Seeking Model: Independent variables – offender's race, offender's sex, offender's age,

number of offenders in incident, offender's suspected alcohol/drug use, relationship of victim to

offender, and location of incident; Dependent variable – bias motivation

Hypothesis 1: Hypothesis 1 states that white males under the age of 18, in groups,

suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs, are more likely to commit hate crimes against known

victims outside the victim's residence/home when the bias motivation is perceived homosexuals.

Defensive Model: Independent variables – offender's race, offender's sex, offender's age,

relationship of victim to offender, and victim's race; Dependent variable – location of incident

Hypothesis 2: Hypothesis 2 states that white males age 25 and older are more likely to

commit hate crimes against African-Americans known to them, when the crime occurs at the

victim's residence/home.

THEORETICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Little is known about why some individuals are more likely to become perpetrators in

hate crimes while others harboring biased feelings do not resort to such acts. Systematically

testing data on hate crime offenders relative to theory can help to gain a better understanding of

this phenomenon. Although references to aspects of Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of*

Offenders theory were made throughout some of the literature I reviewed, I did not come across any studies that systematically tested their theory. In reviewing the literature I sought to focus on articles which addressed the three offender types highlighted in the typology: thrill-seeking, defensive, and mission. The basic patterns include 1) literature that addresses aspects of the typology but does not contain references to Levin and McDevitt, 2) literature that addresses aspects of the typology and includes references to the theorists, and 3) research by Levin, McDevitt, and Bennett in which a revision of the typology is proposed.

Literature Cited

Literature which contains language that reflect aspects of Levin and McDevitt's typology but which do not reference these theorists include the works of Kirby (1999) and Bouman (2003). For example, Kirby (1999) highlights research conducted in 1995 by Forensic psychologist Karen Franklin, who used an anonymous survey to explore "antigay attitudes and behavior among 500 young adults in Northern California" (Kirby 1999:26). Franklin identified four motivators for committing such crimes: self-defense, ideology, thrill seeking, and peer dynamics. Some of the common elements are consistent with Levin and McDevitt's typology of offenders, specifically for thrill-seeking hate crimes:

> I've studied many cases of antigay violence, and the biggest chunk was by young men, usually in groups, attacking a lone gay man or one thought to be gay… Franklin found that 10% of the young people surveyed admitted to physical violence or threats against people they believed were homosexual, while 24% reported participating in antigay name-calling. Among young men, the figures were much higher. Thirty-two percent had hurled antigay epithets, and 18% had actually attacked someone (Kirby 1999:27).

Thrill-seeking crimes, according to Kirby "are often tied to boredom, drinking, and socioeconomic status" (Kirby 1999:29). Like Levin and McDevitt, Kirby makes the link between bias-motivated crimes elicited by organized hate groups and terrorism: "They're not just out to

18

harm one individual. To them, individuals are interchangeable. What they want is to hurt the whole community. That's what terrorism is all about" (Kirby 1999:29).

Bouman (2003) explored effective means of investigating hate/bias crimes, and contends that hate crime offenders can typically be classified in one of five categories based on their motivations. Three of these five types fit Levin and McDevitt's typology [thrill-seeking, missionary (mission in the typology), and reactive (defensive in the Typology)]:

1. Thrill-seeking: Generally groups of young people, these offenders are motivated by the experiences of psychological or social excitement, mere pleasure, or the gain of bragging rights. Their targets often are unknown outside the groups they represent. Hate/bias-based graffiti or verbal or physical assault represent offenses of this classification.

2. Organized: Motivated by the need to express their profound resentment against, for the most part, minority groups, these offenders look for a role model or leader who will organize and encourage them to act. Skinheads and their activities exemplify this classification.

3. Missionary: Usually identifying with a specific leader or higher power, these offenders seek to rid the world of evil by disposing of the members of an identified and despised group. Those led by Hitler typify this classification.

4. Reactive: Typically showing a lack of tolerance for individuals of other groups, these offenders protect and defend what belongs to them (a country, community, neighborhood, school, or church) from outsiders. Average citizens defending their race against another race characterize this classification.

5. Identity conflicted: Motivated by self-hatred or self-protection, these offenders assault targets with whom they share common traits or characteristics. A homosexual person targeting or assaulting other homosexuals epitomizes this classification (P. 23)

Literature which addresses aspects of the typology and contains references to the theorists includes the works of Tischler (1999) and Shafer and Navarro (2003). Tischler (1999) addresses prison gangs, also called Security Threat Groups or STGs, and their impact on other inmates, as well as continuation of such in-group hate behavior once they are no longer incarcerated. He posits that bias crimes committed by organized hate groups involve much more serious offenses, in contrast with the typical hate crime offender who is most often a first-time offender out to gay

bash, and compares them to mission offenders in Levin and McDevitt's typology, offenders who are out to eliminate all members of a particular group. Citing Levin, he contends that it is the gang's support that is the catalyst for committing these crimes, and also serves as a means of justification.

Schafer and Navarro (2003) address the problem of hate groups and introduce a seven-stage comprehensive hate model developed in response to the lack of research in the field. In addition, they describe three types of bias crime offenders: the thrill-seeker, the reactive offender, and the hard-core offender: "They described the reactive offender as one 'who grounds his attack on a perceived transgression, such as an insult, interracial dating, or a neighborhood integration;' The authors' model incorporates the thrill-seeker and the hard-core offender, but redefines the concept of the reactive offender. This phenomenon can be described as secondary justification; skinheads routinely use this technique to instigate attacks" (Shafer and Navarro 2003:3). The concept of secondary justification can be illustrated by the hate group targeting a victim, the victim not reacting submissively, and the hate group feeling that further attack is actually defensive and justified.

Research by Levin, McDevitt, and Bennett (2002) is the closest to the research I tested. McDevitt et al. (2002) add to their earlier work by examining a fourth category of motivation, retaliatory, determining that the original typology was incomplete: "We reanalyze 169 Boston police case files that were originally studied in order to provide empirical grounding for the typology" (McDevitt et al 2002:303). In each of these files the offender was known and represented. According to the authors, "Relevant data coded from the CDU files consisted of location of incident, offense type, bias indication, type of injury, offender's motivation,

20

relationship of parties involved, involvement of organized groups, and victim and offender characteristics" (McDevitt et al 2002:307). In addition to highlighting the characteristics of these offender types, this work also looks at "levels of culpability in explaining the most appropriate sanctions for certain kinds of hate offenders" (McDevitt et al 2002:303).

Many hate crimes involve multiple offenders, often playing differing roles in the commission of crime. Determining what roles each individual plays can help law enforcement better "address, prosecute, and sentence hate crimes," handing out the most appropriate punishments. According to McDevitt et al (2003), "We suggest that there are three levels of culpability,… the leader in an incident, the fellow traveler, and the unwilling participant. Also to distinguish those who are culpable from those who are not, we offer the category of hero to acknowledge those individuals who actively try to intervene to protect the victim of bias-motivated violence" (McDevitt et al 2002:313).

The leaders, most often males who suggested an attack, carry the most responsibility by both initiating and following through. Fellow travelers go along with a crime once it is suggested, participating to the same degree as leaders, but only once the idea to incite violence was initiated. Although they took part, there is slightly less culpability in that they did not make the conscious decision to seek out a victim. Unwilling participants do not agree with the attack, yet are unsure of how to stop it. They fear losing the respect of their friends by standing up for the victim, but do not take an active part in the crime. However, they show approval by doing nothing to try and stop it. Heroes, on the other hand, often try to stop the attack or report it to police, and should be rewarded for doing what they could at a very difficult time. Loyalty to their peers does not take precedence when heroes try to intervene in a hate attack.

Dependent upon the level of culpability, some offenders might benefit more from educational and integrative interventions with members of out-groups, whereas others may need more intensive sanctions. Since the passage of hate crime laws, there has been much debate about how to determine offender motivation as well as whether crimes motivated by bias differ from other crimes. Many hate crimes go unreported, and intent is often difficult to determine. Law enforcement agencies often look at lack of other motivation as indicators of bias crimes. As well, offenders rarely gain anything from committing such crimes beyond the harm inflicted. Retaliatory hate crimes can result when a victim of a hate crime is threatened with revenge if they report it to the police. As well, retaliatory hate crimes can occur if the victim themselves decide to attack their perpetrator or a member of their group. All too often, offenders are not punished for their crimes because bias intent is difficult to determine. In this respect, offenders may feel reinforced by society to continue with the behavior and even escalate the level of harm. It is crucial to investigate motivating factors in order to reduce the incidence of such crimes and send clear messages to offenders that such crimes are intolerable.

According to the authors, "Although the categories 'defensive' and 'retaliatory' share some features, we maintain that they are separate because of the different precipitants that spark violence in each" (McDevitt et al 2002:306). Bigotry is the basic driving force of each of the four categories of hate motivation, but they differ in the environmental and psychological conditions which lead to the offense: "In thrill crimes, for example, the offender is set off by a desire for excitement and power; defensive hate crime offenders are provoked by feeling a need to protect their resources under conditions they consider to be threatening; retaliatory offenders are inspired by a desire to avenge a perceived degradation or assault on their group; and mission offenders

perceive themselves as crusaders who hope to cleanse the earth of evil" (McDevitt et al 2002:306).

Results indicated that thrill-seeking was the most common motivator for committing hate crimes (66% of the sample). The offenders sought specific victims outside of their neighborhoods who they perceived to be members of vulnerable groups. The second most common bias category was defensive (25% of the sample). These offenders sought to defend their neighborhoods by harming minority group members to send the message that they are not welcome in their community. These types of crimes tend to be on the increase where formerly all-white communities began to see an influx of people of color. Retaliatory hate crimes made up 8% in the study. These types of crimes often occur as a result of rumors of an attack, fueling retaliation regardless of whether a hate crime actually occurred. They differ from defensive attacks in that in retaliatory crimes, offenders only act in response to a real or perceived attack on a member of their own group. Of the 169 cases, only 1 was categorized as a mission hate crime, in which the offender believes their life's mission is to rid the world of an entire group of people, making attacks based on bigotry a way of life.

Levin and McDevitt's typology has had a positive impact on law enforcement in terms of helping to investigate and prevent hate crimes. In developing ways to categorize offenders, it is easier to determine who is at risk for committing such crimes. Thirteen indicators were presented by the Uniform Crime Reports in order to help make determinations of bias in crimes: "With growing understanding of what indicators to look for, the investigation process can be greatly enhanced" (McDevitt et al 2002:310). Although hate speech alone does not constitute a bias crime, the offenders language accompanying a crime has been found to be the key indicator

collected in determining bias as a motivating factor. The authors argue that there is currently a lack of hate crime training for law enforcement officials as well as standards for prosecuting offenders. The typology can help in developing a greater understanding of motivators that lead to hate crimes, increasing the effectiveness of investigating and punishing offenders.

Conclusion

Although the literature focuses on important themes relative to hate crimes in general and offenders in particular, none of these articles actually tested theories of offenders. Although aspects of Levin and McDevitt's typology theory were reflected in the language or referenced in the literature reviewed, more research needs to be done to understand the motivating factors that drive people to commit hate crimes. Little is still known about hate crime offenders and whether or not predictions can be made as to who is more likely to commit these crimes. Offender attributes need to be systematically tested, especially in conjunction with theory, in order to more accurately make such predictions. My research seeks to close these gaps. In testing Levin and McDevitt's typology theory I examine potential relationships among variables that might show attributes that could predict future hate crime behavior.

Using this typology, hypotheses about offenders and potential offenders can be derived. Due to the relatively new focus on hate crimes and the collection of statistics, I expected to find little research utilizing this typology. Since my focus is on hate crime offenders (in an attempt to gain a better understanding of who is more likely to commit such crimes), it is useful to employ this typology in my research. Since I am conducting quantitative secondary analysis on existing data, I used this theory to generate my hypotheses. For my purposes, I chose to focus on hypotheses related to what the theory termed thrill-seeking and defensive hate crime offenders.

As applied to my study, this theory holds that I would expect an offender's race, offender's sex, offender's age, number of offenders in incident, offender's suspected alcohol/drug use, relationship of victim to offender, and location of incident to be related to bias motivation specifically for thrill-seeking hate crime offenders. Based on Levin and McDevitt's typology, I hypothesized that white males under the age of 18, in groups, suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs, are more likely to commit hate crimes against known victims outside the victim's residence/home when the bias motivation is perceived homosexuals.

This theory also holds that I would expect an offender's race, offender's sex, offender's age, relationship of victim to offender, and victim's race to be related to location of incident for defensive hate crime offenders. Based on Levin and McDevitt's typology, I hypothesized that white males age 25 and older are more likely to commit hate crimes against African-Americans known to them, when the crime occurs at the victim's place of residence.

DELIMITATIONS

The general topic of my study is hate crimes. In order to delimit this study, I chose to narrow my focus by conducting quantitative secondary analysis on an existing data set. The publicly available SPSS data sets include information on hate crime offenders, victims, and incidences reported to the FBI's National Incident-Based Reporting System for the years 1995 to 2000. For the purposes of my research, I chose to utilize the data set with "offender" as the unit of analysis, which contained information on a total of N = 7,566 offenders. From this large dataset I selected specific variables in order to measure whether certain offender attributes could be found in relation to specific types of hate crimes. Using Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of Offenders* theory, which includes three types: thrill-seeker, defensive, and mission, I chose to

narrow my focus to examine thrill-seeking and defensive offenders to seek out relationships among the variables.

For the purposes of my research, I narrowed my focus to examine thrill-seeking and defensive hate crime offenders in order to gain a better understanding of who is more likely to commit these crimes, what are the motivating factors, and who is more likely to be victimized. Because the dataset I am using does not contain adequate information characteristic of either mission or retaliatory hate crime offenders, such as information on possible mental illness and whether or not the crime was committed out of revenge for a prior offense, I chose not to make any related hypotheses with respect to these two offender types.

For the thrill-seeker offenders I chose to examine the relationship between the independent variables offender's race, offender's sex, offender's age, number of offenders in incident, offender's suspected alcohol/drug use, relationship of victim to offender, and location of incident and the dependent variable bias motivation. For defensive offenders, I chose to examine the relationship between the independent variables offender's race, offender's sex, offender's age, relationship of victim to offender, and victim's race, and the dependent variable location of incident.

METHODS

Explanation of variables

Using the UCR's NIBRS Data Collection Guidelines Volume 1 to examine the data elements and data values in greater detail, I determined which original variables to draw out of the NIBRS offender file that would best fit the models to test the theory. Although Levin and McDevitt emphasize victim's race as a distinctive element in defensive hate crimes, with people

of color (and primarily African-Americans) as the primary targets of victimization, I chose not to use victim's race as the dependent variable for these types of crimes. Upon closer examination of the theory and the variables in the NIBRS dataset, I felt that other factors warranted further investigation in terms of what makes a defensive hate crime. Such crimes are noted by the theorists for being committed based on real or perceived threats to turf, and this notion is discussed in great detail in the literature where their typology is first introduced. Hypothesizing that "place" played a greater role, I used victim's race as an independent variable and examined its affects (along with all other independent variables) on location of incident. I ran frequencies to get an idea of how many valid and missing cases there were from the onset. I found that the original relationship variable, vorel (relationship of victim to offender), had a significant number (3,049) of blank spaces in the data set, of the total population N = 7,566. Because I wanted to use a variation of the relationship variable for each of the two offender models I was examining, I explored this variable in greater depth. Too much rich data would be lost if I were to use the variable as it were with nearly 50% of the population missing.

Further analysis of the UCR Data Collection Guidelines revealed that for this particular variable, data were to be reported only for relationships where the offender perpetrated certain types of crimes, for which such values were entered in the variable UCR1. In other words, the large number of blanks in the dataset were indicative of offenses that did not fall under crimes against persons or robberies against the victim. In order to account for this and still include this variable to test my hypotheses, I decided to take the UCR1 variable and select those cases for which the relationship variable would be valid. Using the original variable UCR1, I created a filter variable, selecting out values representing crimes against persons or robberies against a victim as listed under the description from the ucr data elements and data values section. This

changed the total N population = 7,566 in the original offender file to a sample population n =

4,961, where this n represents 100% valid cases possible (UCR NIBRS Data Collection

Guidelines 1996:94).

Selecting Cases using the UCR1 Variable

From the original ucr1 variable I selected cases as follows: 200 = Arson, 210 =

Extortion/Blackmail, 220 = Burglary/Breaking and Entering, 23A = Pocket-picking, 23B =

Purse-snatching, 23C = Shoplifting, 23D = Theft From Building, 23E = Theft From Coin-

Operated Machine or Device, 23F = Theft From Motor Vehicle, 23G = Theft of Motor Vehicle

Parts/Accessories, 23H = All Other Larceny, 240 = Motor Vehicle Theft, 250 =

Counterfeiting/Forgery, 26A = False Pretenses/Swindle/Confidence Game, 26B = Credit

Card/Automatic Teller Machine Fraud, 26C = Impersonation, 26D = Welfare Fraud, 26E = Wire

Fraud, 270 = Embezzlement, 280 = Stolen Property Offenses, 290 =

Destruction/Damage/Vandalism of Property, 35A = Drug/Narcotic Violations, 35B = Drug

Equipment Violations, 370 = Pornography/Obscene Material, 39A = Betting/Wagering, 39B =

Operating/Promoting/Assisting Gambling, 39C = Gambling Equipment Violations, 39D = Sports

Tampering, 40A = Prostitution, 40B = Assisting or Promoting Prostitution, 510 = Bribery, 520 =

Weapon Law Violations, 90A = Bad Checks, 90B = Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations, 90C

= Disorderly Conduct, 90D = Driving Under the Influence, 90E = Drunkenness, 90F = Family

Offenses, Nonviolent, 90G = Liquor Law Violations, 90H = Peeping Tom, 90I = Runaway, 90J

= Trespass of Real Property, 90Z = 0 (not selected), and 09A = Murder/Nonnegligent

Manslaughter, 09B = Negligent Manslaughter, 09C = Justifiable Homicide, 100 =

Kidnapping/Abduction, 11A = Forcible Rape, 11B = Forcible Sodomy, 11C = Sexual Assault

With An Object, 11D = Forcible Fondling, 120 = Robbery, 13A = Aggravated Assault, 13B =

Simple Assault, 13C = Intimidation, 36A = Incest, 36B = Statutory Rape = 1 (selected) n = 4961 or 100%.

Next, I recoded all of the original variables I drew out in order to better fit my hypotheses, as derived from Levin and McDevitt's typology theory, into dichotomous dummy variables. As a result, the theory was tested using the models from the offender file for which certain types of crimes have taken place, crimes of a violent nature perpetrated against persons and robberies against victims. After recoding my variables, I ran all of my data using the select cases based on the filter variable described above, including frequencies on all of my original and recoded variables, as well as binary logistic regression for the recoded variables. Because I was using a relationship variable for both of my offender models, this process was necessary to use for all variables and related output.

Recoding of variables:

Thrill-Seeking Model

> *Independent Variables*

For the thrill-seeking model, the original variables were recoded into independent variables as follows: *Demographic variables:* The original variable orace (offender's race) was a nominal (categorical) variable with the following values: A = Asian/Pacific Islander, B = Black, I = American Indian/Alaskan Native, U = Unknown, and W = White. I recoded this into a nominal variable called offrace as follows: A, B, I = 0 (non-white), W = 1 (white), and U = 9 (unknown), with 9 marked as a discrete missing value, making this a dichotomous dummy

variable with 0 = non-white (n = 1256 or 30.3% of the sample) and 1 = white (n = 2885 or 69.7%

of the sample) with a total population sample n = 4141.

The original variable osex (offender's sex) was a nominal variable with the following

values: F = female, M = male, and U = unknown. I recoded this into a nominal variable called

offsex as follows: F = 0 (female), M = 1 (male), U = 9 (unknown), with 9 marked as a discrete

missing value, making this a dichotomous dummy variable where 0 = female (n = 722 or 16.8%

of the sample) and 1 = male (n = 3572 or 83.2% of the sample), with a total population sample n

= 4294. The original variable oage (offender's age) was a continuous numeric variable with

values of 0 = unknown and 99 = over 98 years. Frequencies showed the range of ages from 1-98.

To test my hypothesis that minors were more likely to commit these types of hate crimes than

adults, I recoded this into an ordinal variable named offage18 as follows: 0, 1 = 9 (unknown),

with 9 marked as a discrete missing value, NOTE: The age value of 1 with a frequency of 3 was

recoded as unknown and included with missing values as it was plausible to conclude that no

hate crimes were committed by offenders aged 1 year old, 2-17 = 1 (under 18 juvenile); 18-98,

99 = 0 (18 and older), making this a dichotomous dummy variable where 0 = adults (with n =

2694 or 69.7% of the sample), 1 = minors (n = 1170 or 30.3% of the sample), with the total

population sample n = 3864.

The original variable nooffend (number of offenders in incident) was a continuous

numeric variable with no values. Frequencies showed a range from 1 to 15 offenders in a hate

crime incident. I recoded this into an ordinal variable called numoff as follows: 1 = 0 (1

offender), and 2–15 = 1 (multiple offenders), with no missing values, making this a dichotomous

dummy variable with 0 = 1 offender (n = 2826 or 57% of the sample) and 1 = multiple offenders (n = 2135 or 43% of the sample), with a total population sample n = 4961.

The original variable, using (offender suspected of using… prior to or during incident), was nominal and had the following values: A = alcohol, C = computer equipment, D = drugs/narcotics, and N = not applicable. For the purposes of my research, I wanted only to look at cases where the offender was suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs, so I recoded it into a nominal variable called abuse as follows: A, D = 1 (suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs), N = 0 (not applicable), and C = 9 (unknown), with 9 marked as a discrete missing value, making this a dichotomous dummy variable with 0 = not suspected (n = 4101 or 82.9% of the sample) and 1 = offender suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs (n = 847 or 17.1% of the sample), with the total population sample n = 4948.

Relationship variable: The original variable, vorel (relationship of victim to offender), was a nominal variable with the following values: AQ = Victim was acquaintance, BE = Victim was babysittee (the baby), BG = Victim was boyfriend/girlfriend, CF –Victim was child of boyfriend/girlfriend, CH = Victim was child, CS = Victim was common-law spouse, EE = Victim was employee, ER = Victim was employer, FR = Victim was friend, GC = Victim was grandchild, GP = Victim was grandparent, HR = Homosexual relationship, IL = Victim was in-law, NE = Victim was Neighbor, OF = Victim was other family member, OK = Victim was otherwise known, PA = Victim was parent, RU = Relationship unknown, SB = Victim was sibling, SC = Victim was stepchild, SE = Victim was spouse, SP = Victim was stepparent, SS = Victim was stepsibling, ST = Victim was stranger, VO = Victim was offender, XS = Victim was ex-spouse. I recoded this into a nominal variable called stranger as follows: AQ, BE, BG, CF,

CH, CS, EE, ER, FR, GC, GP, HR, IL, NE, OF, OK, PA, SB, SC, SE, SP, SS, XS = 0 (Known),

ST = 1 (Stranger), VO = 8 (Victim was offender), and RU = 9 (Relationship unknown), with

both 8 and 9 marked as discrete missing values. I felt that removing the victim was offender

value was necessary in order to avoid complicating the variable and the results. To keep in line

with my hypotheses and how the variable was theoretically linked to the dependent variable, I

chose to remove these from the analysis, making this a dichotomous dummy variable with 0 =

known (n = 2264 or 62.4% of the sample) and 1 = stranger (n = 1362 or 37.6% o the sample),

with a total population sample n = 3626.

   Place variable: The original variable location (location of incident), was a nominal

variable with the following values: 1 = Air/Bus/Train Terminal, 2 = Bank/Savings and Loan, 3 =

Bar/Nightclub, 4 = Church/Synagogue/Temple, 5 = Commercial/Office Building, 6 =

Construction Site, 7 = Convenience Store, 8 = Department/Discount Store, 9 = Drug Store/Drs

Office/Hospital, 10 = Field/Woods, 11 = Government/Public Building, 12 =

Grocery/Supermarket, 13 = Highway/Road/Alley, 14 = Hotel/Motel/Etc., 15 = Jail/Prison, 16 =

Lake/Waterway, 17 = Liquor Store, 18 = Parking Lot/Garage, 19 = Rental Stor. Facil., 20 =

Residence/Home, 21 = Restaurant, 22 = School/College, 23 = Service/Gas Station, 24 =

Specialty Store (TV, Fur, Etc.), 25 = Other/Unknown. I recoded this into a nominal variable

called outside as follows: 20 = 0 (Victim's residence/home), 1-19, 21-24 = 1 (Not victim's

residence/home), 25 = 9 (Other/unknown), with 9 marked as a discrete missing value, making

this a dichotomous dummy variable with 0 = Victim's residence/home (n = 1414 or 30.1% of the

sample) and 1 = Not victim's residence/home (n = 3288 or 69.9% of the sample), with the total

population sample n = 4702.

Dependent Variable

Bias motivation variable: For my dependent variable, the original variable, bias (bias motivation), was a nominal variable with the following values: 11 = White, 12 = Black, 13 = American Indian or Alaskan Native, 14 = Asian/Pacific Islander, 15 = Multi-racial group, 21 = Jewish, 22 = Catholic, 23 = Protestant, 24 = Islamic (Muslim), 25 = Other religion, 26 = Multi-religious group, 27 = Atheism/Agnosticism, 31 = Arab, 32 = Hispanic, 33 = Other ethnicity/national origin, 41 = Male homosexual (gay), 42 = Female homosexual (lesbian), 43 = Homosexual (gay and lesbian), 44 = Heterosexual, 45 = Bisexual, 88 = None, 99 = Unknown. I recoded this into a nominal variable called gayvsall as follows: 11-15, 21-27, 31-33, 44 = 0 (not homosexual), 41-43, 45 = 1 (homosexual), 88 = 8 (none), and 51-52 (outliers), 99 = 9 (unknown), with both 8 and 9 marked as discrete missing values, making this a dichotomous dummy variable with 0 = not homosexual (n = 4288 or 88.6% of the sample) and 1 = homosexual (n = 550 or 11.4% of the sample), with the total population sample n = 4838.

Defensive Model

Independent Variables

For the defensive model, I used the same recoded variables offender's race (offrace) and offender's sex (offsex) as I did for the thrill-seeking model. Using the same original variable oage (offender's age), I created an ordinal variable called offage25 as follows, in order to better fit the model for defensive offenders: 0, 1 = 9 (unknown), with 9 marked as a discrete missing variable, ages 2-24 = 0 (under 25), and ages 25-98, 99 = 1 (25 and older), making this a dichotomous dummy variable with 0 = under 25 (n = 2298 or 59.5% of the sample) and 1 = 25 and older (n = 1566 or 40.5% of the sample), with a total population sample n = 3864. For the

relationship variable, I used the recoded variable stranger from the thrill-seeking model to create a nominal variable called known, by recoding the values of 0 = known and 1 = stranger (for thrill-seeking) into 0 = stranger and 1 = known for defensive, making this a dichotomous dummy variable with 0 = stranger (n = 1362 or 38.4% of the sample) and 1 = known (n = 2184 or 61.6% of the sample), with a total population sample n = 3546.

Bias Motivation Variable: The original variable vicrace (victim race) was a nominal variable with the following categories: A = Asian/Pacific Islander, B = Black, I = American Indian/Alaskan Native, U = unknown, W = White. I recoded this into a nominal variable called vmrace as follows: W = 0 (white), B = 1 (black), A, I = 2 (neither black nor white), U = 9 (unknown), with both 2 and 9 marked as discrete missing values, making this a dichotomous dummy variable with 0 = white (n = 3034 or 66.1% of the sample) and 1 = black (n = 1557 or 33.9% of the sample), with a total population sample n = 4591.

Dependent Variable

Place variable: For my dependent variable, I used the recoded variable outside from the thrill-seeking model to create a nominal variable called vresiden, by recoding the values of 0 = Victim's residence/home and 1 = Not victim's residence/home (for thrill-seeking) into 0 = Not victim's residence/home and 1 = Victim's residence/home for defensive, making this a dichotomous dummy variable with 0 = Not victim's residence/home (n = 3288 or 69.9% of the sample) and 1 = Victim's residence/home (n = 1414 or 30.1% of the sample), with a total population sample n = 4702 (UCR NIBRS Data Collection Guidelines 1996:65-101)

According to the Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines revised in October 1999, hate crimes data first began to be collected in response to the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990. This

34

law required collection beginning in this year and for the following four years. A later

amendment made collection of such statistics a permanent addition to the Uniform Crime

Reporting Program (UCR), which "was conceived in 1929 by the International Association of

Chiefs of Police to meet a need for reliable, uniform crime statistics for the nation" (Uniform

Crime Reports. Available at: http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucr.htm). The FBI's UCR Program was

designated by the Attorney General to manage and implement such collection. According to the

Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines (1999):

> The primary emphasis in developing an approach for collecting national hate crime statistics was to avoid placing major new reporting burdens on law enforcement agencies contributing to the UCR Program. Hate crimes are not separate, distinct crimes, but rather traditional offenses motivated by the offender's bias. Hate crime data can be collected by merely capturing additional information about offenses already being reported to UCR. There are, of course, many kinds of bias. The types of bias to be reported to the FBI's UCR Program are limited to those mandated by the enabling Act and its subsequent amendments. (P. 1-2)

The purpose of this data collection was to determine whether offenders were motivated

by bias. According to the guidelines, "Because of the difficulty of ascertaining the offender's

subjective motivation, bias is to be reported *only if* investigation reveals sufficient objective facts

to lead a reasonable and prudent person to conclude that the offender's actions were motivated,

in whole or in part, by bias" (Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines 1999:4). It is important to

note that no facts may be conclusive, and in order to establish bias certain facts are looked at,

such as "The offender and the victim were of different race, religion, disability, sexual

orientation, and/or ethnicity/national origin" (Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines 1999:5).

Facts may be misleading and bias findings can be overturned after proper investigations take

place, following with an update of national files.

Hate crime data are reported to the FBI's UCR Program in two formats 1) "the Quarterly

Hate Crime Report," and 2) "a hate crime data element for NIBRS participants" (Hate Crime

Data Collection Guidelines 1999:8). According to the guidelines, "The Quarterly Report is to be submitted in addition to other UCR Program requirements; i.e., the offenses which are reported using the form must also be reported in accordance with the requirements of the SRS or NIBRS, depending on which system is applicable" (Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines 1999:8). Participating agencies in the SRS "and agencies participating in NIBRS that are not ready to include the hate crime data element in their submissions" submit such quarterly reports (Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines 1999:9).

This original data was used to create a web site that makes NIBRS data on hate crimes from the years 1995 to 2000 publicly accessible, providing a comprehensive analysis of the data. The NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders website, available at: http://www.as.wvu.edu/~jnolan/nibrshatecrime.html was put together by James J. Nolan, III – West Virginia University, F. Carson Mencken – Baylor University, and Jack McDevitt – Northeastern University. The NIBRS program is for local, state, and federal agencies. According to information provided on the site, "Within each criminal incident, NIBRS captures information on offenses, victims, offenders, property, and persons arrested" (NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders). As compared to the UCR Program, NIBRS is a better method of data collection because it provides more information. Further, "The ability to link and analyze the detailed information is a significant improvement to the existing Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. NIBRS is rich with information about bias crimes reported to the police, and particularly about juveniles who are victims and offenders of these crimes" (NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders). The UCR does not supply adequate victim/offender information. State and local law enforcement agencies are increasingly utilizing

36

NIBRS. According to the NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders

website:

> In 1995, only 4% of the U.S. population was covered by NIBRS reporting agencies; by 2002 that
> proportion reached 17%. In terms of hate crime reporting, most police agencies in the United States
> participate in the UCR Hate Crime Data Collection Program. Between 1995 – 2002, roughly 85% of the
> U.S. population was covered by law enforcement agencies that participate in the program. The proportion
> of these agencies using NIBRS to report their hate crime data is growing and continues to grow. In 1995
> only 5% of the hate crime contributors submitted in NIBRS format. That proportion steadily increased to
> nearly 20% in 2002.

The NIBRS Hate Crime Web Site project, which includes NIBRS and UCR Program data on

hate crimes,

> …was supported by Grant 2001-JR-BX-0006 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
> Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. Department of Justice to West Virginia University. It has two primary goals: 1)
> To conduct an analysis of NIBRS hate crime data reported between 1995 and 2000 (focusing on juvenile
> victims and offenders) and 2) To provide direction to other analysts and researchers in terms of accessing
> and analyzing NIBRS data (NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders).

The focus of my research is on the FBI's NIBRS hate crimes data for the years 1995-

2000 available on the NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders website.

The publicly available data I have accessed is in an SPSS file which uses offender as the unit of

analysis, and includes a total population sample of 7,566 (N). A codebook for this specific file

was also included. Because the dataset is so large and complex it can make the full potential of

its use difficult to achieve. "While NIBRS data cannot be considered a national sample, it does

represent a large number of bias crimes from a large and diverse segment of the country"

(NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders).

Data Analysis

I conducted quantitative secondary analysis on existing data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). I tested recoded variables that are either nominal or ordinal in terms of the measure. I used frequencies, as well as binary logistic regression, both bivariate and multivariate, to analyze the data. Frequencies were run initially to gain a better understanding of the numbers (i.e., the number of missing cases, etc.).

I also ran logistic regression analyses. I looked specifically at binary logistic regression using different combinations of dependent variables and independent variables. I ran both bivariate and multivariate logistic regression to compare and contrast different models. Bivariate logistic regression was utilized running each of my independent variables theoretically linked to my dependent variables for each of the two offender types. With respect to multivariate logistic regression, Model I examined the relationship between the demographic variables and the dependent variable for the Thrill-Seeking Offender Model. Model II examined the relationship between all independent variables and the dependent variable for the Thrill-Seeking Offender Model. For the Defensive Model, I utilized multivariate binary logistic regression by testing for the effects of all independent variables against the dependent variable victim's residence. I examined the results in greater depth by looking at the logistic regression coefficients, odds ratios, standard error, and chi-squared statistics, including significance levels. These statistical analyses helped to systematically test the theoretically linked relationships between the selected variables for the two offender types.

FINDINGS

Thrill-Seeking Model

Bivariate logistic regression analysis. Table 1 illustrates the bivariate logistic regression results examining potential relationships between each independent variable and the dependent variable gay versus all (homosexual). All but one of the independent variables were found to be significantly related to the dependent variable.

Table 1	Bivariate Logistic Regressions for Thrill-Seeking Model		
Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error
Offrace *(White)*	.902**	2.464	0.132
Offsex *(Male)*	0.029	1.03	0.131
Offage18 *(Offender under 18)*	-.581**	0.559	0.125
Numoff *(More than 1 offender)*	-.241*	0.786	0.093
Abuse *(Offender suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs)*	.681**	1.976	0.105
Stranger *(Victim did not know offender)*	-.449**	0.638	0.115
Outside *(Crime did not take place inside victim's residence/home)*	-.458**	0.633	0.095
	** Significant at the .01 level * Significant at the .05 level		

Looking at the logistic regression coefficients, the strongest positive significant relationship is found among offender's race (white) (.902) and gay versus all, with white offenders 2.464 times more likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals than non-white offenders. Another significant positive relationship was found among abuse (offender suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs) (.681) and gay versus all, with offenders suspected of using 1.976 times more likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals than offenders not suspected. Four independent variables were significantly negatively related to the response variable, including offender's age (under 18) (-.581), stranger (victim did not know offender) (-.449), outside (hate crime did not take place at victim's residence/home) (-.458), and number of offenders in incident (more than 1 offender) (-.241). Offender's sex (male) (.029) was not significant, but showed a weak positive relationship. With a significance level of .822 I found no evidence that this variable was related to the dependent variable bias motivation.

Multivariate logistic regression analysis. I ran multivariate logistic regression to test the effects of each variable while controlling for independent variables. The results of these tests are illustrated in Table 2. Model I represents the relationships between the demographic variables and gay versus all. In this model, two of the three variables were significant. Of these relationships, one supported Levin and McDevitt's theory as predicted, and the other contradicted the theory. The strongest positive relationship was found among offender's race (.920), with white offenders 2.509 times more likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals than non-white offenders, when controlling for offender's sex and age. The other significant relationship was an inverse relationship between offender's age (-.550) and gay versus all, with minors .577 times less likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals than adult offenders age 18 and older, when taking offender's race and sex into

account. Offender's sex (-.035) was the only variable that was not significant, showing a slight slightly negative association. However, with a significance value of .804 no evidence was found that this variable is related to the dependent variable. Overall, Model I correctly predicted 88.3% of responses, and produced a Pearson chi-square statistic of 74.313, which was significant.

Table 2	Multivariate Logistic Regression for Thrill-Seeking Model					
	Model I			Model II		
Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error
Offrace *(White)*	.920**	2.509	0.141	.755**	2.127	0.154
Offsex *(Male)*	-0.035	0.966	0.129	-0.014	0.986	0.155
Offage18 *(Offender under 18)*	-.550**	0.577	0.127	-.476**	0.621	0.154
Numoff *(More than 1 offender)*				-0.144	0.866	0.123
Abuse *(Offender suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs)*				.627**	1.872	0.133
Stranger *(Victim did not know offender)*				-.519**	0.595	0.14
Outside *(Crime did not take place inside victim's residence/home)*				-.299*	0.741	0.127
N		3653			2898	
Chi-square		74.313**			107.763**	
	** Significant at the .01 level					
	* Significant at the .05 level					

The relationships found in Model I changed slightly in Model II, which introduced the remaining independent variables into the equation, in addition to the demographic variables. Five of the seven independent variables are significant. Two of these five support Levin and McDevitt's theory, and three are contradictory. Offender's race (.755) and abuse (.627) are significantly positively related, showing support for the theory. Although offender's race is significant in both models, the strength of this relationship decreased in Model II. When controlling for all other independent variables, offender's age (-.476), stranger (-.519) and outside (-.299) are significantly negatively related. Offender's age, though significant, reduces in strength when controlling for all other independent variables (-.476). As with Model I, offender's sex continues to show no significant relationship to gay versus all when controlling for all other independent variables, and the strength of this relationship decreases slightly (-.014). With a significance level of .928 no evidence was found that this variable was related to the dependent variable. In addition, number of offenders in incident (-.144) is not significant, with a value of. 243, and cannot be said to be related to the dependent variable.

In Model II, when controlling for all other independent variables, white offenders are 2.127 times more likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals than non-white offenders, which supports Levin and McDevitt's theory; minors are .621 times less likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals than adults age 18 and older, which contradicts the theory; offenders suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs prior to or during a hate crime are 1.872 times more likely to commit a hate crime against a perceived homosexual than an offender not suspected of using, supporting the theory; offenders who are strangers to the victim are .595 times less likely to commit a hate crime against a perceived homosexual than offenders who are known to the victim, contradicting the theory; and offenders who commit hate

crimes against perceived homosexuals are .741 times less likely to commit the crimes outside of the victim's residence/home as opposed to at the victim's residence/home, also contradicting the theory. Overall, Model II correctly predicted 88% of responses, and produced a Pearson chi-square statistic of 107.763 which was significant.

Examining hypothesis 1: Hypothesis 1 states that white males under the age of 18, in groups, suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs, are more likely to commit hate crimes against known victims outside the victim's residence/home when the bias motivation is perceived homosexuals. Statistical results from both Models I and II of the multivariate logistic regression show partial support for this hypothesis. Model I, which controlled for the demographic variables, showed white adults age 18 and older as being significantly more likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals. Offender's sex was inversely related but not significant. Offender's race was the only variable supporting the hypothesis, and showed the strongest logistic regression coefficient (.920). The coefficient for offender's age (-.550) also demonstrated a strong association.

Model II, which introduced the remaining independent variables, showed that white adults age 18 and older, suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs were significantly more likely to commit hate crimes against perceived homosexuals known to the victim, at the victim's residence/home. As with Model I, offender's sex was inversely related and not significant, as was the case for number of offenders in incident, when controlling for all other variables. For Model II, offender's race and abuse were the only variables that supported the hypothesis. Offender's race continued to reveal the strongest logistic regression coefficient (.755), with

values for abuse (.627), stranger (-.519), offender's age (-.476), and outside (-.299) also

indicative of relatively strong associations.

Defensive Model

  Bivariate logistic regression analysis. Table 3 illustrates the bivariate logistic regression

results examining potential relationships between each independent variable and the dependent

variable vresiden (offense took place at victim's residence/home). Four of the five variables were

found to be significantly related to the dependent variable.

Table 3	Bivariate Logistic Regressions for Defensive Model		
Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error
Offrace *(White)*	.280**	1.323	0.07
Offsex *(Male)*	-.237*	0.789	0.079
Offage25 *(Offender 25 and older)*	.508**	1.662	0.064
Known *(Victim knew offender)*	1.261**	3.528	0.09
Vmrace *(Black)*	-0.05	0.951	0.06
	** Significant at the .01 level		
	* Significant at the .05 level		

Looking at the logistic regression coefficients, the strongest positive significant relationship is found among known (victim knew offender) (1.261) and victim's residence, with the offender 3.528 times more likely to know the victim when the offense took place at the victim's residence/home than when the offender did not know the victim. Two other significant positive relationships were found: offender's race (white) (.280) and offender's age (25 and older) (.508), with white offenders 1.323 times more likely to commit hate crimes at the victim's residence/home than non-white offenders, and offenders 25 and older 1.662 times more likely to commit crimes at the victim's residence/home than offenders under age 25. One independent variable was significantly negatively related to the response variable: offender's sex (male) (-.237). Victim's race (black) (-.05) was not significant in this model, and showed a weak negative relationship. With a significance value of .405, no evidence was found relating this variable to the dependent variable.

Multivariate logistic regression analysis. To test the effects of each variable while controlling for independent variables, I ran multivariate logistic regression. The results of this test are illustrated in Table 4. This model represents the relationships between the independent variables and vresiden. In this model, three of the five variables were found to be significant. Of these, all three supported Levin and McDevitt's theory as predicted: offender's race (.208), known (1.337), and offender's age (.807). Offender's sex is not significant (-.037). Victim's race is not significant, but is slightly positive (.054). The strongest positive relationship among the variables is between known and victim's residence (1.337) and is highly significant.

When taking all other independent variables into account, white offenders are 1.232 times more likely to commit hate crimes at the victim's residence/home than non-white offenders;

offenders known to the victim are 3.809 times more likely to commit hate crimes at the victim's residence/home than offenders who are strangers to the victim; and offenders age 25 and older are 2.241 times more likely to commit hate crimes at the victim's residence/home than offenders under age 25. Overall the model correctly predicted 71.8% of responses, and produced a Pearson chi-square statistic of 289.423 which was significant.

Table 4	*Multivariate Logistic Regression for Defensive Model*		
Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error
Offrace *(White)*	0.208*	1.232	0.099
Offsex *(Male)*	-0.037	0.963	0.111
Offage25 *(Offender 25 and older)*	0.807**	2.241	0.087
Known *(Victim knew offender)*	1.337**	3.809	0.104
Vmrace *(Black)*	0.054	1.055	0.094
N		2801	
Chi-square		289.423**	
	** Significant at the .01 level		
	* Significant at the .05 level		

Examining hypothesis 2: Hypothesis 2 states that white males age 25 and older are more likely to commit hate crimes against African-Americans known to them, when the crime occurs at the victim's place of residence. Statistical results from the multivariate logistic regression show partial support for this hypothesis. In this model, which treated victim's residence as the dependent variable against all other variables, three of the five variables were significant, all of which showed support for the theory as predicted, indicating that white offenders known to the victim, age 25 and older were more likely to commit hate crimes at the victim's residence/home than stranger offenders of color who were under the age of 25. The strongest logistic regression coefficient was found between known and victim's residence (1.337). Slightly weaker associations were found among offender's age (.807) and offender's race (.208). Neither victim's race (.054) nor offender's sex (-.037) were significant.

DISCUSSION

Thrill-Seeking Offenders

The purpose of this study was to test Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of Offenders* theory using NIBRS data. I tested two hypotheses. For thrill-seeking offenders I hypothesized: 1) that white males, under the age of 18, in groups, suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs, are more likely to commit hate crimes against known victims outside the victim's residence/home when the bias motivation is perceived homosexuals. Results from both Models I and II of the multivariate logistic regression showed partial support for this hypothesis.

For Model I, which tested the demographic variables offender's race, offender's sex, and offender's age against gayvsall, offender's race was highly significant in support of the hypothesis, showing whites as being significantly more likely to commit hate crimes than non-

whites when the victim was a perceived homosexual. As Levin and McDevitt posit, the culture

of hate plays an important role in terms of victimizing perceived homosexuals, primarily because

of the negative messages society perpetuates about such out-group members. In this respect,

whites, as members of the dominant culture, would be more likely than non-whites to commit

hate crimes that target homosexuals because it may be seen as justifiable since this group has

historically been portrayed in a negative light. Interestingly, offender's sex was not significant

and showed a slight negative relationship with gayvsall, despite 83% of the offender sample

being male. This finding warrants further investigation. Levin and McDevitt suggest that

offenders who victimize perceived homosexuals are more often young males who feel a

psychosexual threat and gay bash in order to gain a sense of dominance over them. Offender's

age was also highly significant, however, it did not support the hypothesis, revealing that adults

age 18 and older were more likely to commit hate crimes than juvenile offenders when the victim

was a perceived homosexual.

The theory posits that typically, teenage males are more likely to gay bash, out of

boredom, sexual threats, and the need to feel accepted by peer group members. However, the

findings from Model I suggest that demographically, thrill-seeking offenders are more likely to

be white adults age 18 and older, and could be either female or male. It is possible that thrill-

seeking offenders look more like adults when applied to larger sample sizes in various

jurisdictions. Further, younger generations may be less homophobic due to increasing visibility

of these groups in the media, more positive portrayals in such mediums, as well as greater

dialogue in schools and other social settings that aim to teach about the benefits of celebrating

diversity. Closer examination of these attributes is necessary.

When looking at Model II, which introduced the remaining independent variables in addition to those controlled for in Model I, similar trends are evident in terms of the demographic variables tested. Offender's race was highly significant in support of the hypothesis. Offender's sex was not significant and showed a slight negative relationship, and offender's age remained highly significant and did not support the hypothesis.

Number of offenders in incident was not significant, and revealed a slight negative association, contrary to the hypothesis. This finding reveals that for thrill-seeking crimes it could go either way, in terms of being committed by either a single or multiple offenders. It is possible that offenders who are armed with a weapon, or who are under the influence may be as likely to victimize perceived homosexuals than offenders in groups because they feel they have power over the victim or have less reservations about initiating an attack. This finding also warrants further investigation.

Abuse was highly significant in support of the hypothesis, revealing that offenders suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs prior to or during the crime were significantly more likely than offenders not suspected to commit thrill-seeking hate crimes, when the victim was a perceived homosexual. This result could be due to the notion that being under the influence, which is found to lower inhibitions, could increase the likelihood that a perpetrator will initiate an attack. The stranger variable was highly significant but did not support the hypothesis, revealing that victims were more likely to know the offender when the victim was a perceived homosexual. Levin and McDevitt theorized that for thrill-seeking crimes, victims were chosen more at random, and that there existed an element of interchangeability where any member of the victim group would suffice. This study shows the opposite to be the case, with some relationship

existing between the victim and offender. However, the categories for having a known relationship were so broad, ranging from being an acquaintance, a relative, romantic partner, employer/employee, friend, and neighbor, which could have played a role.

The final independent variable, outside, was also significant but did not support the hypothesis, revealing that the offense was more likely to take place at the victim's residence/home than a location beyond the residence when the victim was a perceived homosexual. The theory suggests that for thrill-seeking crimes, offenders are more likely to go where members of particular groups are known to congregate in order to find a potential victim. However, the data reveal that many of these crimes are taking place at the victim's residence/home. Although this finding runs counter to the theory, it supports the finding that a prior relationship of some sort exists between the victim and offender, making it more likely that the offense would take place where the victim lived. Overall, Model II revealed that offenders were more likely to be white, 18 and older, suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs, have a known relationship to the victim, and commit the crimes at the victim's residence/home when the victim was a perceived homosexual.

Defensive Offenders

For defensive offenders I hypothesized: 2) that white males age 25 and older are more likely to commit hate crimes against African-Americans known to them, when the crime occurs at the victim's residence/home. Results from the multivariate logistic regression showed support for Hypothesis 2, with all significant variables revealing strong positive relationships. For this model, which tested offender's race, offender's sex, known, victim's race, and offender's age against vresiden, offender's race was significant in support of the hypothesis, with whites

significantly more likely to commit hate crimes than non-whites when the crime took place at the

victim's residence/home. Unlike for thrill-seeking offenders, offender's sex was not significant

and revealed a slight negative association which did not support the hypothesis, with female

offenders more likely than male offenders to commit hate crimes when the offender was 25 and

older. Again, this finding warrants further investigation and does not support Levin and

McDevitt's theory. After re-examining the data set, looking at the frequencies and the recoding

of the offender sex variable, I was not able to determine what could have affected this

unexpected finding.

Offender's age was highly significant in support of the hypothesis, revealing that

offenders 25 and older were more likely than those under 25 to commit hate crimes when the

crime took place at the victim's residence/home. Older offenders may be more likely to have

established residences, and may be a factor behind this result. The known variable was highly

significant in support of the hypothesis, revealing that victims were more likely to know the

offender when the crime took place at their residence/home. This finding supported Levin and

McDevitt's theory. When the crime took place at the victim's residence/home, the offender was

more likely to know the victim. This finding supports the notion of a particular victim being

targeted based on a real or perceived threat. Victim's race was not significant, revealing only a

slight positive association with vresiden, despite the finding that offenders were more likely to be

white. Approximately 31% of the victims in the sample were black, which may have affected the

results. Overall, this model revealed that offenders were more likely to be white, have a known

relationship with the victim, and be 25 and older when the crime took place at the victim's

residence/home. Using victim's residence as the defensive variable, and finding greater support

for this offender model, lends to the notion that defensive crimes are not just about race. Location is a significant factor in these types of crimes.

The significance of this study can be seen in that a number of strong positive relationships exist among the variables as hypothesized for each offender models, lending to the importance of further testing of Levin and McDevitt's theory against hate crime data. However, aspects of their typology may need revised upon further systematic investigation due to the lack of support of some of the basic founding characteristics of their proposed offender types. As the data shows, even the bivariate results (which should reveal trends closer to the theory before introducing control variables as with multivariate regression), show limited support for the theory. Although some of the findings are not consistent with the theory for both thrill-seeking and defensive offenders, various factors could have contributed, such as the size and demographic makeup of the NIBRS dataset tested versus that of the sample size upon which the theory was derived. Further, the theory is dated, having been derived from data over twenty years old. Based on my research, I would suggest that hate crimes can change over time and place, dependent upon various factors, such as demographics, politics, and education. Whereas adult offenders may disproportionately commit thrill-seeking crimes in a particular place, adolescents may commit more of these same types of crimes in another area. This may also contribute to the overlap that was found in my research, where a lack of clear distinction between thrill-seeking and defensive offenders is evident.

Limitations

The *Typology of Offenders* theory was based on "452 hate crimes that had been reported to the Boston police between 1983 and 1987"(Levin and McDevitt 2002:182). Testing a theory

derived from a relatively small sample (with N = 452 representing roughly 9% of the N = 4,961

cases tested from the NIBRS dataset) could have affected the results. According to the theorists,

"As with any single study, the present work is limited in a number of ways. The typology we

propose is based on research in a single urban jurisdiction and represents investigations

conducted by only one police agency" (Levin et al. 2002:315). Despite these limitations, the data

were collected by professionals experienced in conducting effective bias crime investigations.

According to Levin, McDevitt, and Bennett (2002):

> One concern about using official reports to identify offender motivation is important to note. Although any study of motivation that is inferred from indirect data (as opposed to direct interviews conducted by the researcher) introduces potential bias, the investigators from the CDU are a rather unique source of information. These investigators are experienced police investigators who have been trained and had experience investigating hate crimes in Boston. All investigators have been instructed in the elements necessary to prove bias motivation in court. They have, for example, been trained that the use of language alone cannot be an indicator of motivation" (P. 306)

Using quantitative secondary analysis on existing data as my method of inquiry had both

strengths and weaknesses. Quantitative analysis on existing data is beneficial in that it saves

time, money and effort. I saved time by not having to collect my own data on hate crimes, which

would have involved accessing reported incidences from law enforcement agencies across the

country. I also saved time by not having to do my own data entry, which is itself a very tedious

process. The data I used was already entered into the database prior to my gaining access. I did

not have to seek funding for access, and little effort was required in obtaining the data because it

was a publicly available data set. Because the data already existed and was easily accessible, I

was able to do my research at my own pace. I avoided some crucial bias issues since I did not

deal with obtrusive methods of data collection. Therefore, I was exempt from having to seek IRB

approval. Also, the database was designed so that I could create my own tables and draw out

variables of interest in order to use the data for my own unique purposes. I was able to recode selected variables in order to be more congruent with the specific nature of my hypotheses.

Quantitative secondary analysis on available data also has its disadvantages. Because the data was originally collected for purposes other than my own, there were limitations in terms of my knowledge of the data. Although I had full access to the codebook and the data collection guidelines, I was at a disadvantage in terms of developing a clear understanding of how the variables were operationalized. Measurement validity also suffers to a degree when using available data since I cannot be sure the data as I used it accurately measured what it was intended to measure.

There were also some limitations specific to the NIBRS dataset I utilized. The large and complicated dataset, with respect to how the data elements and data values were laid out, made it difficult to fully comprehend. It was a tedious process trying to make sense of the original variables in order to use them for my research: some of the variables had multiple layers as to how they were coded. Further, the offender file contained data only for offenses where a suspect was apprehended/arrested, therefore, variables such as number of offenders in incident reflected only those who were caught and not necessarily the full scope of those committing such crimes.

Although at the time of my gaining access to the dataset information had been reported to the NIBRS on hate crimes from years 1995 – 2002, data for years 2001 and 2002 were not yet publicly available in electronic format, so my study was limited to years 1995 to 2000. In addition, as illustrated in Table 1 below, "Between 1995 and 2000, only about 10% of the bias crimes reported to the National Hate Crime Data Collection Program were from NIBRS." (NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders).

Table 1. U.S. Population Covered by NIBRS and Hate Crime Participants by Year *

Year	U.S. Population	U.S. Population covered by NIBRS Agencies		U.S. Population covered by Hate Crime Contributors		Percent of Hate Crime Contributors reporting via NIBRS
1995	262,755,000	10,630,200	4%	197,066,250	75%	5.4%
1996	265,284,000	15,917,040	6%	233,346,702	84%	7.1%
1997	267,637,000	21,410,960	8%	222,856,059	83%	9.6%
1998	270,296,000	27,029,600	10%	216,235,376	80%	12.5%
1999	272,691,000	35,449,830	13%	232,829,887	85%	15.2%
2000	281,421,906	39,399,067	14%	236,929,512	84%	16.6%
2001	284,796,887	42,719,533	15%	241,799,615	85%	17.7%
2002	288,368,698	49,022,679	17%	247,246,683	86%	19.8%

Source: Federal Bureau of Investigations, *Crime in the United States* and *Hate Crime Statistics*

Despite this fact, "While NIBRS data cannot be considered a national sample, it does represent a large number of bias crimes from a large and diverse segment of the country. And, it appears to follow the patterns of the National program. As more police agencies update their records management systems, the FBI anticipates a greater proportion of these bias crimes will be reported through NIBRS." (NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders). Table 2 below better illustrates this discrepancy in reporting contributions:

Table 2. NIBRS Contribution to the UCR Hate Crime Data Collection Program -1995-2000

	UCR Hate Crime Data Collection Program –Total 1995-2000	NIBRS 1995 – 2000 [a]
Total Number of Offenses	58,333	6,193
Offense Type		
Crime Against Persons	69%	59%
Crime Against Property	31%	41%
Bias Type		
Racial Bias	59%	62%
Religious Bias	15%	13%
Ethnicity Bias	11%	11%
Sexual Orientation Bias	14%	13%
Disability Bias	<1%	1%
Race of Offender		
White	64%	61%
Black	20%	22%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1%	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%	1%
Multi-Racial Group	4%	n/a [b]
Unknown	9%	14%

[a] NIBRS data are included in the NHCDCP totals.

[b] NIBRS does not have this category.

Another reason for the lack of representation is that not all states have hate crime laws. It is difficult to generalize about offenders based on hate crime data that does not come from all fifty states and the District of Columbia. In these respects, my findings were not generalizable for all offenders and cannot be said to be entirely representative. My research would not be externally valid if I were to over-generalize my results and apply them to people or groups that are not similar to the offenders in my sample. I did not expect to have any major issues with reliability however, because I clearly outlined my variables in terms of how they were operationalized, how they would be used to test the theory based on my hypotheses, and the methods and statistical analyses used to report my findings. Other researchers should be able to repeat my study and get the same results since the data itself will not change.

Future Research

Because the NIBRS dataset is so large and contains data on hate crime offenders from incidents which occurred in many jurisdictions in the country that may differ greatly from Boston, my results may vary to a degree from the proposed theory. Who conducted the investigations, the methods used, and the variation in demographics of the jurisdictions for example, could all affect the information obtained and therefore the outcomes found. Testing this theory against hate crime data specifically for urban areas and cities might reveal trends that are more consistent with both the thrill-seeking and defensive offenders in Levin and McDevitt's typology. It would be useful to obtain the Boston data upon which the theory was derived and match it with NIBRS data to see whether trends were more closely related. It would also be useful to test this theory against non criminal justice samples.

The NIBRS has not been used to test hate crime theories in previous studies, therefore, future research could benefit greatly from utilizing this rich source of data. Law enforcement agencies should push for more jurisdictions to submit hate crime data to this reporting system. The NIBRS contains ample information relative to hate crimes, and one that could be considered national data. It would be interesting to test hate crime theories based on bias motivation, as opposed to theories like Levin and McDevitt's based on offenders. My research supports this assertion. For example, the bias motivation variable for thrill-seeking offenders, coded as not homosexual (including all other bias categories such as race/ethnicity, and religion) and homosexual, is more consistent with testing a hate crime typology rather than an offender typology. I recoded this variable to match up as close to the victims of defensive crimes as Levin and McDevitt proposed.

Since few systematic studies have tested hate crime offender theories, future research could benefit greatly from conducting further analyses using the NIBRS data, especially as more states pass hate crimes laws and greater numbers of agencies report information on hate crime incidences . It would be useful to test both mission and retaliatory offender types against NIBRS or other hate crime datasets, provided sufficient information on these offenders is collected. In addition, re-examining both offender types in this study using different combinations of the variables tested might be useful. For example, using victim's race as the dependent variable for thrill-seeking offenders. It would be interesting to test other variables not examined in this study to see what affect they might have: such as, state where incident occurred, weapon/forced used by offender, victim's sex, victim's age, number of victims in incident, and injury to the victim. Also, recoding some of the tested variables and re-examining the affects of these attributes might prove useful. The offender typology for both thrill-seeking and defensive hate crimes holds true

in many respects based on the results of my study, however, it may be that some of the proposed offender attributes, when applied to larger samples and jurisdictions that are more rural need revised. As the research suggests, an increase in specialized training for police agencies in terms of how to effectively conduct bias crime investigations will ensure more accurate statistics are at the disposal of law enforcement agencies, and researchers interested in examining offender theories systematically.

REFERENCES

Anderson, James. F., Laronisitine Dyson and Willie Brooks Jr. 2002. "Preventing Hate Crime and Profiling Hate Crime Offenders." *Western Journal of Black Studies.* 26(3):140-148.

Bouman, Walter. 2003. "Best Practices of a Hate/Bias Crime Investigation." *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin,* March, pp. 21-25.

Creswell, John W. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dunbar, Edward. 2003. "Symbolic, Relational, and Ideological Signifiers of Bias-Motivated Offenders: Toward a Strategy of Assessment." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 73(2):203-211.

Green, Donald P., Dara Z. Strolovitch, Janelle S. Wong and Robert W. Bailey. 2001. "Measuring Gay Populations and Antigay Hate Crime." *Social Science Quarterly* 82(2):281-296.

Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines. 1999. Uniform Crime Reporting. Revised October 1999.

Hate Crimes Statistics Act, sec. b[1], 28 USC 534 [1990].

Kirby, David. 1999. "What's in a Basher's Mind?" *Advocate,* September 28, pp. 26-28.

Levin, Jack. 2002. *The Violence of Hate: Confronting Racism, Anti-Semitism, and Other Forms of Bigotry.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Levin, Jack and Jack McDevitt. 1993.*Hate Crimes: The Rising Tide of Bigotry and Bloodshed.* New York: Plenum Press.

_____ . 2002. *Hate Crimes Revisited: America's War on Those Who Are Different*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

McDevitt, Jack, Jack Levin and Susan Bennett. 2002. "Hate Crime Offenders: An Expanded Typology." *Journal of Social Issues.* 58(2):303-317.

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. 2007. Hate Crime Laws in the U.S. (Last updated November 2007.) Available at:
http://www.thetaskforce.org/downloads/reports/issue_maps/hate_crimes_11_07_color.pdf

NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders. James J. Nolan, III, West Virginia University, F. Carson Mencken, Baylor University, and JackMcDevitt, Northeastern University. Available at:
http://www.as.wvu.edu/~jnolan/nibrshatecrime.html

Nolan, James J. III, Yoshio Akiyama and Samuel Berhanu. 2002. "The Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990: Developing a Method for Measuring the Occurrence of Hate Violence." *American Behavioral Scientist* 46(1):136-153.

Planck, Corri. 1997. "Lesbian Prosecutor Takes Hate Crime Offenders Off Streets." *Lesbian News,* February, pp. 26-27.

Schafer, John R. and Joe Navarro. 2003. "The Seven-Stage Hate Model The Psychopathology of Hate Groups." *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, March, pp. 1-8.

Tischler, Eric. 1999. "Can Tolerance be Taught?" *Corrections Today,* August, pp. 76-79.

Uniform Crime Reporting: National Incident-Based Reporting System Volume 1 Data Collection Guidelines. September 1996.

Uniform Crime Reports. Available at: http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucr.htm

Uviller, Richard H. 2000. "Making it Worse: 'Hate' as an Aggravating Factor in Criminal Conduct." *Ethnic & Racial Studies*. 23(4):761-767.

Willis, Danny G. 2004. "Hate Crimes Against Gay Males: An Overview." *Issues in Mental Health Nursing* 25(2):115-132.

APPENDIX I

Variables in Detail

Thrill-Seeking Model

Defensive Model

The following variables, recoded from variables constructed from the NIBRS dataset with "offender" as the unit of analysis for years 1995 – 2000, are theoretically linked to thrill-seeking and defensive hate crime offenders under Levin and McDevitt's *Typology of Offenders* theory. These variables have been systematically tested for the 'crimes against persons or robberies against a victim' listed below:

Murder/Nonnegligent Manslaughter

Negligent Manslaughter

Justifiable Homicide

Kidnapping/Abduction

Forcible Rape

Forcible Sodomy

Sexual Assault With An Object

Forcible Fondling

Robbery

Aggravated Assault

Simple Assault

Intimidation

Incest

Statutory Rape

VARIABLES USED IN THE THRILL-SEEKING MODEL

Independent:	Dependent:
offrace	gayvsall
offsex	
offage18	
numoff	
abuse	
stranger	
outside	

HYPOTHESIS 1:

* White males under the age of 18, in groups, suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs, are more likely to commit hate crimes against known victims outside the victim's residence/home when the bias motivation is perceived homosexuals.

-          Whites are more likely to commit hate crimes than non-whites

-          Males are more likely to commit hate crimes than females

-          Minors are more likely to commit hate crimes than adults

-          Offenders are more likely to commit hate crimes in groups than alone

-          Offenders are more likely to be suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs before or during a hate crime than sober

-          Offenders are more likely to commit hate crimes against strangers than against known victims

-          Offenders are more likely to target victims outside of their neighborhood or community than on their own turf

-          Offenders are more likely to commit hate crimes against victims based on perceived homosexuality (gay, lesbian, bi) than against heterosexuals and all other bias categories including race, ethnicity and religion

VARIABLES USED IN THE DEFENSIVE MODEL

Independent:	Dependent:
offrace	vresiden
offsex	
offage25	
known	
vmrace	

HYPOTHESIS 2:

* White males age 25 and older are more likely to commit hate crimes against African-Americans known to them when the crime takes place at the victim's residence/home.

- Whites are more likely to commit hate crimes than non-whites

- Males are more likely to commit hate crimes than females

- Adults age 25 and older are more likely to commit hate crimes than those under the age of 25

- Offenders are more likely to commit hate crimes against blacks than against whites

- Offenders are more likely to know the hate crime victim than be a stranger

- Offenders are more likely to commit hate crimes at the victim's residence than outside the

    victim's residence

APPENDIX II

Tables

Thrill-Seeking Model: Binary Logistic Regression:

Frequency Tables for Thrill-Seeking Model

Table 1: Bivariate Logistic Regressions for Thrill-Seeking Model

Table 2: Multivariate Logistic Regression for Thrill-Seeking Models

Defensive Model: Binary Logistic Regression:

Frequency Tables for Defensive Model

Table 3: Bivariate Logistic Regressions for Defensive Model

Table 4: Multivariate Logistic Regression for Defensive Model

Frequencies of Variables for Thrill-Seeking Model		
Variable	Value/Label	Frequency
Offrace (Independent – I)	Non-white (0)	1256
	White (1)	2885
	Total (n)	4141
Offsex (I)	Female (0)	722
	Male (1)	3572
	Total (n)	4294
Offage18 (I)	18 and older (0)	2694
	Under 18 (1)	1170
	Total (n)	3864
Numoff (I)	1 offender (0)	2826
	Multiple Offenders (1)	2135
	Total (n)	4961
Abuse (I)	Not suspected (0)	4101
	Suspected of using alcohol &/or drugs (1)	847
	Total (n)	4948
Stranger (I)	Known (0)	2184
	Stranger (I)	1362
	Total (n)	3546
Outside (I)	Victim's residence/home (0)	1414
	Not victim's residence/home (I)	3288
	Total (n)	4702
Gayvsall (Dependent – D)	Not homosexual (0)	4288

	Continued Frequencies from previous page	
	Homosexual (1)	*550*
	Total (n)	4838
* I - denotes Independent Variable		
* D - denotes Dependent Variable		

Table 1	Bivariate Logistic Regressions for Thrill-Seeking Model		
Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error
Offrace *(White)*	.902**	2.464	0.132
Offsex *(Male)*	0.029	1.03	0.131
Offage18 *(Offender under 18)*	-.581**	0.559	0.125
Numoff *(More than 1 offender)*	-.241*	0.786	0.093
Abuse *(Offender suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs)*	.681**	1.976	0.105
Stranger *(Victim did not know offender)*	-.449**	0.638	0.115
Outside *(Crime did not take place inside victim's residence/home)*	-.458**	0.633	0.095
	** Significant at the .01 level * Significant at the .05 level		

68

Table 2	Multivariate Logistic Regression for Thrill-Seeking Model					
	Model I			Model II		
Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error
Offrace *(White)*	.920**	2.509	0.141	.755**	2.127	0.154
Offsex *(Male)*	-0.035	0.966	0.129	-0.014	0.986	0.155
Offage18 *(Offender under 18)*	-.550**	0.577	0.127	-.476**	0.621	0.154
Numoff *(More than 1 offender)*				-0.144	0.866	0.123
Abuse *(Offender suspected of using alcohol and/or drugs)*				.627**	1.872	0.133
Stranger *(Victim did not know offender)*				-.519**	0.595	0.14
Outside *(Crime did not take place inside victim's residence/home)*				-.299*	0.741	0.127
N	3653			2898		
Chi-square	74.313**			107.763**		
	** Significant at the .01 level					
	* Significant at the .05 level					

Frequencies of Variables for Defensive Model		
Variable	Value/Label	Frequency
Offrace (I)	Non-white (0)	1256
	White (1)	2885
	Total (n)	4141
Offsex (I)	Female (0)	722
	Male (1)	3572
	Total (n)	4294
Offage25 (I)	Under 25 (0)	2298
	25 and older (1)	1566
	Total (n)	3864
Known (I)	Stranger (0)	1362
	Known (1)	2184
	Total (n)	3546
Vmrace (I)	White (0)	3034
	Black (1)	1557
	Total (n)	4591
Vresiden (D)	Not residence/home (0)	3288
	Residence/home (1)	1414
	Total (n)	4702

* I - denotes Independent Variable

* D - denotes Dependent Variable

Table 3	Bivariate Logistic Regressions for Defensive Model		
Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error
Offrace *(White)*	.280**	1.323	0.07
Offsex *(Male)*	-.237*	0.789	0.079
Offage25 *(Offender 25 and older)*	.508**	1.662	0.064
Known *(Victim knew offender)*	1.261**	3.528	0.09
Vmrace *(Black)*	-0.05	0.951	0.06
	** Significant at the .01 level		
	* Significant at the .05 level		

Table 4	Multivariate Logistic Regression for Defensive Model		
Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Standard Error
Offrace *(White)*	0.208*	1.232	0.099
Offsex *(Male)*	-0.037	0.963	0.111
Offage25 *(Offender 25 and older)*	0.807**	2.241	0.087
Known *(Victim knew offender)*	1.337**	3.809	0.104
Vmrace *(Black)*	0.054	1.055	0.094
N		2801	
Chi-square		289.423**	
	** Significant at the .01 level		
	* Significant at the .05 level		