



0288-A

CR 1.2:CR 86

Hate Crime in Indiana: A Monitoring of the Level, Victims, Locations, and Motivations

**Indiana Advisory Committee to the
United States Commission on Civil Rights**

June 1994

A report of the Indiana Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. This report will be considered by the Commission and the Commission will make public its reaction. The findings and recommendations of this report should not be attributed to the Commission but only to the Indiana Advisory Committee.

99 010205

a

The United States Commission on Civil Rights

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, first created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and reestablished by the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1963, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the Federal Government. By the terms of the 1963 act, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

The State Advisory Committees

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(e) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and section 6(c) of the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1963. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference that the Commission may hold within the State.

I

Hate Crime in Indiana: A Monitoring of the Level, Victims, Locations, and Motivations

**Indiana Advisory Committee to the
United States Commission on Civil Rights**

June 1994

A report of the Indiana Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. This report will be considered by the Commission and the Commission will make public its reaction. The findings and recommendations of this report should not be attributed to the Commission but only to the Indiana Advisory Committee.

Letter of Transmittal

Indiana Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Members of the Commission
Mary Frances Berry, *Chairperson*
Cruz Reynoso, *Vice Chairperson*
Carl A. Anderson
Arthur A. Fletcher
Robert P. George
Constance Horner
Russell G. Redenbaugh
Charles Pei Wang

Mary K. Mathews, *Staff Director*


The Indiana Advisory Committee submits this report, *Hate Crime in Indiana: A Monitoring of the Level, Victims, Locations, and Motivations*, as part of its responsibility to advise the Commission on civil rights issues within the State. The report was unanimously approved by the Committee.

The Advisory Committee held a community forum on August 8, 1991, to obtain various perspectives and facts on hate crime in Indiana. As a result of that meeting, *The Increase of Hate Crime in Indiana* was published in August 1992. A key observation of that report was that there was an absence of data on the number of hate crimes in Indiana.

Resolving to expand upon our initial study and help fill an information gap on the subject, the Advisory Committee enlisted the support of the Indiana Consortium of Local Human Rights Agencies to monitor hate crime in Indiana. The FBI training manual was used as a guide for the monitoring, which encompassed the entire State. Several localities received significantly more cooperation from local law enforcement agencies, and that interaction is reflected in higher levels of hate crime monitored in those areas.

The monitoring does not presume to account for all hate crime in Indiana, but it is an initial survey of such incidents and does give preliminary results on victimization patterns, the locations of such crimes, and the types of crimes committed. The Committee hopes the Commission will find it of value in its monitoring of racial, ethnic, and religious tensions nationwide.

Respectfully,



Hollis E. Hughes, Jr. *Chairperson*
Indiana Advisory Committee

Indiana Advisory Committee

Hollis E. Hughes, Jr., Chairperson
South Bend

Graciela Beecher
Fort Wayne

Katherine M. Blanks
Fort Wayne

Kathleen K. Brita
Fort Wayne

Paul Chase
Indianapolis

Michael Lee Gradison
Indianapolis

Judith Hawley
Indianapolis

Ernest G. Hernandez
Portage

Sondra L. Matthews
Evansville

Doris S. Parker
Indianapolis

Irwin R. Rose
Indianapolis

Julie Z. Schmitt
Indianapolis

Sidney Taylor
Evansville

Contents

1. Introduction	1
Definition and Background	1
Research on Hate Crime	1
FBI Data	2
2. Hate Crime Monitoring in Indiana	4
Methodology and Data	4
Hate Crime Bias Motivation	6
Types of Hate Crime	6
Types of Hate Crime and Bias Motivation	7
Location of Hate Crime	8
Comparison with FBI Data	8
Annual Data	9
St. Joseph County: A Case Study	10
Analysis by Census Tract	12
3. Conclusions	16
Tables	
1. Hate Crime Offense Codes Reported, 1991	2
2. Hate Crime Bias-Motivations Reported, 1991	3
3. Indiana Counties with Consortium Member Agencies and Location of Human Rights Organization	6
4. Victims of Hate Crime by Category, July 1, 1992–December 31, 1992	6
5. Types of Hate Crime, July 1, 1992–December 31, 1992	7
6. Hate Crime by Victim and Offense, July 1, 1992–December 31, 1992	7
7. Location of Hate Crime, July 1, 1992–December 31, 1992	8



8. Rates of Hate Crime by Offense for the Nation and Indiana	10
9. Hate Crime Monitoring by the Bloomington, Muncie, Michigan City, and South Bend Offices for the Periods: July 1, 1992–December 31, 1992 and January 1, 1993–June 30, 1993	10
10. Hate Crime Rate and Census Group Rate, St. Joseph County, July 1, 1992–June 30, 1993	11
11. Hate Crimes in St. Joseph County, Indiana, by Victim and Type, July 1, 1992–June 30, 1993	12
12. Characteristics of the Eight Section Tracts, St. Joseph County, Indiana	13
13. Hate Crime in the Eight Section Tracts of St. Joseph County	13
14. Correlations of Hate Crime with Demographic Variables	13
15. Regression Results for Hate Crime Against Minorities in St. Joseph County	14
16. Regression Results for Hate Crime Against Gays and Lesbians in St. Joseph County	15
Figures	
1. Hate Crime Monitoring by County, July 1, 1992–December 31, 1992	5
2. Comparison of FBI and Indiana Data by Bias Motivation	9
Appendix	
1. FBI Statewide Participation Results from 1991	18
2. County Map of Indiana	19
3. Census Tracts and Section Tracts for St. Joseph County, Indiana	20

VI

Definition and Background

Hate crimes are acts of violence or intimidation against a person or property that are motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias against a race, religion, ethnic/national origin group, or sexual orientation.¹ In August 1991 the Indiana Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights (USCCR) held a community forum on hate crime activity in the State. A summary report of the meeting, *The Increase of Hate Crime in Indiana*, was published in August 1992.

The Committee concluded that the level of hate crime in Indiana had increased in recent years. However, it also observed:

There is an absence of data on the number of hate crimes in Indiana. Further, it is likely that there will not be a significant collection of hate crime data in the near future by either the State police or most local law enforcement agencies. This lack of information restricts study of the issue and also gives the perception that there is no . . . hate crime problem in the State.²

The Hate Crimes Statistics Act (HCSA) established that, beginning in 1990 and continuing for the next 4 calendar years, the Attorney General of the United States would collect data on hate crimes.³ The Attorney General delegated this task to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) through its uniform crime report section. Currently in Indiana, 334 law

enforcement agencies collect data for the FBI's uniform crime report, yet few agencies are maintaining hate crime statistics as part of this recordkeeping.

In 1991 only one law enforcement agency in Indiana reported to the Department of Justice under the HCSA.⁴ In 1992 five law enforcement agencies, Carmel, Bloomington, Frankfort, South Bend, and Valparaiso, reported under the HCSA. Those five agencies reported 19 hate crimes.⁵

Research on Hate Crime

Because of the paucity of data on hate crimes, analysis of its causes has been both limited and incomplete. Much of what has been presented as analysis is really conjecture. Early writings on the subject have presented a consensus that hard economic times are a stimulus for increases in hate crime. This view has been made in the academic press, in government documents (USCCR and Department of Justice), and by organizations that have attempted to study the issue (Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith and the National Institute Against Prejudice & Violence).

Such reasoning remains prevalent. In a recent study of race relations by the Iowa Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, it was reported that, in hard times, suffering and deprivation increase. Individuals look for scapegoats to blame for

1 United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines*, p. 1.

2 Indiana Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Increase of Hate Crime in Indiana*, August 1992, p. 19.

3 28 U.S.C. § 534 note (Supp. IV 1993).

4 Carmel, Indiana, was the one reporting agency and it reported no instances of hate crime in 1991. Carmel is a suburb of Indianapolis located in Hamilton County in central Indiana.

5 Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Report, 1992*.

economic losses. People of different races, colors, and religions are convenient targets for this blame because of their minority status and because they are distinguishable from the majority.

Dr. Chiachian . . . noted that there is a tendency for racial tensions to increase during periods of economic downswing. An economic system that is not able to create jobs and provide for the basic needs of the people causes unemployed and insecure workers to vie for the few vacancies available and to vent their anger on the most available scapegoat, minority groups.⁶

Two studies on the nature of hate crime have been conducted in the midwest. The Chicago Commission on Human Relations began tracking hate crimes in the city in 1986. During the 6-year period, 1986 to 1991, 1,371 incidents were recorded. In 1992 the commission sanctioned a study of the hate crime data collected in that 6-year period. Although there were increasing numbers of hate crimes, the study failed to conclude that there was an increase in hate crime despite deteriorating economic conditions. It did find that changing demographics, i.e., racial and ethnic groups moving into homogeneous neighborhoods, were linked to hate crime.

The analysis in this report shows that the most volatile combination for producing hate crimes is a small amount of population change involving new racial and ethnic groups. . . . Hate crimes are most likely to occur in areas where . . . the residents are afraid that racial/ethnic change will bring in large numbers of low-income households, leading to a chain of negative results for the community.

TABLE 1
Hate Crime Offense Codes Reported,
1991

	No.	Pct. ^a
Murder	12	0.3
Forcible rape	7	0.1
Robbery	119	2.5
Aggravated assault	773	16.3
Burglary	56	1.2
Larceny-theft	22	0.5
Motor vehicle theft	0	0.0
Arson	55	1.2
Simple assault	796	16.7
Intimidation	1,614	33.9
Destruction of property/ vandalism	1,301	27.4
Total offenses	4,755	100.0

^a Because of rounding, percentages do not add to total.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hate Crime Statistics, January 1993.

Another recent study was conducted in Cincinnati by Housing Opportunities Made Equal (HOME). Based upon reports it received between May 1990 and May 1993, HOME, like the Chicago Commission on Human Relations, found that minorities moving into predominantly white lower class areas were most likely to be the victims of hate crime.⁸

FBI Data

In January 1993 the FBI released hate crime statistics monitored under the HCSA

6 Iowa Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *A Time To Heal: Race Relations In Dubuque, Iowa*, May 1983, p. 8.

7 Metro Chicago Information Center, *A Report to the Chicago Commission on Human Relations, When Worlds Collide: Culture Conflict and Reported Hate Crimes in Chicago*, (June 1992), pp. 6 and 14, (hereafter referred to as the *Chicago Study*).

8 *Housing Opportunities Made Equal, "Hate Crimes and Ethnic Intimidation," May 1990-May 1993*, (spring, 1993), unpublished, (hereafter referred to as the *Cincinnati Study*).

cent reported hate crime occurrences; the remainder reported no such offenses came to their attention. Table 1 shows the hate crime offenses reported and table 2 lists the bias motivations.

Bias-Motivation	No.	Pct.*
Race	2,963	62.3
Antiwhite	888	18.7
Antiblack	1,689	35.5
Anti-American Indian, Alaskan Native	11	0.2
Anti-Asian/Pacific Islander	287	6.0
Antimultiracial group	88	1.9
Ethnicity	450	9.5
Anti-Hispanic	242	5.1
Anti-other ethnicity, national origin	208	4.4
Religion	917	19.3
Anti-Jewish	792	18.7
Anti-Catholic	23	0.5
Anti-Protestant	26	0.5
Anti-Islamic (Moslem)	10	0.2
Anti-other religion	51	1.1
Antimultireligious group	11	0.2
Anti-atheism, agnosticism, etc.	4	0.1
Sexual orientation	425	8.9
Antihomosexual	421	8.9
Antiheterosexual	3	0.1
Antibisexual	1	0.0
Total	4,755	100.0

* Because of rounding, percentages may not add to totals.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hate Crime Statistics, January 1993.

2. Hate Crime Monitoring in Indiana

Methodology and Data

In an attempt to learn the amount of hate crime occurring in Indiana, the Indiana Advisory Committee to the USCCR joined with the Indiana Consortium of State and Local Human Rights Agencies to monitor hate crime incidents in the State. The Consortium of State and Local Human Rights Agencies is an 18-member body composed of the directors of the local human rights agencies in Indiana.¹

The directors began monitoring their communities for hate crime on July 1, 1992. Monthly reports of hate crime incidents were submitted by the directors to the Midwest Regional Office (MWRO) of the USCCR. These submissions included hate crime incident reports listing instances of hate crimes categorized by date, location, type of incident, bias motivation, victim category, and suspected offenders' race/group.² Active monitoring by consortium members continued through December 1992. After December, only the Bloomington, Muncie, Michigan City, and South Bend offices continued to submit reports. The reporting for these four offices ended on June 30, 1993.

In addition to the monitoring by local consortium members, the Advisory Committee enlisted monitoring support from governmental agencies in cities without a consortium member.³ Incidents were reported to the MWRO where they were verified through police reports or other official information.

The number of hate crime incidents monitored during the period, July 1, 1992, to

December 31, 1992, are not considered exhaustive, either in counties with hate crime activity or in the amount of hate crime throughout the State. Of the 92 counties in Indiana, just 16 have local human rights agencies. The counties with a local human rights agency are noted in table 3. Of the 16 counties with a local human rights agency, 13 reported hate crime activity.

The first set of data analyzed is monitored hate crime in Indiana for the last 6 months of 1992 when all consortium members were reporting. This information is tabulated by county, incident, location, victimization, and offender. An analysis of this data is conducted in terms of hate crime bias motivation, types of hate crime, type of hate crime and bias motivation, and location of hate crime. The information is then compared on a statewide basis with the national hate crime data collected by the FBI under the HCSA during 1991. The second set of statistics is monitoring data from the South Bend Human Rights Office. A detailed examination of hate crime in St. Joseph County is conducted incorporating demographic variables into the analysis.

During the 6-month period, July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992, 143 incidents of hate crime were monitored in 19 counties. Figure 1 shows hate crimes monitored by county. Hate crime activity was monitored in every part of the State. All reports, however, were in urban localities. No reports of hate crime were received from rural sections. (See appendix for a map of the urban areas of the State.) The

- 1 These agencies are local government entities that investigate allegations of discrimination in employment and public accommodation on account of race, color, sex, religion, ethnicity, and disability.
- 2 The hate crime incident reports used in the data collection were patterned on a similar form in the FBI's hate crime data collection manual.
- 3 Cities monitored by the Advisory Committee included Crawfordsville, Lafayette, Madison, Portage, Terre Haute, and Vincennes.

TABLE 3
Indiana Counties with Consortium
Member Agencies and Location
of the Human Rights Organization

County	City
Allen	Fort Wayne
Bartholomew	Columbus
Clark	Jeffersonville
Delaware	Muncie
Elkhart	Elkhart
Grant	Marion
Howard	Kokomo
Lake	East Chicago, Gary, and Hammond
LaPorte	Michigan City
Madison	Anderson
Marion	Indianapolis
Monroe	Bloomington
St. Joseph	South Bend
Tippecanoe	West Lafayette*
Vanderburgh	Evansville
Wayne	Richmond*

* Indicates nonmember agency

TABLE 4
Victims of Hate Crime by Category,
July 1, 1992-December 31, 1992

Category	No.	Pct.
Whites	32	22.4
Blacks	66	46.1
Jews	5	3.5
Asians	1	0.7
Hispanics	12	8.4
Ethnic	1	0.7
Religion	1	0.7
Homosexual	25	17.5

Categories are exclusive, e.g., homosexuals are listed in the "homosexual" category and not in other categories. "Religion" and "ethnic" refer to hate crimes motivated by bias against a specific religion and non-Hispanics.

Source: MWRO monitoring data for the period July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992.

large number of reports in St. Joseph, Marion, and Monroe Counties are considered the result of intensive monitoring by the South Bend, Indianapolis, and Bloomington human rights agencies. These higher numbers do not reflect higher hate crime activity in those counties.

Hate Crime Bias Motivation

Racially, African Americans, who are 7.8 percent of Indiana's population, were the most common victims of hate crime. Sixty-six incidents of hate crime, 46.1 percent, were monitored against blacks. Whites were the next greatest victim group. Nearly one-fourth of the monitored hate crimes were perpetrated against whites. The proportion of hate crimes against this group is small, however, as whites are 90.6 percent of the State's population.

Twenty-five incidents, 17.5 percent, of reported hate crimes in Indiana during the monitoring period were motivated by sexual orientation bias. Hispanics were also a highly targeted group of hate crime in the State. Hispanics were victims of 8.4 percent of monitored hate crime activity although they are just 1.8 percent of the State's residents. Anti-Semitic activity during the 6-month period was recorded five times. Table 4 shows the number of hate crimes monitored, categorized by the victims' group.

Types of Hate Crime

Intimidation was the most common hate crime incident. Forty percent of the hate crimes reported involved intimidation, which includes activity such as harassment and threats. Crimes against property, i.e., vandalism and theft, accounted for 16 percent of the tracked hate crime, with vandalism accounting for all but one of the property crimes. Table 5 shows monitored hate crime activity by type.

Assaults, both aggravated and simple, were 41 percent of the monitored hate crime. Of the assaults, simple assault, i.e., battery, was 70 percent of these crimes. When murder and rape are included in the assault statistics, assaults are 62 of the 143 monitored hate crimes.

Category	No.	Pct.
Murder	1	0.7
Rape	2	1.4
Aggrav. assault	18	12.6
Theft	1	0.7
Simple assault	41	28.7
Intimidation	58	40.6
Vandalism	22	15.3

Source: MWRO monitoring data for the period July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992.

Types of Hate Crime and Bias Motivation

Table 6 reveals the types of hate crime perpetrated against the different victim groups during the period, July 1, 1992 to December 31, 1992. Blacks were the target of the largest amount of reported hate crime and were more likely to be intimidated than

dications from the data that many hate crime assaults begin as acts of intimidation. Further, there is evidence from the data that threats, particularly at homes and residences, are very traumatic for the victims.

One-third of the reported hate crime against blacks was physical assault. African Americans suffered numerous acts of vandalism and destruction of property. Half of all reported vandalism was directed at the homes and the property of blacks.

According to the data, gay and lesbian victims of hate crime were most likely to suffer physical assault, and half of these were aggravated assaults. Gays and lesbians also suffered vandalism and intimidation, but in smaller proportions than other types of hate crime.

Whites who encountered hate crime were the group most likely to experience some form of physical violence. Three-fourths of the monitored hate crime against whites was physically violent. Intimidation accounted for only 20

TABLE 6
Hate Crime by Victim and Offense, July 1, 1992 December 31, 1992

Offense/victim	Homicide	Rape	Assault	Theft	Simple assault	Intimidation	Vandalism
White	1	1	3	1	19	6	1
Black	0	0	8	0	15	32	11
Jew	0	0	0	0	1	2	2
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Hispanic	0	0	1	0	1	6	4
Ethnic	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Homosexual	0	1	6	0	5	11	2

Note: The categories are mutually exclusive, e.g., an individual placed in the Hispanic category is not in any other category.

Source: MWRO monitoring data for the period, July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992.

percent of the hate crime against whites, and the amount of vandalism against this group was negligible.

The tracked hate crime during the period July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992, against Hispanics, Jews, and Asians was mostly intimidation and vandalism. There were two reported assaults against Hispanics; this was 17 percent of all hate crime monitored against this group.

Location of Hate Crime

Table 7 lists the locations of the monitored hate crime. The home was the most common site for a hate crime. Thirty-six percent of all reported hate crime occurred at the residence of the victim. Most of the reported hate crime committed on public highways is linked to a residential site. Virtually all of these locations were reported as occurring on a residential road. Since the incident did not actually occur on private property, i.e., the home of the victim, the site is technically a public highway. However, where the precise public highway location could be ascertained, three-fourths of the incidents were in front of the residence of the victim. This indicates that more than half of all reported hate crime occurs at the home of the victim.

The next two most prevalent sites for hate crime were public highways and schools. Churches, stores, bars, parking lots, restaurants, offices, lakes, and other places, e.g., such as fields, were the other locations where hate crime was monitored. None of these sites, though, was widespread as a site for hate crime. Table 7 shows the location of the tracked hate crimes.

Comparison with FBI Data

The hate crime monitored during the 6-month period, July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992, is similar to the national data in the types of bias motivating hate crime. Data from the FBI's 1991 national reports showed racial bias motivated six of 10 offenses reported;

TABLE 7
Location of Hate Crime, July 1,
1992-December 31, 1992

Location	No.	Pct.
Church	3	2.1
Store	4	2.8
Bar	8	5.6
Parking lot	7	4.9
Home	52	36.3
Restaurant	4	2.8
School	21	14.7
Highway	34	23.8
Office	2	1.4
Lake	1	0.7
Other	7	4.9

Note: Data in this table are hate crimes monitored by MWRO for the period, July 1, 1992 to December 31, 1993.


religious bias, two of 10; and ethnic and sexual orientation bias, each one of 10.

The Indiana data showed stronger racial and sexual orientation bias. Race bias motivated nearly 7 of 10 offenses and sexual orientation motivated almost 2 of 10 hate crimes. Figure 2 depicts the similarity between the two sets of data.

Asians and Jews, groups proportionately smaller in Indiana than nationwide, had much lower rates of hate crime in the State than in the Nation. In Indiana anti-Semitic offenses were 3.5 percent of the total. Asians, who are less than 1 percent of Indiana's population, suffered only one reported incident of a hate crime against them. Figure 2 depicts a comparison of FBI national data from 1991 HCSA statistics with the Indiana data by bias motivation.

There is a strong similarity between the two sets of data in the types of offenses. For both sets, intimidation was the most common hate crime. Nationwide, intimidation was 34 percent of the tracked hate crime while in

Figure 2
Comparison of FBI and Indiana Data by Bias Motivation



Source: FBI, 1991 Hate Crime Statistics, January 1993 and MWRO monitoring data for the period July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992.

Indiana it accounted for 40 percent of the monitored incidents.

The number of occurrences of murder, rape, burglary, larceny, auto theft, and arson were negligible amounts of crime in both sets of data. Combined, these six crime categories accounted for just 6 percent of all tracked hate crime in the FBI's 1991 national data set. In Indiana only three of these offenses were recorded as hate crimes. One murder, two rapes, and one theft were reported as hate crimes and they comprised just 2.8 percent of the total monitored hate crime.

The national data shows higher rates of aggravated assault and vandalism while the Indiana data shows a higher rate of simple

assault. Table 8 gives the numerical comparisons of the two sets of data.

Annual Data

Four consortium offices, those located in Bloomington, Muncie, Michigan City, and South Bend, reported their monitoring of hate crime activity to the MWRO of the USCCR during the period January 1, 1993 to June 30, 1993, making the data from these offices a 1-year measure. This is in contrast to the 6-month monitoring and reporting of the other consortium members.

The amount of hate crime monitored by these four offices in the first 6 months, June 30, 1992, to December 31, 1992, of the project

TABLE 8
Rates of Hate Crime by Offense for
the Nation and Indiana

Offense	National rate	Indiana rate
Murder	0.3	0.7
Rape	0.1	1.4
Robbery	2.5	0.0
Aggravated assault	16.3	12.6
Burglary	1.2	0.0
Larceny/theft	0.5	0.7
Auto theft	0.0	0.0
Arson	1.2	0.0
Simple assault	16.7	28.7
Intimidation, harassment	33.9	40.6
Destruction of property, vandalism	27.4	15.3

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, FBI, 1991 Hate Crime Statistics (January 1993), and MWRO monitoring data for the period July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992.

TABLE 9
Hate Crime Monitoring by the
Bloomington, Muncie, Michigan
City, and South Bend Offices

Office	7/1/92- 12/31/92	1/1/93- 6/30/93
Bloomington	18	15
Muncie	3	3
Michigan City	2	2
South Bend	23	37

Source: MWRO monitoring data.

is similar to the amount of hate crime they monitored in the second 6 months, January 1, 1992, to June 30, 1993. In the first 6 months of the monitoring project, the Bloomington, Muncie, Michigan City, and South Bend offices reported 18, 3, 2, and 23 instances of hate crime, respectively. During the second 6 months of the project, these offices reported 15, 3, 2, and 37 instances of hate crime (see table 9).

The similarity between the two sets of numbers suggests that if all consortium members had continued to report hate crime activity in 1993, the annual data would not deviate substantially from the 6-month data set reported previously.

The Bloomington and South Bend offices had the active cooperation of the local police departments in their monitoring efforts. Both of these police departments, the South Bend police department and the Bloomington police department, were among the five law enforcement agencies in Indiana in 1992 that reported hate crime statistics to the FBI under the Hate Crime Statistics Reporting Act.

St. Joseph County: A Case Study

In the 6-month period, July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1992, the South Bend Human Rights Commission monitored 23 incidents of hate crime in St. Joseph County. In the period, January 1, 1993, to June 30, 1993, the South Bend agency recorded 37 hate crimes. This total of 60 monitored incidents of hate crime was the result of the willingness of the South Bend police department and the mayor of South Bend to cooperate with the local human rights office to obtain a complete data set. It does not indicate that St. Joseph County has higher numbers of hate crime than other counties in the State.⁴

⁴ To support this point, Elkhart County abuts St. Joseph County directly to the east and has a demographic profile similar in many respects to St. Joseph County. The Elkhart human rights office, however, without the active cooperation of local officials reported only two incidents of hate crime during the monitoring project.

The intense monitoring activity allowed for a more detailed analysis of hate crime, not only in terms of victimization and type of crime, but also in terms of demographic variables. The South Bend Human Rights Office denoted all hate crime incidents by type, location, victimization, and census tract. Census tract variables, i.e., racial composition of the neighborhood, migration patterns, socioeconomic status, and percentage of owner-occupied housing, were then obtained and used to analyze their effects on levels of hate crime.

The 1990 census reported the population in St. Joseph County as 87.4 percent white (non-Hispanic), 9.7 percent black (non-Hispanic), 2.0 percent Hispanic, 0.7 percent Asian, and 0.2 percent Native American.⁵ Thirty-eight of the 60 reported hate crimes during the monitoring year were motivated by bias against one of the five racial/ethnic groups classified by the census. Proportions of hate crimes against these groups were: whites, 20.5 percent; African American, 64.1 percent; Asians, 2.6 percent; Hispanics, 12.8 percent; Native Americans, 0 percent (see table 10).

TABLE 10
Hate Crimes and Census Group
Rate, St. Joseph County, July 1,
1992-June 30, 1993

Race/ethnicity	Percent of population	Percent of victims
White	87.4	20.5
African Amer.	9.7	64.1
Hispanic	2.0	12.8
Asian	0.7	2.6
Native Amer.	0.2	0.0
Total	100.00	100.00

Source: MWRO monitoring data.

Hate crimes against whites were far fewer than their proportion of the population. In contrast, the proportion of hate crimes against blacks and Hispanics were several times their representation in the general population. Incidents against Asians did not deviate proportionately from their representation in the community.

In addition to suffering a higher proportion of hate crimes than their representation in the general population, blacks and Hispanics also suffered more violent hate crime. For blacks, 44 percent of the monitored incidents of hate crime were violent, i.e., aggravated assault, three; simple assault, one; and vandalism, seven. For Hispanics, all five monitored hate crime incidents were violent. There were three monitored incidents of simple assault and two crimes of vandalism. The only hate crime monitored against an Asian was an act of intimidation (see table 11).

The monitoring showed a high level of violence and intimidation directed against the homosexual community. Eighteen (31 percent) of the 60 reported hate crimes were motivated by bias against the sexual orientation of the victim. Gays and lesbians were the second highest victimized group, both in the percentage of hate crimes and the actual number of incidents. Moreover, hate crimes against the gay and lesbian community in St. Joseph County tended to be violent; this included four assaults and five cases of vandalism. Almost half of all the incidents monitored, 29 of 60 total reports (48 percent), included violence to person or damage to property. This is a lower ratio than the officially reported national data and the Indiana data. The FBI reported that 62 percent of hate crime incidents involved violence to person or property while 58 percent of the hate crimes monitored in Indiana involved violence to person or property. The lower ratio of violence in St. Joseph County suggests that hate crime

⁵ The 1990 census data for St. Joseph County is: whites (non-Hispanic) 216,984; blacks (non-Hispanic) 24,190; Hispanic 5,201; Asian 2,507; Native American 848; and other 2,526.

	Assault	Theft	Vandalism	Harassment	Total
Antiwhite	1	1	1	5	8
Antiblack	4	0	7	14	25
Anti-Hispanic	3	0	2	0	5
Anti-Asian	0	0	0	1	1
Anti-ethnic	0	0	1	0	1
Antireligious	0	0	1	0	1
Anti-Semitic	0	0	0	1	1
Anti-sexual orientation	4	0	5	9	18

Source: MWRO monitoring data.

intimidation may be much higher nationally than shown by FBI statistics.

Analysis by Census Tract

St. Joseph County has 59 census tracts.⁶ Tracts that were contiguous and similar in racial composition, median income, and housing characteristics, were combined into eight section tracts: west (W), far west (FW), east (E), far east (FE), south (S), far south

(FS), north (N), and far north (FN) (see tables 12 and 13).⁷

Simple correlation statistics were employed to examine the association of the demographic variables with hate crime.⁸ In every grouping, hate crime was negatively correlated with white population, decreases in white population, income, and home ownership. Table 14 shows the correlations for the

6 Several census tracts are subdivided by the census.

7 To avoid bias, the development of the eight section tracts were completed independently and prior to any examination of the hate crime data. The census tracts comprising the eight section tracts are:

west: 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26;
 far west: 108, 109, 111, 120, 121, and 122;
 east: 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16;
 far east: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, and 115;
 south: 17, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35;
 far south: 116, 117, 118, 119, 123, and 124;
 north: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 18; and
 far north: 110, 112, 113, and 114.

(See appendix for a map of census tracts and the eight section tracts dividing St. Joseph County.) Table 12 lists the eight districts and their population, percentage of white residents, change in white residents from the 1990 census, median household income, and percentage of housing that is owner-occupied. Table 13 shows hate crimes in the eight sections by total hate crime, hate crime against minorities, hate crime against African Americans, hate crime against whites, and hate crime against gays and lesbians.

8 Correlation is a statistic measuring the deviation of an observation from its mean controlling for the units of its measurement. A positive correlation between two variables implies that there is a tendency for the two variables to move together, i.e., a higher value of one is associated with a higher value of the other.

	Population	Percent white	Change in white population	Median income	Percent homeowners
W	18.1	51.6	-2.5	17.0	65.9
FW	23.3	95.3	-1.5	30.2	84.1
S	27.5	71.7	-12.2	25.0	73.9
FS	36.2	97.6	-1.2	34.8	79.7
E	26.4	82.3	-12.2	29.4	66.7
FE	41.7	96.2	-0.4	24.6	59.2
N	23.1	70.6	-8.0	22.2	57.7
FN	33.2	91.9	-5.0	41.4	80.9

Note: Population and median income are measured in thousands.
Source: Midwestern Regional Office, USCCR.

TABLE 13
Hate Crime in the Eight Section Tracts, St. Joseph County

	Total	Antiminority	Antiblack	Antiwhite	Antigay/lesbian
W	24	13	12	4	5
FW	1	0	0	1	0
S	2	1	0	0	0
FS	3	1	0	0	2
E	7	1	1	0	5
FE	7	3	3	0	4
N	6	3	3	2	4
FN	10	8	6	1	1

Note: Antiminority hate crime does not include antiwhite, antireligion, anti-Semitic, or anti-sexual-orientation hate crime.

Source: Midwestern Regional Office, USCCR.

TABLE 14
Correlations of Hate Crime with Demographic Variables

Variable	Total	Minority	Hate crime groupings		
			Black	White	Gay/lesbian
Population	-0.38	-0.36	-0.35	-0.71	-0.01
Percent white	-0.67	-0.59	-0.63	-0.75	-0.27
Change in white	-0.18	-0.24	-0.26	-0.22	-0.09
Median income	-0.43	-0.25	-0.36	-0.54	-0.37
Own home	0.33	-0.17	-0.28	-0.24	-0.54

Source: Midwestern Regional Office, USCCR.

five variables and the five hate crime groupings.

The results were expected for median income and home ownership. Neighborhoods with lower levels of home ownership are correlated with higher levels of hate crime; areas with lower median incomes are correlated with higher levels of hate crime. Changing racial neighborhoods was also correlated with hate crime. Since all the changes in white population were negative, the negative correlation implies that neighborhoods with greater decreases in the white population had higher levels of hate crime, i.e., areas with higher minority migration into white neighborhoods have higher levels of hate crime. These findings are consistent with the Cincinnati and Chicago studies that found higher levels of hate crime in lower income, racially changing residential areas.

A model of probability was developed to test the effect of the particular neighborhood characteristics on hate crime. Estimates of the relationships between the above variables and levels of hate crime were derived from a statistical procedure known as multiple regression.⁹ It isolates the relationship between an individual characteristic and the studied variable, in this case hate crime, holding other

variables constant. The considered neighborhood characteristics were:

- population (pop),
- current racial composition of the neighborhood, i.e., the percentage of the population that is white (wh),
- changing racial/ethnic pattern of the neighborhood, i.e., the differences in white population in the 1980 census as compared to the 1990 census (dwh),
- percentage of housing owner-occupied (hng), and
- median income (inc).

The regression analysis supported the correlations with the exception of the effect of median income. Total hate crime, controlling for population and owner-occupied housing, was positively and significantly associated with higher minority migration into the area and negatively associated with the proportion of whites in the neighborhood. Higher median income was positively and significantly associated with higher levels of total hate crime.

Similar results were found for hate crimes against minorities. The results in table 15 show that increased minority migration into white areas are associated with additional incidents of hate crime against minorities. In

TABLE 15
Regression Results for Hate Crime Against Minorities in St. Joseph County

$$hc_{mj} = 34.75 + 0.10 \text{ pop} - 0.45 \text{ wh} - 0.71 \text{ dwh} + 0.63 \text{ inc} - 0.15 \text{ hng}$$

(ns) (-5.45) (-5.34) (3.06) (ns)

$$R^2 = 0.91 \quad s = 2.6 \quad F = 3.83$$

Note: Categories of hate crime in this analysis include anti-black, anti-Hispanic, anti-Asian, and anti-ethnic. NS indicates the results for that variable are not statistically significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level. R^2 is

the fraction of the variance of the dependent variable, i.e., hate crime, explained by the independent variables.

Sources: Midwestern Regional Office, USCCR.

⁹ Heteroskedasticity was found in the independent variables; to control for this, a heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix was employed in the regressions.

addition, areas with lower proportions of white residents have higher levels of hate crime against minorities. The two are consistent; higher numbers of hate crime are significantly associated with neighborhoods where (1) whites are leaving, (2) minorities are moving in, and (3) the resulting racial mix of the neighborhood is proportionately less white.

Given the negative correlation between income and hate crime, the significant and positive influence of median income with higher hate crime is not clear. This finding could suggest an interactive effect with the other variables, e.g., hate crime more likely occurs in racially changing neighborhoods that enjoy some level of affluence. On the other hand, this variable might be capturing the effect of hate crime, particularly intimidation, against minorities who frequent public areas, e.g., shopping malls, in higher income neighborhoods.

When hate crime against African Americans was regressed on the demographic variables, it was found to be significantly associated with lower white population levels, negative changes in the proportion of white

residents, and higher income levels.¹⁰ This is not different from the results of hate crime against all minorities. When hate crimes against whites were examined, the same variables were found to be significant. In addition, lower levels of owner-occupied housing was also significantly associated with the number of hate crimes perpetrated against whites.¹¹ These findings suggest that minority migration into white neighborhoods triggers increased levels of hate crime against all groups: whites and minorities.

Separate regression analysis for hate crimes against gays and lesbians showed no significance for any demographic variables. Income, owner-occupied housing, changing racial composition, and population were all nonsignificant predictors of hate crime motivated by sexual-orientation bias. Similar results were found when the white proportion of the neighborhood (wh) and changes in proportion of the white population (dwh) were deleted as variables. These findings suggest that hate crime motivated by bias against the sexual orientation of the victim is independent of the particular demographics of the area. (See table 16.)

TABLE 16
Regression Results for Hate Crime Against Gays and Lesbians in St. Joseph County

$$hc_g = 13.30 + 0.02 \text{ pop} - 0.05 \text{ wh} - 0.12 \text{ dwh} + 0.07 \text{ inc} - 0.13 \text{ hsg}$$

(ns) (ns) (ns) (ns) (ns)

$$R^2 = 0.36 \quad s^2 = 3.18 \quad F = 0.22$$

Source: Midwestern Regional Office, USCCR.

10 Regression results for hate crime against blacks is:
 $HC_b = 25.05 + 0.02 \text{ pop} - 0.27 \text{ wh} - 0.07 \text{ dwh} - 0.19 \text{ hsg} + 0.52 \text{ inc}$
 (ns) (-4.82) (-4.81) (-1.09) (2.69)
 $R^2 = 0.89 \quad s^2 = 2.51 \quad F = 8.31$

11 Regression results for hate crime against whites is:
 $HC_w = 12.13 - 0.19 \text{ pop} - 0.07 \text{ wh} - 0.21 \text{ dwh} - 0.05 \text{ hsg} + 0.11 \text{ inc}$
 (-5.81) (-7.77) (-11.94) (-4.42) (4.45)
 $R^2 = 0.99 \quad s^2 = 0.24 \quad F = 45.05$

It is accepted that the data set in this report is biased. The different consortium offices had varying levels of monitoring success and different areas of the State had varying monitoring activity. It is also understood that the data from St. Joseph County is incomplete and that census sections fashioned in a different manner might yield different results. Still, the report offers some preliminary ideas on the nature of hate crime in this society. The Indiana Advisory Committee makes four observations.

First, incidents of hate crime are not being adequately reported under the 1990 Hate Crimes Statistics Act. Second, the Indiana data blend with national data from the FBI, and both sets indicate that racial bigotry and intolerance are the leading motivators for hate crime. Third, home is not a safe haven from hate crime. Fourth, African Americans and homosexuals are the most likely victims of hate crime.

1. Law enforcement agencies are not participating in the collection of hate crime data. The 1991 hate crime data published by the FBI is the composite report of 2,771 law enforcement agencies. That is a 17 percent reporting compliance from the more than 16,000 law enforcement agencies who record crime statistics under the uniform crime report.

In Indiana only one law enforcement agency complied with hate crime reporting requirements in 1991. In 1992 five law enforcement agencies in the State reported, but the Indiana State police and law enforcement agencies from the State's three largest cities, Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, and Evansville, did not.

Two of the five municipalities in Indiana that did begin to record hate crime activity in 1992 are in counties that recorded the second and third highest levels of hate crime during the 6 months of this project. The Bloomington police department reported hate crime ac-

tivity in 1992, and in Monroe County 33 incidents of hate crime were monitored by the local human rights agency. The South Bend police department also began reporting hate crime activity in 1992, and the consortium agency in that city monitored 60 incidents of hate crime in St. Joseph County.

It is clear to the Advisory Committee that police cooperation is essential in monitoring hate crime. Where police agencies are active in monitoring hate crime, significant levels of these offenses are recorded. Since the authority of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act extends only through 1994, lack of compliance by law enforcement agencies will curtail study and knowledge of these crimes.

2. Racial intolerance and bigotry remains embedded in the fabric of this State. Racial conflict appears to be the dominant motivation for hate crime in the State. Forty years after the beginning of the modern era civil rights movement, racial intolerance appears ingrained in the psyche of many citizens. A great deal of animosity persists among the racial and ethnic groups of this nation, breeding hate crimes.

This is evident from the data collected in St. Joseph County showing a significant relationship between minority migration into white areas and higher numbers of hate crime. And in those areas, the hate crime is both ways, minorities on whites and whites on minorities.

Worse, indications from this project are that racial animosity will continue as 15 percent of the monitored hate crime in the State occurred at schools or on college campuses. Places of education, traditionally bastions of racial, ethnic, and cultural acceptance, are sites of racial and ethnic conflict among our youth.

3. A person's residence is the most likely place for an individual to be victimized by a hate crime. Recent studies in Chicago and Cincinnati reported that changing racial and ethnic neighborhoods are

related to high levels of hate crime. This study supports those findings.

It appears that more than half of the recorded hate crime during this project transpired at or around the victim's residence. Statewide data collected in this project show 35 percent of the monitored hate crime incidents occurred at the home of the victim. Another 24 percent of hate crime was found to occur on the public highways. A followup analysis of that data indicated that most of these incidents were on residential streets near or in front of the victims' residences.

Further, there is evidence that hate crime is a neighborhood phenomenon. A significant relationship was found in the St. Joseph County data between hate crime and changing racial neighborhoods. The violation of the tranquility of a citizen's home because of

racial and ethnic animus is a particularly chilling prospect for our society.

4. African Americans and gays and lesbians bear the brunt of hate crime activity. The violence, threats, and intimidation of African Americans in Indiana are profoundly out of line with this group's proportion of the State's population. Blacks are less than 10 percent of the State's population, yet the data shows them to be victims of almost half of all hate crime. And these hate crimes are not confined to any one part of the State, anti-black violence was monitored in every section of Indiana.


The homosexual community in Indiana also appears to be especially targeted for hate crime. The reported hate crimes in this State on the basis of sexual orientation were almost 20 percent of all monitored hate crime.

Appendix

Agency Participation in Hate Crime Reporting, 1991

State	Agencies Participating*	Incidents Reported
ARIZONA	1	48
ARKANSAS	169	10
CALIFORNIA	2	5
COLORADO	194	128
CONNECTICUT	29	69
DELAWARE	58	29
GEORGIA	2	23
IDaho	98	33
ILLINOIS	26	133
INDIANA	1	0
IOHA	201	89
KANSAS	3	6
KENTUCKY	1	0
LOUISIANA	6	0
MARYLAND	156	431
MASSACHUSETTS	30	100
MINNESOTA	42	128
MISSISSIPPI	4	1
MISSOURI	18	136
NEVADA	1	16
NEW JERSEY	271	898
NEW MEXICO	1	0
NEW YORK	773	943
OHIO	30	80
OKLAHOMA	7	99
OREGON	39	196
PENNSYLVANIA	50	177
TENNESSEE	2	1
TEXAS	28	98
VIRGINIA	19	83
WASHINGTON	206	196
WISCONSIN	303	41
Total	2,771	4,938

*includes agencies participating in Program whether or not any incidents were experienced.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Census Tracts and Section Tracts for St. Joseph County, Indiana

