

# Hating the Neighbors: The Role of Hate Crime in the Perpetuation of Black Residential Segregation

Ami M. Lynch, Ph.D., Women's Studies Program, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

## Vol. 2(1) 2008

**Editorial** (p.3)

**Focus:**

**Neighbourhood & Violence**

**Guest Editorial** Miles Hewstone, Douglas S. Massey (pp.4–5)

- ▶ **Hating the Neighbors: The Role of Hate Crime in the Perpetuation of Black Residential Segregation** Ami Lynch (pp.6–27)

**Neighborhood Violence and Adolescent Friendship** David Harding (pp.28–55)

**The effects of living in segregated vs. mixed areas in Northern Ireland: A simultaneous analysis of contact and threat effects in the context of micro-level neighbourhoods** Katharina Schmid, Nicole Tausch, Miles Hewstone, Joanne Hughes, Ed Cairns (pp.56–71)

**Youth Criminality and Urban Social Conflict in the City of Rosario, Argentina** Celina Del Felice (pp.72–97)

**How Insecurity impacts on school attendance and school drop out among urban slum children in Nairobi** Netsayi N. Mudege, Eliya M. Zulu, Chimaraoke Izugbara (pp.98–112)

**How Neighborhood Disadvantage Reduces Birth Weight** Emily Moiduddin, Douglas S. Massey (pp.113–129)

**Open Section**

**Crossing the Rubicon: Deciding to Become a Paramilitary in Northern Ireland** Neil Ferguson, Mark Burgess, Ian Hollywood (pp.130–137)

**Policing and Islamophobia in Germany – The Role of Workplace Experience** Heidi Mescher (pp.138–156)

# Hating the Neighbors: The Role of Hate Crime in the Perpetuation of Black Residential Segregation

Ami M. Lynch, Ph.D., Women's Studies Program, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Grounded in group conflict theory and the defended neighborhoods thesis, this nationwide empirical study of cities and their residential segregation levels examines the occurrence of hate crime using data for all U.S. cities with populations over 95,000 and Uniform Crime Reporting data for hate crime, in conjunction with 2000 census data. Hate crime is any illegal act motivated by pre-formed bias against, in this case, a person's real or perceived race. This research asks: Do hate crime levels predict white/black segregation levels? How does hate crime predict different measures of white/black segregation? I use the dissimilarity index measure of segregation operationalized as a continuous, binary, and ordinal variable, to explore whether hate crime predicts segregation of blacks from whites. In cities with higher rates of hate crime there was higher dissimilarity between whites and blacks, controlling for other factors. The segregation level was more likely to be "high" in a city where hate crime occurred. Blacks are continually multiply disadvantaged and distinctly affected by hate crime and residential segregation. Prior studies of residential segregation have focused almost exclusively on individual choice, residents' lack of finances, or discriminatory actions that prevent racial minorities from moving, to explore the correlates of segregation. Notably absent from these studies are measures reflecting the level of hate crime occurring in cities. This study demonstrates the importance of considering hate crime and neighborhood conflict when contemplating the causes of residential segregation.

## 1. Introduction

Despite the successes of the civil rights movement and the Fair Housing Act, housing segregation continues to exist and is a social issue with significant consequences. In homogeneous white segregated communities, the presence of new racial minority residents may be seen by whites as racial trespassing. These areas are ripe for hate crime to occur. Massey and Denton's seminal work on residential segregation, *American Apartheid* (1993), helped inform much of today's research on segregation by Logan, Iceland, Weinberg, Welch, and others, and contended that segregation plays a major and oft-forgotten role in minority poverty/disadvantage. Just as Massey and Denton demonstrated that segregation was the missing link in the debate on poverty, this research asserts that race-based violence plays an often-overlooked role with regard to segregation.

Although the patterns of segregation are relatively clear, the explanations of segregation's persistence are not. Most

literature locates the cause and perpetuation of segregation in one of three arenas: individual choice, residents' lack of finances, or discriminatory actions that prevent racial minorities from moving. The existing research does not include the forgotten role of race-based violence, also known as hate crime, in maintaining segregation. Hate crime is any illegal act motivated by pre-formed bias against, in this case, a person's real or perceived race. Hate crime's relative infrequency is overshadowed by the potency of its social implications. This study asks whether hate crime perpetuates segregation. Might residents commit hate crime in an effort to defend their neighborhoods from racial infiltration? Do whites use hate-motivated violence to restrict blacks' neighborhood choices and promote segregation? This study aims to better understand what, if any, hate crime factors promote segregation and to postulate why. The study is grounded in the contention that hate crime perpetuates residential segregation and prevents black residents from leaving their segregated neighborhoods, while

staying in segregated neighborhoods denies housing rights and other economic opportunities to African Americans.

The study investigates just how the occurrence of hate crime against blacks may affect white/black racial segregation levels. This cross-sectional analysis asks: Do hate crime levels predict white/black segregation levels? How does hate crime predict different measures of white/black segregation? Prior studies of residential segregation have not investigated the level of hate crime occurring in cities. This study demonstrates the importance of considering hate crime and neighborhood conflict when contemplating the causes of residential segregation.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Segregation

Segregation, or the isolation or separation of people or things into distinct groups, can occur in housing, neighborhoods, schools, workplaces, churches, and elsewhere. Residential segregation is the intentional isolation (by policy or by choice) of residents into particular areas, often referring to racial minorities in comparison to whites. Residential segregation has real-world effects on the segregated residents. In the case of black Americans, these residents, who are already marginalized, are kept from resources in jobs, housing, employment, and schools, and are surrounded by those in a similar situation. Various authors refer to racial segregation as the structural linchpin of American race relations (Bobo 1988; Bobo, Schuman, and Steeh 1986; Massey and Denton 1993; Schuman and Bobo 1988; Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo 1985).

Numerous studies have documented the distinct racial and ethnic residential location patterns in the United States (Frey and Farley 1996; Glaeser and Vigdor 2001; Logan, Stults, and Farley 2004; Massey and Denton 1993). Residential patterns result from a variety of causes, including disparate economic resources; preferences of residents; community zoning laws that discourage economic integration; and a long history of discriminatory practices by

lending institutions, real estate agents, political elites, and neighbors (Frey and Myers 2002; Turner et al. 2002). It is widely agreed that black housing segregation came about through organized efforts to ghettoize blacks in the early twentieth century (Doob 2005; Massey and Denton 1993). As late as the early 1960s, discrimination against blacks seeking to live in white areas was nearly universal. But two changes, laws that banned most forms of housing discrimination and white attitudes shifting to be sharply against the practice of blatant housing discrimination, led to greater tolerance of housing integration (Doob 2005).

While segregation between whites and blacks has decreased, it has done so mostly in newer cities with relatively small black populations while holding firm in older, industrial areas where the black population remains concentrated (Iceland and Weinberg 2002).<sup>1</sup> Fair housing legislation in the 1960s and the enforcement of these laws in conjunction with the emergence of a large black middle-class population contributed to a slight decline in black segregation levels in the 1990 Census from 1980 levels (Frey and Myers 2002). Even so, the segregation levels of 1990 were such that, on average, 6 out of 10 blacks would have had to change neighborhoods to be distributed in the same way that whites were (Frey and Myers 2002). By 2000, while there were declines in black segregation compared to 1980, residential segregation was still higher for blacks than for Latinos/as and Asians (Iceland and Weinberg 2002). In 2000, the majority of blacks would still have had to move to match the neighborhood distribution of whites (Iceland and Weinberg 2002). Cities in the south and southwest with new construction and recent in-migration tended to have the lowest levels of segregation, but these areas of high growth are where segregation measures are increasing the most for Asians and Latinos while decreasing the most for blacks (Frazier, Margai, and Tettey-Fio 2003).

The 2000 Census indicates that the number of blacks grew in the previous two decades from 26.5 million (11.7 percent of the U.S. population) in 1980 to 30.0 million

<sup>1</sup> Black and African American will be used interchangeably, although black (with or without capitalization) is a better term because it indicates

that this is about perceived race and notes that not all blacks are African American (meaning not necessarily of African descent).

(12.1 percent) in 1990. In the 2000 Census, there were 36.4 million blacks (12.9 percent of the U.S. population). According to Iceland and Weinberg (2002), segregation decreased for blacks in metropolitan areas. From 1980 to 2000 segregation of African Americans declined across all indices but was still higher for African Americans than for all other groups (Iceland and Weinberg 2002). Measuring the dissimilarity index at the city level indicates more mixed results. Residential segregation varied by the percentage (expressed in quartiles) of the population that is black. Although overall there was a pattern of decreasing residential segregation over time, three of the five indices showed a pattern of higher segregation in places with a higher percentage of blacks in 2000. As the black percentage of the population increased, blacks were less likely to be evenly spread across the metropolitan area (dissimilarity index), less likely to share common neighborhoods (isolation index), less concentrated in dense areas (delta index), less likely to be centralized (absolute centralization index), and more likely to live near other blacks (spatial proximity index). Blacks remain segregated and highly disadvantaged, no matter how we measure segregation.

Numerous national studies compared segregation patterns across metropolitan areas (Glaeser and Vigdor 2001; Logan 2001). Logan's analysis identified segregation between non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, non-Hispanic Asians, and Hispanics. Black segregation from whites remained higher than Asian and Hispanic segregation from whites, but black segregation declined slightly in most areas while Asian and Hispanic segregation increased to a small extent (Logan 2001). Logan's study revealed the relative lack of change in the high segregation levels observed for larger, northern metropolitan areas where most blacks continue to live. Glaeser and Vigdor (2001) demonstrated that black segregation declined the most in the south and west regions, which are also the areas experiencing rapid growth in their black populations. But no studies have looked at city-level segregation levels.

African Americans experience segregation from whites as a result of discrimination (Galster 1992). Blacks and whites live separately from one another, experience little contact, and do not have the opportunity to get to know each other, so they rely on salient characteristics and stereotypes to

assess one another. Segregation is reinforced by barriers to social intercourse. Many whites believe that blacks are a nuisance, are prone to criminal behavior, prefer welfare over work, and embody other negative stereotypes (Charles 2001; Farley and Colasanto 1980; Farley, Fielding, and Krysan 1997; Feagin and Sikes 1994; Feagin and Vera 1995; Schuman and Bobo 1988; Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo 1985). Some whites, feeling vulnerable to minority encroachment at any time and assuming such harmful characteristics about blacks, may use methods of coercion, intimidation, violence, and other tools of bias to send messages to blacks that they are not wanted in white neighborhoods.

Oftentimes, moving into areas with better education, jobs, and other resources means moving into white neighborhoods. All-white neighborhoods, while symbolizing economic, educational, and occupational opportunities, may come with hefty warnings and risks. Hate crime, which I am positing is used by whites to defend neighborhoods, is the outgrowth of such hostility, so in many cases blacks' fears or concerns about white neighborhoods are grounded in real danger. In her study Ellen (2000), argues that blacks, when moving to a new neighborhood, typically avoided census tracts with fewer than one in ten blacks. The absence of blacks in an area may send a signal to other blacks to avoid that neighborhood (Ellen 2000; Feagin and Sikes 1994) or that they can not financially access the neighborhood. Throughout history, whites have successfully used various racialized messages of "you're not wanted" (Meyer 2001). While whites claim to fear encroachment and a loss of property value, segregated blacks just want equal access and improvement of their living circumstances.

Segregation affects blacks across classes. Some say people are segregated by class and not by race, but blacks' segregation across classes speaks against this (Zubrinisky Charles 2001). Segregation's persistence cannot be attributed to the black middle class moving out. Whether or not class segregation persists, residential segregation between blacks and whites builds. Poverty concentrates into the residential structure of the black community and guarantees that poor blacks have fewer advantages (Massey and Denton 1993). William Clark cited racial preferences and economic factors as accounting for large portions of racial segregation (Clark 1991; Clark 1993). Various authors (e.g. Dreier et al.

2001) have stated that economic factors transcend racial ones when it comes to segregation. To the extent that economic discrimination affects people's lives, it is certainly not exclusive of racial discrimination. Blacks have multiple disadvantages (Krivo and Peterson 1996; Parker and McCall 1999) and are more likely to experience discrimination in economic arenas (Parker and McCall 1999). A study by Yancey Choi (2003) discovered that when asking whites if they would buy a home in a neighborhood with low, moderate, or high black, Hispanic, or Asian percentages, as the non-white population increased, whites were less likely to buy the home, even controlling for crime rate, property value, and educational quality. Race clearly matters. There is a question of the influence of race versus class on issues of crime, employment, wealth, family stability, and education, but with segregation, race clearly has an independent effect.

## 2.2. Hate Crime

From Native American genocide to slavery, and still today, race-based violence is inseparable from the United States' colonialist history. A particularly noteworthy example is lynching, a common practice of whites against blacks dating back to the seventeenth century. Blacks were hanged or burned, beaten, or shot to death, and sometimes also castrated, for such minor offenses as being "saucy" to whites (Petrosino 1999), trying to register to vote, participating in labor union activities (Turner et al. 1982), or, like Emmett Till, having "the nerve to flirt" with a white woman (Orr-Klopfer 2005). The hate crime of today is analogous to the lynching of yesterday (and lynching even still occurs in some instances today) (Tolnay and Beck 1995). Violent sanctioning continues against those who trespass into "white space." Such trespassing may occur when racial minorities attempt to move into places deemed white neighborhoods, white educational institutions, white jobs, or white social spaces. The sentiments expressed through lynching in centuries past are manifested contemporarily through racially motivated hate crime.

In the category of race, *Hate Crime Statistics*, 2006 indicated that blacks were the primary targets of hate crime and whites were the chief perpetrators (United States Department of Justice 2007). Nearly 67 percent of all anti-race hate crime had black victims, although blacks comprise only 12.9 percent of the population, and nearly 60 percent of the known perpetrators were white (United States Department of Justice

2007). The largest percentage of hate crime occurs in neighborhoods in or near residences.

### 2.2.1. Perpetrators

Many people falsely assume that hate groups such as the Ku Klux Klan commit most hate crime (Kennedy 1990; Levin 2002; MacLean 1994; Weller 1998). However, Levin and McDevitt (2001) laid out three hate crime perpetrator typologies, of which the least frequent type of offender is the mission perpetrator or hate group member. The thrill-seeking offender, the next most likely to commit hate crime, attacks people or places on a whim using bias as a selection mechanism. Thrill-seeking perpetrators seek to cause trouble and look for a target (such as a black or gay person) to commit the crime against. The most common offender is the reactionary offender. Reactionary offenders respond to what they see as an intrusion—an intrusion into physical space, social circles, jobs, or even the country (Levin and McDevitt 2002). I posit that reactionary perpetrators are most likely to commit the anti-black hate crime on which this study focuses.

Shanika Williams' case serves as an example of the hate crime discussed here. Ms. Williams, a black woman, moved into an all-white neighborhood with her children and had her home firebombed (Flint 2004). The perpetrators did not have an issue with Ms. Williams herself; they had an issue with Ms. Williams' skin color and anyone else with that skin color that was to move into the neighborhood. While this example may be extreme, it demonstrates the reality for many blacks in majority-white neighborhoods.

The hostility from whites may depend on the degree to which their identity is tied to the composition of their neighborhood (Flint 2004; Levin 2002; Perry 2001). With race-based hate crime, white people are not typically drawn out of their neighborhoods to go kill, harass, or assault blacks in other areas (Levin and McDevitt 2002). Rather, they "defend" their homes. These defenses are in response to "invading" minority group members. Hate manifests itself and is exacerbated when any previously segregated minority group attempts to secure the same resources as the majority group, which this study posits as including the minority family's choice of a neighborhood (Olzak 1992). Whites seek to protect their status, investments, and living environments

by resisting integration of those they see as the embodiment of negativity. Segregation benefits these whites. When we ask why segregation persists we must acknowledge the benefits whites believe it provides them. The opportunities associated with these neighborhoods are known by residents and non-residents alike, and as the population of racial minorities increase in the United States and they attempt to secure a “piece of the pie,” whites may restrict access (Liebersohn 1980).

### 2.2.2. Targets of Hate Crime

Those victimized or potentially victimized by hate crime are referred to as hate crime targets.<sup>2</sup> All racial minorities are potential targets of racially motivated hate crime (Perry 2001).<sup>3</sup> Rarely does the actual target matter. Any member of the attacked group feels vulnerable because the target was chosen based on the target’s presumed group affiliation, not something changeable by the target (Perry 2001). That hate crime has greater physical and emotional impact and attacks an entire community through an individual because of an immutable characteristic is what leads some researchers to explain that hate crimes “hurt more” (Iganski 2001).

### 2.3. Segregation and Hate Crime Together, the Missing Link

Research by the Mumford Center offers informative analyses of segregation and its causes and costs, but fails to include an analysis of violence as a possible precipitator of segregation. This same lack of analysis is found in the Census Bureau’s own report by Iceland and Weinberg (2002), which demonstrates segregation’s continued presence in the United States, and Green, Strolovich and Wong’s study of hate crime and neighborhood population proportions in New York City (1998). To date, no studies analyze segregation and race-based hate crime. Racial segregation and racial violence must be studied in tandem. The hate crime study by Green et al. (1998) is the only one to include population change as a key variable (but it relies only on a select section of New York City and was predicting hate crime, not looking at segregation). The authors’ chief finding was that demographic change may predict racially motivated crime directed at minorities. Flint (2004) explained that maintaining spaces that contain and protect established or desired social relations

is common. I contend that one way to maintain this space is through the use of race-based violence. The segregation levels of neighborhoods matter and are influenced by race-based violence, and this study contributes to the missing research on this topic.

## 3. Theoretical Mechanism

### 3.1. Group Conflict Theory

Group conflict theory (Blau 1977; Bobo 1988; Vold 1985) asserts that groups who must share resources will compete for them. The group that believes it possessed the resources first is likely to attempt to protect them from other groups. Various manifestations of conflict arise from this competition. The theory derives from the principle that any group will attempt to sustain itself by maintaining its place and position in a constantly changing society (Aldrich 1999; Blalock 1957; Blalock 1967; Blau 1977; Collins 1975; Levine and Campbell 1972; Massey and Denton 1987; Meyer 2001; Suttles 1972). Group conflict theory posits that groups see each other as adversarial, and because their resources seem threatened, conflict will arise. In this research, groups are defined as races, and whites are the assumed dominant or primary group.

The proportion of group members of different races is critical regarding conflict in neighborhoods because these distributions determine the likelihood of social interaction between groups (Blau 1977). Racial heterogeneity determines the likelihood of contact between persons of different groups (Wadsworth and Kubrin 2004). “Blau and Blau posit that racial inequality creates strong pressures to commit violence and that this process derives from the inherent contradiction between ascriptive inequality and democratic values” (Wadsworth and Kubrin 2004, 651). The authors were not referring specifically to race-motivated violence, but this logic motivates a study on hate crime and residential segregation.

### 3.2. Defended Neighborhoods Thesis

In a study of hate crime in New York City, Green, Strolovich, and Wong (1998) argued the “defended neighborhoods thesis,” which suggests that in a white neighbor-

<sup>2</sup> Some choose to say “hate crime victim” but I opt for “target.”

<sup>3</sup> And according to federal law anyone, including whites, can be targeted.

hood, residents will defend themselves from non-white newcomers in order to protect their resources, including property value, political power, or simply the maintenance of white homogeneity. This defense, in the form of hate crime, may keep neighborhoods segregated. The defended neighborhoods theory suggests that whites will feel threatened by the presence of racial minorities in their predominantly white neighborhood and hence will defend their neighborhoods in an effort to prevent minorities from moving in or “invading” (Green et al. 1998). Defended neighborhoods thesis applies group conflict theory specifically to an area experiencing demographic change and notes the importance of a dominant group. However, while Green et al. (1998) examined racial population proportion, they did not refer to the vast literature on segregation and therefore did not discuss the social costs of segregation and the compound effects of hate crime on segregation. Using their theoretical basis, this study seeks answers to many of the questions left unasked by Green et al. (1998).

The defended neighborhoods theory (Green et al. 1998) would hypothesize that predominantly white neighborhoods, particularly those experiencing an increase in or a new presence of a minority population, may have more frequent racially motivated crime. In the case of mostly white neighborhoods, an attempted change to the racial homogeneity of the neighborhood may spawn hate crime. Whites see this demographic change and have three options: acceptance, resistance (by joining with other whites to slow the influx of new residents), or self-segregation by moving to whiter areas (Swain 2002). Option two is where hate crime would come in. The defended neighborhoods theory contributes causal propositions for white *fight* (instead of, or before, “white flight”) in neighborhoods experiencing a transition from racial homogeneity. Instead of simply quitting the neighborhood by fleeing, some whites fight the perceived invasion first. When racial minorities move into white neighborhoods, the conflict over housing, schools, businesses, and the accompanying qualities of life may spawn hate crime. The defended neighborhoods theory holds that hate crime committed by whites against racial

minorities would influence racial segregation or racial change, because whites living in residentially homogeneous neighborhoods feel particularly vulnerable in the presence of minority groups, especially blacks, and may choose to employ hate crime to protect their turf. This hate crime may prevent blacks from moving to or staying in neighborhoods deemed “white.” Hate crime sends clear messages to racial minorities that their presence is not wanted in the areas, and hence, hate crime may well aid in the perpetuation of segregation.

#### 4. Data and Methods

Asking if the occurrence and/or number of hate crimes in a city has a statistically significant effect on segregation, the study consisted of a national cross-sectional analysis that examined the relationship between various measures of segregation in cities in 2000 and the occurrence of race-based hate crime and hate crime in general (since hate crime in general may create a climate of intolerance), examining white/black segregation levels. Violent hate crime and sex-based hate crime were tested for their effects on levels of white/black segregation.

##### 4.1. Measures and Models of Segregation

Segregation measures at the city level were obtained from the Lewis Mumford Center. This unit of analysis is consistent with past research (Wadsworth and Kubrin 2004; Parker 1989).<sup>4</sup> The index of dissimilarity has become the standard indicator of racial segregation between pairs of groups within cities with non-Hispanic whites as the reference group (Massey and Denton 1993). The index is calculated for small neighborhood-like areas (census tracts) for which data are available only from decennial U.S. censuses. In any given city, this index examines the extent to which racial and ethnic minority groups are segregated from whites. With a range of 0–100, the dissimilarity index measures the evenness with which whites and the minority group are distributed throughout the neighborhoods, relative to the city as a whole (Iceland and Weinberg 2002). If the city as a whole has a racial distribution of 10 percent black and 90 percent white, then an even distribution in

<sup>4</sup> While cities can also be very heterogeneous, Parker (1989) supports the use of cities over metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) and suggested that

the city was the most appropriate level of aggregation since MSAs can be very heterogeneous.

each neighborhood throughout the city is 10 percent black and 90 percent white. The dissimilarity index calculates the deviation each neighborhood has from the city's 10 percent black and 90 percent white distribution. The dissimilarity index is included as a continuous variable and, using determinations of high, moderate, and low segregation by Massey and Denton (1993) and Iceland and Weinberg (2002), each measure was also constructed into one of three dichotomous variables indicating low, moderate, or high levels of segregation and also an ordinal variable indicating the same.

#### 4.2. Measures of Hate Crime

Hate crime data were obtained from the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) *Hate Crime Statistics* for 1998, 1999, and 2000 and hate crime case data requested from the UCR headquarters.<sup>5</sup> The UCR's *Hate Crime Statistics* report, produced annually since 1993, is the only source of national hate crime data available. Each annual edition of *Hate Crime Statistics* provides data regarding incidents, offenses, victims, and offenders in reported crime motivated in whole or in part by a bias against the victim's perceived race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or disability.<sup>6</sup>

The UCR covers over 95 percent of the United States population (United States Department of Justice 2007). Yet, the UCR data are almost certainly an undercount of hate crime, since extensive validation of hate crimes is required before reporting (Herek and Berrill 1992; Levin and McDevitt 2002). This does not necessarily mean that crimes themselves are going unreported (though many are because of fear of secondary victimization at the hands of law enforcement (Bowling 2003; Herek and Berrill 1992)), but that reported crimes are often not correctly coded as bias crimes (Bell 2002; Nolan, Akiyama, and Berhanu 2002).

Also, many victims of hate crime do not report the incidents to the police and have little confidence that officials can or will do anything to apprehend the persons responsible (Torres 1999). Researchers using UCR data can be confident that they are not overestimating the hate crime problem. The UCR is the most widely used source of crime count information available in the United States.

Given the relative rarity of hate crime, I aggregated data from 1998 to 2000 in order to increase the number of hate crimes with different motives and types of crime, a common practice in crime literature (Morenoff and Sampson 1997; Wadsworth and Kubrin 2004). This was necessary, as creating the measure from fewer years would result in many cities having few or no recorded hate crimes, thus skewing the distribution toward zero.<sup>7</sup> The data were also broken down by type of hate crime, such as anti-race or anti-black, and whether or not the crimes were violent or sexual. The variable of total hate crime occurring in the city was frequently used because a climate of intolerance is created when hate crimes are occurring, which is in line with my theoretical explanation of why this variable is assumed to be a strong predictor of segregation levels. This also provides for a more robust measure.

In other models, specifically anti-black hate crime as opposed to total hate crime was used in order to explore the effects of specifically targeted hate crime numbers. These total and race-specific measures are count measures.<sup>8</sup> A binary variable for whether or not hate crime occurred in a city was also completed to test whether just the occurrence of hate crime can have an effect on segregation as opposed to the degree of hate crime occurring in the city. Additionally, total violent hate crime and sex-based hate crime were explored separately to see if there is a unique effect of these

<sup>5</sup> The UCR program is a city, county, and state law enforcement program that provides a nationwide assessment of crime generated from the submission of statistics by law enforcement agencies throughout the country.

<sup>6</sup> Mandated for five years by the Hate Crime Statistics Act, and permanently mandated by the Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996, annual hate crime statistics are assembled by the U.S. Attorney General from local law enforcement.

<sup>7</sup> Granted, hate crime is not the dependent variable, but aggregating the measure makes it more robust.

<sup>8</sup> For some areas where it appears that no hate crime occurred, one only knows that none were reported. This could reflect a particularly hostile environment where targets fear reporting hate crime or a more tolerant one where hate crime is not occurring.



particularly egregious types of assaults. It was suspected that violent and sex-based hate crime would have larger effects on segregation. Hate crime in general is known to exhibit signs of overkill and tends to be more violent than non-bias assaults (Berk, Boyd, and Hamner 1992; Gerstenfeld 2004; Iganski, Burney, and Institute for Jewish Policy Research 2002; Levin 2002).<sup>9</sup> The level of sexual assaults occurring with hate crime is also higher because of ways that sexual assault motivations can be complicated by a combination of gender and race biases (Gelber 2000; McPhail 2002).

To account for white perpetrators, only measures for hate crime with white perpetrators were initially used, but research shows that a large proportion of unknown race perpetrators are most likely white (Green et al. 1998). Green et al. (1998) used all white and unknown perpetrators as white because there is a correspondence between racially motivated crimes committed by whites and the number committed by known perpetrators. In their study (1998), Green et al. discovered correlations between and only between racially motivated crimes perpetrated by whites and those committed by an unidentified perpetrator (see Table 1 a). For example, the correlation between the number of anti-black crimes committed by whites and the num-

ber committed by unknown offenders was .82 across the sample. The correlation between the number of anti-black incidents committed by Latinos correlated at -.05 with anti-black hate crimes committed by unidentified perpetrators. They discovered that “one cannot reject the null hypothesis that the parameters that generate incidents by white offenders also generate incidents by unknown offenders. The parameters themselves look very similar after the data are disaggregated by perpetrator, although the smaller number of incidents in each perpetrator category makes for greater sampling variability” (Green et al. 1998, 382). Like Green et al. (1998), I ran a sensitivity analysis, and in order to maximize the precision with which I estimate my models, I focused my attention on all incidents involving white or unknown perpetrators (see Table 1 b). Note that

**Table 1a: Table of correlations between racially motivated crimes with known and unknown perpetrators, from Green et al. (1998, 382)**

Race of known perpetrators	Incidence of racially motivated crime committed by unknown perpetrators		
	Black victims	Latino/a victims	Asian victims
White	.82*	.66*	.82*
Black	-	-.12	.07
Latino/a	-.05	-	.03
Asian	-.07	.00	-

N = 51

\* Significant at  $p < .05$ . Entries are Pearson correlations. The .82 correlation in the upper left-hand corner depicts the statistical association between the number of anti-black attacks by unknown perpetrators and the number of anti-black attacks by white perpetrators.

**Table 1b: Pearson correlations between racially motivated crimes with known and unknown perpetrators**

Race of known perpetrators	Incidence of racially motivated crime committed by unknown perpetrators		
	Black victims	Latino/a victims	Asian victims
White	.75 **	.612**	.71*
Black	-	.07	.08
Latino/a	-.06	-	.06
Asian	-.02	.01	-

N = 12,852

\*  $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$

this does not come into play with all hate crime variables. Other studies recommend not separating out the race of the perpetrator since the majority of perpetrators are white; the environment of intolerance that hate crime creates may also be more important than making sure each perpetrator was white. Total hate crime, for instance, is all hate crime, regardless of perpetrator, as explained earlier.

#### 4.3. Control Variables

Information on demographic and structural characteristics of each city comes from the 2000 Census. The measures

<sup>9</sup> Overkill means additionally desecrating the target by using more violence than would have been necessary just to injure or kill.

include the following classes of variables described below: population by race, economic characteristics (including median income, percentage of female-headed households, and poverty rate), workforce characteristics (including unemployment rate and percentage in the manufacturing industry), mobility, and geographic location (what region in the country the city is located) (see Table 2).<sup>10</sup>

Population variables controlled for the percentage of blacks in the overall population of the city. According to the threat hypothesis (Blalock 1967) as well as the theoretical grounding of this study, the larger the proportion of the population that is black, the more likely are discrimination against blacks and segregation. This variable has been included in other models but is not always found significant. I also used the percentage of whites in all models.

As a measure of the neighborhood instability used in many studies, this study controlled for the percentage of female-headed households.<sup>11</sup> Economic and employment control variables, including income, poverty rate, unemployment rate, and percentage of the workforce in manufacturing are signs of white economic vulnerability and were held constant. Median income was used in previous research and found significant (Farley and Frey 1994). With respect to labor market participation, researchers have suggested that higher rates of labor market involvement can lead to more opportunities for interracial interactions (Messner and South 1992). The variable “percentage of the workforce in the manufacturing sector” was used in other segregation research and was found highly significant as theorized by Wilson (1987). This study controlled for geographic region using the four-region approach (United States Census Bureau 2004) as done by other researchers on segregation

**Table 2: Basic statistics and correlations, white/black dissimilarity models**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. WBDISSIM	1.00	.319**	-.235**	-.237**	.961**	.324**	.241**	-.537**	.591**	-.375**
2. TOTHC		1.00	-.111	-.092	.300**	-.109	.115**	.035	.114	-.122
3. PCWHITE			1.00	.274**	-.188**	-.047	-.165*	-.157	-.585**	.069
4. MOBIL				1.00	-.302**	.125	-.225**	.191**	-.259**	-.165**
5. PMFAMU					1.00	.271**	.277**	-.549**	-.267**	-.323**
6. SOUTH						1.00	-.213**	-.589**	.106	-.263**
7. NEAST							1.00	-.320**	.401**	-.032
8. WEST								1.00	-.329**	.109
9. DISADVAN									1.00	-.267**
10. WBDISS90										1.00
X	41.56	66.93	54.1	52.82	.075	.2802	.10	.47	0	45.39
SD	17.89	164.52	20.4	6.41	.036	.45	.31	.50	1	19.46

\*\*p < .01 \*\*\*p < .001

Variable abbreviations:

WBDISSIM: white/black dissimilarity in the city; TOTHC: total hate crime in the city; PCWHITE: percent white population in the city; MOBIL: measure of mobility in the city; PMFAMU: percent population employed in manufacturing sector; SOUTH: 1 if city located in the southern United States; NEAST: 1 if city located in the northeastern United States; WEST: 1 if city located in the western United States; DISADVAN: disadvantage index variable; WBDISS90: white/black dissimilarity measure from 1990 Census.

<sup>10</sup> These data were compiled previously into an SPSS database by Dr. Charis Kubrin, and this database was used for a study on suicide in black youth (Kubrin et al. 2006).

<sup>11</sup> Though I also recognize that merely not having a man in the house does not indicate an unstable household and there are many ways in which this measure is biased.

(Cutler, Glaeser, and Vigdor 1999; Frey and Farley 1996; Ovadia 2003).

All variables were checked for multicollinearity prior to running regression models. After running collinearity diagnostics, and guided by previous research (Messner and Golden 1992; Parker and McCall 1999; Wadsworth and Kubrin 2004), I determined that including many of these variables as independent predictors in the models would add significant bias due to the high correlations between them.<sup>12</sup>

Another approach for exploring the causal process by which hate crime influences segregation is to examine the influence of these characteristics on whether or not an area is segregated (binary dependent variable) and also to what level it is segregated (ordinal dependent variable for low, moderate, or high segregation). Logistic regression was used because ordinary least squares assumes a normal distribution that includes numbers other than 0 and 1, the only choices for our binary dependent variable (Menard 1995). The logistic model, unlike the continuous model, does not envision a steady and even change in segregation. According to the rules of multiple regression, a one-degree change in hate crime has the same effect on segregation whether the hate crime occurrences increase from 1 to 2 or from 200 to 201. Because the continuous model hides some of these effects, we can tease out extremes better in the logistic models.

Ordinal logistic regression performs a similar function to logistic though it allows for white/black dissimilarity with the choices of low, moderate, and high.<sup>13</sup>

#### 4.4. Analysis Plan

This study posits that segregation is a function of hate crime such that:<sup>14</sup>

$$\text{segregation} = f(\text{Hate crime, control variables})$$

$$\text{segregation level} = \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{hatecrime}} \text{hatecrime} + \beta_{\text{control}} \text{controlvariables} + \mu$$

Clearly there is a dynamic process at work between hate crime and segregation. But there may well be a reciprocal relationship between hate crime and segregation, where the segregation produced by hate crime keeps blacks and whites separated and further exacerbates the lack of understanding and fear that whites have of blacks. Because of these effects, which are a result of segregation, segregation in turn may lead to hate crime because whites do not understand and do not have exposure to blacks. When minorities move into a white neighborhood, whites receive exposure to those whom segregation has heretofore kept isolated (Massey 1995). This possible reciprocal relationship is taken into account in the study. Hate crime is suspected of being endogenous with the error term because of a potential reciprocal relationship between segregation and hate crime. In order to handle the autocorrelation suspected in this model, I used an earlier segregation measure as a lag variable.<sup>15</sup> The method of using a lag variable can account for reciprocity. Using 1990 segregation measures is a way to account for this reciprocal relationship by acknowledging that 1990 segregation has a large effect on 2000 segregation levels (because the best predictor of future segregation is past segregation). Lagging the variable is also grounded in theory: the measurable difference in the segregation of the area related to hate crime would be captured in the lag variable instead of remaining in the error term of the model (Green, Glaser, and Rich 1998).

<sup>12</sup> I also tested many interaction variables reported in the findings. To control for multicollinearity in the interaction variables, I used centered measures of each variable (meaning the mean is set to 0) and then multiplied the centered independent variables.

<sup>13</sup> This ordinal variable was predicted using SPSS PLUM (Borooah 2001) and Ordinal Logit in STATA (which occasionally reports coefficients with the same sign though different magnitude than SPSS).

<sup>14</sup> This study used SPSS 13.0 for logistic, ordinal, and multiple linear regressions. STATA was also used on logistic regressions because its algorithm may more accurately predict coefficients for logistic regressions but found no significant differences.

<sup>15</sup> A lag variable was developed so that the ordinary least squares estimates would not be biased and inconsistent.

**5. Findings**

Findings of this study demonstrate a significant relationship between hate crime and segregation.<sup>16</sup> Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for all variables used in the analyses are presented in Table 2. All cities have populations of greater than 95,000 and a mean of 350,000. Segregation levels as measured by the dissimilarity index for white/black were the dependent variables in all models. Each score represents the segregation score for a city based on population totals of census tracts in 2000. The mean segregation score is 41.6 (white/black dissimilarity). The average three-year counts for hate crime in each city are 66.93 (all hate crime), 26.02 (anti-race), and 20.24 (anti-black). The average racial distribution of the cities is 14.76 percent black (compared to the national average of 12.3 percent ), 21.11 percent Hispanic (12.9 percent), 7.34 percent Asian (3.6 percent), and 54.1 percent white. Of the 177 cities, 46.7 percent are located

in the western region, 28 percent in the southern region, 14.8 percent in the central region and 10.4 percent in the eastern region.

Consistent with existing research, disadvantage-related variables were highly associated with one another and loaded on the same factor in factor analysis. The means of the variables that comprise the black disadvantage index were as follows: percentage of the population that is living in poverty (14.77); percentage unemployed (6.77); percentage of the population that is black (14.76);<sup>17</sup> percentage of female-headed households (19.89); median family income (\$49,647); and percentage of the population 25 or older with a high school diploma or more (79.32), as shown in Table 3.<sup>18</sup> Specifically, principal components analysis was performed using the varimax rotation method.<sup>19</sup> Factor analysis of these variables yielded one factor with an eigenvalue above the conventional thresh-

**Table 3: Correlations of variables in factor analysis for black disadvantage**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. % population living in poverty	1.00	.807**	.484**	.716**	-.807**	-.609**
2. % population unemployed		1.00	.536**	.715**	-.703**	-.695**
3. % population that is black			1.00	.807**	.455**	-.215**
4. % female-headed household				1.00	-.652**	-.387**
5. Median family income					1.00	.623**
6. % of the 25+ population with a high school diploma or more						1.00
X	14.77	6.77	14.76	19.89	49646.84	79.32
SD	5.87	2.50	15.33	11.02	11975.65	9.27

\*\*p < .01

<sup>16</sup> All reported results for white/black segregation are only for models where performing hierarchical regression and adding the hate crime variable increased the R<sup>2</sup> of the model. Tests were run in three iterations. Iteration 1 included the dependent variable and all control variables. Iteration 2 added the lag variable. Iteration 3 added the hate crime variable.

<sup>17</sup> Percentage of the population that is black is included in the index because of the strong loading exhibited by this variable.

<sup>18</sup> I checked for skewness in all variables. For all variables, outliers were searched for with the intent of excluding outliers where appropriate, but since this did not significantly affect any of the models, outliers were included.

<sup>19</sup> The varimax rotation method is a method of orthogonal rotation that simplifies the factor structure by maximizing the variable of a column of the pattern matrix.

old of 1.00 (as shown in Table 4), which generated one index that captures disadvantage for my models measuring white/black segregation. The factor, labeled disadvantage, had an eigenvalue of 4.113 and exhibited high loadings (factor loadings follow in parentheses) for percentage of the population living in poverty (.904), total percentage unemployed (.905), percentage of the population that is black (.696), percentage of female-headed households (.865), median family income (-.863), and percentage of the population 25 or older with a high school diploma (-.707). Using factor analysis greatly reduces levels of collinearity among the independent variables and addresses

**Table 4: Varimax rotated factor patterns (loadings > .60) in 180 U. S. cities; black disadvantage index**

Variable	Factor loading
Black disadvantage index	
% population living in poverty	.904
% population unemployed	.905
% population that is black	.696
% female-headed households	.865
Median family income	.863
% of the 25+ population with a high school diploma or more	.707
Eigenvalue: 4.113	
Percent variance explained: 68.553	

many of the data analysis and statistical inference problems.

Table 5 shows which factors are significantly associated with white/black segregation as measured through the dissimilarity index. Looking first at 1990 segregation, as in most models, nothing predicted 2000 segregation levels better than 1990 segregation measures (WBDISS90) with a beta of .902 ( $p < .001$ ). Due to the inclusion of 1990 segregation levels, these models can be deemed conservative, and yet for those where hate crime is significant, we can be sure there is a hate crime effect due to the increase in the R2 of the model. Our independent variable of interest, hate crime, as a measure of all hate crime that occurred in the city, is significant ( $p < .05$ ) and positive. In contrast, while one would expect the disadvantage

**Table 5: Multiple regression models 1**

Variable	White/black dissimilarity		
	Total hate crime variable	Anti-black hate crime variable	Yes/no hate crime variable
Disadvantage index	-.733 (.587)	-.832 (.584)	-.902 (.576)
Mobility	13.148* (6.245)	12.742* (6.276)	14.325* (6.299)
Northeastern city	-1.740 (1.448)	-1.596 (1.449)	-1.526 (1.461)
Southern city	.742 (1.268)	.759 (1.274)	.421 (1.264)
Western city	-2.747* (1.323)	-2.668* (1.324)	-2.442 (1.324)
% population in manufacturing sector	-35.023** (11.125)	-35.914** (11.148)	-32.774** (11.025)
White % of the population	-9.777*** (2.564)	-10.049*** (2.565)	-10.014*** (2.524)
White/black dissimilarity in 1990	.829*** (.028)	.833*** (.028)	.853*** (.026)
Hate crime variable	.005* (.002)	.017* (.009)	5.742** (2.130)
CONSTANT	5.978 (4.287)	6.194 (4.315)	-1.266 (4.208)
Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.929	.939	.937
	* $p < .05$	** $p < .01$	*** $p < .001$

Entries are unstandardized coefficients followed by standard error in parentheses. Note: All variables are measured at the city level. Mobility is the measure of mobility in the city.

variable to be significant in predicting segregation, it is not ( $p = .214$ ). This may be because of the 1990 segregation level effects. The percentage of the population that is in the manufacturing sector is significant and negative. Mobility (percentage of the population that moved in the last five years) was significant and positive. Examining the role of region, with central left out for comparison, location in the west region significantly decreased segregation. The model explained 94 percent of the variance. In sum, cities with higher rates of hate crime, greater mobility, more whites, segregation in 1990, and a location in the northeast or south region had higher levels of white/black dissimilarity.

For models altering the hate crime measure from all hate crime to hate crime against the specific group for which segregation is being measured, 94 percent of the variance was explained. Hate crime, measured as all anti-black hate crime, was significant and positive, indicating that the more hate crime that occurs, the higher the dissimilarity index or the more segregated the city. The 1990 dissimilarity level was highly significant and positive with a beta of .905. Disadvantage was again not significant. Percentage white was highly significant and negative, as was percentage of the population in the manufacturing sector. West was significant and negative in comparison with the central region. Mobility was significant and positive. For cities with higher hate crime, greater mobility, lower percentages in the manufacturing sector, lower percentage white, segregation in 1990, and located in the northeast or south, white/black dissimilarity was likely to be higher.

When hate crime is operationalized as a dummy variable for whether or not hate crime occurred in the city (1 = yes, 0 = no) we see that the occurrence of hate crime affects levels of black/white segregation. For the white/black dissimilarity index model, the hate crime dummy variable was significant and positive, as was 1990 dissimilarity, percentage white, and mobility, while the percentage in the manufacturing sector was significant and negative. Disadvantage and region remained not significant. This indicates that in cities where hate crime occurs and the percentage of whites is higher, the percentage in the manufacturing sector is lower, and there is more mobility, then white/black dissimilarity will likely be higher.

In Table 6 hate crimes are operationalized to specifically mean sex-based hate crime or violent hate crime. This was done because these particularly egregious hate crimes may have varying effects on degrees of segregation. For white/black dissimilarity, sex-based hate crime was significant and positive. The dissimilarity measure for 1990 was significant and positive. Percentage in manufacturing and percentage white were both significant and negative. Violent hate crimes were borderline significant ( $p = .065$ ) and positive when predicting white/black dissimilarity. The dissimilarity measure for 1990 was significant and positive while percentage in manu-

facturing and percentage white were both significant and negative. For both an increase in violent hate crime and sex-based hate crime, cities with higher 1990 segregation

**Table 6: Multiple regression models 2**

Variable	White/black dissimilarity	
	Sex-based hate crime variable	Violent hate crime variable
Disadvantage index	- 1.128 (.652)	-.945 (.662)
Mobility	10.109 (7.096)	11.059 (7.070)
Northeastern city	-.930 (1.665)	-1.796 (1.649)
Southern city	.929 (1.414)	.930 (1.417)
Western city	-1.882 (1.415)	-2.486* (1.416)
% population in manufacturing sector	-34.460** (12.680)	-32.157 (12.677)
White % of the population	-9.627** (2.803)	-9.605** (2.809)
White/black dissimilarity in 1990	.851*** (.029)	.839*** (.031)
Hate crime variable	2.220* (1.135)	.007^ (.004)
CONSTANT	6.203 (4.857)	6.299 (4.686)
Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	.9367	.936

^p < .07 \*p < .05 \*\*p < .01 \*\*\*p < .001

Entries are unstandardized coefficients followed by standard error in parentheses. Note: All variables are measured at the city level. Mobility is the measure of mobility in the city.

rates, lower percentages of whites, and lower percentages of workers in the manufacturing sector were likely to be more highly segregated. Disadvantage was not significant in either model.

While we lose some explanatory power in a binary dependent variable model, it does demonstrate that in the extremes, hate crime affects segregation. Table 6 demonstrates the likelihood of high white/black dissimilarity through logistic regression. When measuring

high white/black dissimilarity, the model chi-square was 80.729 ( $N=178$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Total hate crime was significant and positive, as was disadvantage, and mobility and percentage in the manufacturing sector were significant and negative. A one-unit increase in hate crime results in a 267-percent increase in the odds of high white/black segregation ( $.267=1-\exp(.009)$ ).

The model in Table 7 also measures the likelihood of low white/black dissimilarity. When predicting low white/black dissimilarity, the model chi-square was 121.070 and  $-2 \log$  likelihood is 108.188. Pseudo  $R^2$  is .682 ( $N=178$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Hate crime was significant and negative, indicating that a one-unit increase in hate crime led to a decrease in the likelihood of low segregation by 3.1 percent; this means that segregation was likely to be higher rather than lower when hate crime was occurring. Disadvantage was significant and negative, as were the percentage in the manufacturing sector and the west region compared with the central region.

Now I will discuss ordinal regression, for the model in Table 8, estimating the level of white/black dissimilarity. When hate crime was operationalized as anti-black hate crime, the effect on segregation was significant and positive, indicating that the likelihood of white/black dissimilarity increases with the occurrence of anti-black hate crime. White/black dissimilarity also increases with an increase in disadvantage, a decrease in the percentage in the manufacturing sector, an increase in mobility, and the city's location in the western region of the United States. Hate crime was also significant and positive when operationalized as total violent hate crimes. With this model, disadvantage was also significant and positive.

In sum, my findings suggest that among the measures that have been hypothesized to influence segregation, hate crime, but not disadvantage, was an important predictor of segregation in U.S. cities in 2000. Cities with high rates of hate crime had significantly higher levels of segregation, controlling for other factors. However, the findings also suggest that the effect of previous segregation on continuing segregation is due to the masked disadvantage contained therein.

**Table 7: Logistic regression models: high and low white/black dissimilarity**

Variable	High white/black Dissimilarity	Low white/black Dissimilarity
	Total hate crime variable	Total hate crime variable
	b	b
	S.E.	S.E.
	Exp (b)	Exp (b)
Disadvantage index	1.470**	-.958*
	.508	.473
	4.350	.384
Mobility	-16.195**	2.341
	6.184	5.154
	.000	10.387
Northeastern city	-1.743	1.415
	1.103	1.608
	.175	4.118
Southern city	.583	2.034
	.907	1.329
	1.792	7.648
Western city	-2.324^	5.031***
	1.227	1.401
	.098	153.310
% population in manufacturing sector	-26.346*	34.334***
	12.631	9.584
	.000	8.14 E+14
White % of the population	1.301	3.541
	2.386	2.083
	1.009	34.512
White/black dis- similarity in 1990	009**	-.032***
	.003	.010
	3.672	.969
CONSTANT	7.155	-9.013
	3.507	3.184
	1280.610	.000
$\chi^2$	80.729	121.07
P	.000	.000
-2 LL	80.369	108.188
Pseudo $R^2$	.613	.682

^p < .07      \*p < .05   \*\*p < .01  
 \*\*\*p < .001

Note: All variables are measured at the city level. Mobility is the measure of mobility in the city.

**Table 8: Logistic ordinal regression models**

Variable	White/black dissimilarity level	
	Anti-black hate crime variable	Violent hate crime variable
Disadvantage index	1.238*** (.322)	1.307*** (.343)
Mobility	-7.754* (3.548)	-4.813 (3.738)
Northeastern city	-1.428 (.819)	-1.424 (.869)
Southern city	-.146 (.686)	.029 (.737)
Western city	-2.976*** (.721)	-2.970*** (.745)
% population in manufacturing sector	-29.529*** (7.029)	-27.690*** (7.359)
White % of the population	-.426 (1.398)	-.058 (1.449)
Hate crime	.038*** (.010)	.015*** (.004)
WBDISSLV=0	-8.771 (2.211)	-7.005 (2.317)
WBDISSLV=1	-4.230 (2.087)	-2.382 (2.203)
$\chi^2$	157.960	131.894
P	.000	.000
-2 LL	203.310	178.664
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	.437	.425

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .001

Entries are unstandardized coefficients followed by standard error in parentheses.

**6. Discussion**

The aim of this study was to examine whether hate crime levels affected segregation levels. Prior research has found that the proportion of non-whites in an area most likely influences the level of hate crime (Green et al. 1998), but has not investigated the reverse role that race-based violence plays in segregation. This study questioned whether the defended neighborhoods thesis held true and whites defended their neighborhoods from racial minorities with hate crime. In short, whether segregation is influenced by hate crime and race-based

violence influences where racial minorities can and cannot live.

We see a clear effect of race-based violence on the segregation of blacks from whites. The 1990 segregation level was often the strongest predictor of white/black segregation, as expected. Despite the large effect previous segregation had, we learn that the bias violence occurring in a city affects the segregation level between whites and blacks. Hate crime in general in the city increased the segregation level, as did hate crime specifically targeting blacks. Even controlling for the previous segregation measure, which added robustness to the model, we see the importance of the effects of race-based hate crime. Although the relationship is not particularly strong, as hate crime increases, white/black segregation increases. Blacks are most likely forced to quit neighborhoods where hate violence is occurring; whites may eventually quit the neighborhood, but in most cases it will be after white flight (hate crime). Presumably whites want to hold on to “their” neighborhood and identity. Because the dissimilarity index indicates how dissimilar census tracts are from the city overall and uses whites as the reference group, any increase in dissimilarity indicates more blacks in some census tracts than were there before, particularly since whites are not likely to easily abandon their neighborhoods. Whites are more likely to move after racial minorities have established a certain level of presence in the neighborhood if the area was previously homogeneously white. Cities with more hate crime have higher white/black dissimilarity.

With white/black segregation it may be the fact that race-based violence is occurring at all, more than to what degree it occurs, that affects where people live since the hate crime dummy variable had a strong relationship with white/black dissimilarity. When hate crime occurs at all, it causes an increase in the white/black dissimilarity index. We see a stronger relationship between the occurrence of any hate crime and segregation than any other controlling variable. With the history of race-based violence against blacks, the message may be sent to blacks that “there is more crime where that came from”; for black residents, even one hate crime happening does not seem like an outlier, because it rarely is. There is an extensive history of anti-black violence used to control blacks. If segregation increases when any



hate crime occurs and even more so the more hate crime happens, then census tracts become more dissimilar to the racial proportions of the city as a whole, which suggests that blacks do not move out of the city but to another census tract in the same city. The census tracts they moved to and the ones they moved from both become more dissimilar from the overall city proportions.

While black residents may choose to move, even if they have some agency in determining where they move, the term of “voluntary choice” in moving is not appropriate here. Some researchers argue free choice in the neighborhood decisions of blacks (Patterson 1997; Thernstrom and Thernstrom 1997), but how is there free choice when one may be moving to avoid race-based crime? Blacks’ moving may be due to fear of and intimidation by whites. These factors, which are push factors, may be stronger than the pull factors of black neighborhoods. And the existing pull factors may be rooted in the reason for leaving the more white area – there will be less race-based violence against blacks in areas with more black residents, mostly because there are fewer whites. We would not expect whites to travel to largely black neighborhoods to commit hate crime. Whites are expected to commit hate crime to push minorities into neighborhoods deemed “minority neighborhoods,” which often have higher levels of economic and educational disadvantage.

Sex-based hate crime and violent hate crime lead to more white/black dissimilarity. Sex-based hate crimes are strongly related to white/black dissimilarity. The particularly heinous nature of these crimes appears more likely to cause segregation. There may be increased desperation to avoid these crimes. Sex-based crimes function to demonstrate power over the (usually female) victim in a highly racialized way, harkening back to times of slavery. The message tends to be one of race and gender in the symbolism of the sexual entitlement of the white man (Healey 2003; McPhail 2002). This demonstrates the intersectionality at work in hate violence (meaning that race or gender, for instance, rarely operate independently), an area needing more research. The expected psychological effects on victims, families, and communities are even higher for sex-based hate crime than for other hate crime.

Violent hate crimes also increase white/black segregation, although the increase is not as strong and significance is borderline. These crimes of assault and homicide tend to show signs of excessive violence and are also rare. The low effect may be due to the level of harassment that typically leads up to violent hate crime; this harassment may have already motivated people to move. This is important to consider. Since harassment is less likely reported to the police, and intimidation, if reported, is rarely classified as hate crime this could contribute to lower coefficients in some models.

Hate crime increases the likelihood of high white/black dissimilarity. Hate crime does not just mean that the segregation level may rise, as indicated in the continuous measure, but the occurrence actually increases the potential for *highly segregated areas*. This is important to understanding how hate-based violence functions and builds strength for the arguments made earlier based on the models with continuous measures of segregation. Similarly, when lower numbers of hate crimes occur, there is an increased likelihood of low segregation. This seems to point to one possible method that will assist in integrating our cities: decrease the hate crime levels. Similarly, when examining the likelihood of having low, moderate, or high white/black dissimilarity, anti-black hate crime and violent hate crime in particular increase the likelihood of an increase in categories of segregation. The violence and direct targeting of these hate crimes cause extreme increases in segregation levels.

When hate crime occurs, white/black segregation increases. Hate crime also increases the likelihood of categorical jumps in segregation, rather than increases of just a few percentage points. Hate crime clearly has an effect on controlling the living choices and options of blacks, and in pushing them into greater disadvantage.

What becomes evident from this study is that blacks continue to be a highly disfavored group in America. Blacks are disproportionately targeted for hate crime and feel the effects in their neighborhoods more than Latinos/as or Asians. But why is this? One reason is that in a racist country, darkness of skin and a history of white racism targeting blacks makes blacks acceptable victims to those who might

commit hate crime. There is symbolism in the desecration of black bodies linked to a colonialist history. Blacks are the most dehumanized of racial minority groups and, although nowadays vocal vehement racism may be frowned upon in society, this does not stop the actions related to such racism from happening.

Neighborhood identity and home ownership have historically been symbols of “making it in America” (Crump 2004). Crump explained that, “The efforts of African Americans to breach the boundaries of the urban ghettos and end housing segregation threatened the sense of white racial identity reflected in home ownership” (2004, 229). In homogeneous white neighborhoods the presence of blacks may symbolize a threat to life as whites know it. While in urban areas the chance of criminal victimization for blacks is already great, the threat of violence from hate crime makes their risk even greater. Because of the belief that blacks are violent, segregation gives whites a strong incentive to maintain the status quo and perpetuate the black ghetto for fear of such violence. The irony is that some whites use the very criminality and violence they fear, in the form of hate crime, to keep blacks segregated. Clearly blacks, Hispanics, and Asians are not segregated in the same way nor are they affected by hate crime in the same way, but this racialized violence still influences where both groups can live. The most recent national hate crime statistics available (for 2004) document the continuation of race-based violence and the predominance of crimes against blacks (See Table 1b). But violence against Hispanic and Asians at the hands of whites still functions to influence where people live.

### 6.1. Theory Implications

Studies have suggested that hate crime will be most frequent when minorities constitute a small share of the population (Green et al. 1998). While this may seem contrary to the threat hypothesis, it may be that whites perceive a threat no matter how many individuals from racial minorities are present. It may also be key to investigate how long the minority and white populations have resided in a neighborhood; the timing of minority arrival may be more important than the numbers of new arrivals, but my study cannot measure this. The defended neighborhoods thesis posited that whites would attempt to maintain white homo-

geneity by defending themselves from non-white incomers. This thesis acknowledges the importance of a threat to white homogeneity. It also predicts that hate crime may diminish when significant numbers of minorities move into a neighborhood. The models did not allow for measuring the exact time that the minority population arrived in the city, though the models do document an accelerated relationship between hate crime against blacks and segregation of blacks. Between whites’ choices of acceptance, resistance, or leaving the neighborhood, whites rarely choose the acceptance option unless the city already contains segregated areas. We can say that the occurrence of hate crime appears to cause more segregation, and although a city-level test cannot determine this, I predict that the hate crimes are occurring in census tracts with more white residents in an effort to cluster the minorities into census tracts away from whites. Hate crime leading to more dissimilar census tracts within a city and less exposure of whites to minorities seems to support this argument. Whites defend their neighborhoods from minorities with hate crime and hence increase segregation.

In terms of group conflict theory, in a city that is highly segregated and in a census tract within that city that is mostly white or all white, white residents may feel less threatened by the presence of very few non-whites than they would in an area that has a markedly increasing number of non-whites. When whites are newly exposed to minority residents, particularly if it is more than one new household, they begin to feel threatened and may use hate crime as their weapon of choice. Whites may react and try to prevent future increases in the non-white population. White flight does in fact happen. We see that hate crime targeting specific racial groups influences segregation levels, but so does hate crime in general. Racial minorities can get messages in school, at work, at play, and at home to indicate white disdain for their presence. More research, particularly qualitative research, is needed on this topic.

### 7. Future Research and Conclusions

This study seeks to marry two literatures previously separated from one another. Segregation disproportionately affects blacks and has consequences beyond the location of housing. This research asked about the unique ways these racial minorities may experience hate crime and segrega-

tion. The segregation literature neglects the role of race-based violence, and neighborhood population composition is rarely incorporated into hate crime discussions. Understanding the role violence plays in perpetuating segregation will lead to a more complete understanding of the dynamics of segregation and continued white racism by which blacks are prevented by whites from achieving social standing. This study breaks the silence in the literature on the ways segregation and hate crime interact.

This national cross-sectional analysis examines the relationship between various measures of segregation in cities in 2000 and the occurrence of race-based hate crime and hate crime in general, examining white/black segregation levels, operationalized as the dissimilarity index. Data used in this study are the best-available and most widely used. Models take into account the nuances of hate crime and segregation measures. The models in this study are conservative: where they demonstrate a hate crime effect we can be certain this does exist.

Continued and expanded research is needed in the area of hate crime and segregation. In-depth interviews with hate crime perpetrators will provide additional insight into the motivations behind hate violence. Interviews with perpetrators should involve those who vandalized property as well as those who committed homicide so researchers can tease out the real motivations at multiple levels of such violence. Measures of how much the perpetrator values a homogeneous white neighborhood should be investigated to determine whether whites are consciously committing hate violence with the intent of removing racial minorities and whether perpetrators intended to make minorities fear for their safety. Additionally, we could discover to what degree minority movement is due to fearing for their safety.

Future studies should also explore additional populations such as women, American Indians, Jews, same-sex couples, and transgendered individuals, who may experience violence based on their new presence in neighborhoods,

schools, and/or jobs. In addition, looking at smaller cities could enable an additional assessment of factors not readily apparent when only looking at large cities.

Clearly, race is still a salient issue in this country, and the violent manipulation tools of the pre-civil rights era are still being used in an attempt to keep the master's home and neighborhood free of racial minorities. Hate crime, alone and in combination with other factors, assists in limiting the residential opportunities of racial minorities in U.S. cities. Blacks clearly remain a highly disfavored group, experiencing a strong relationship between hate crime and segregation and being disproportionately targeted for hate crime more than any other group. We also notice that hate crime is patterned. Hate crime is not a random act by a lone individual (even if it looks like it is). Hate crime is strongly tied to location and intrinsically linked to the social forces of the neighborhood. Because of this we may be able to predict in the future where hate crime might occur.

While the magnitude of my effects may not be large, the important point is that clearly there is a relationship between hate crime and segregation.<sup>20</sup> There are limits to the claims I can make from the data but there are clear correlations. A previously undocumented relationship, between hate crime and segregation, has been documented. Although my study does not measure the social psychological assumptions in which group conflict theory and the defended neighborhoods thesis are grounded, it contributes to the debate by attempting to provide an alternative explanation for changes in segregation in cities. Most important for this study was that segregation and hate crime variables clearly are related and provide us with an interesting finding. Given that the theory grounding this study also points us to a relationship where hate crime influences segregation, it would be even harder to make a reverse causal relationship argument.

We cannot suggest ending segregation without acknowledging the important role played by race-based violence in

10. While one may wonder how I can posit that hate crime is happening in the same places segregation is increasing, it is important to remember that research documents that hate crime is

committed close to home (Flint 2004; Perry 2002, 2001). It is therefore plausible that hate crime is occurring in places that people live.

perpetuating segregation. Race matters in neighborhoods. It matters who is subjected to violence and persistent disadvantage. All-white neighborhoods must not represent the pinnacle of success for whites and drive them to be so determined to maintain this privilege that they use race-based violence to segregate minorities.

Nowhere is the use of hate crimes to maintain racial superiority and spatial separation more obvious than in the residential structure of the U.S. city. African Americans move beyond existing racial boundaries and are met with violent opposition. As documented in the background, racial violence was initially viewed as a *cause* of segregation along with formal real estate methods and policy strategies. Now, such violence can be viewed as *assisting in maintaining* segregation. This research has documented that hate violence and/or intimidation play/s a role in neighborhood defense. We know that hate crime intimidates racial minorities, affects entire communities beyond the initial victims, has long-lasting effects, creates fear within and even of a community, and contributes to an environment of racial hostility, so it makes sense that hate crime would cause further segregation of racial minorities and perpetuate homogeneous white areas.

Hate crime is not a random act; it is part of a pattern of discrimination and deprivation unleashed on our nation's minorities. While some racial minorities do choose minority neighborhoods, we do not know how often racial minorities are concerned about racially motivated violence, only that it exists and affects segregation. Ignoring the role of violence in studies of segregation is a disservice to all involved. While many may not want to admit that race-based violence is a continuing problem, we see from this research that it is.

“So long as black ghettos exist, entombing black souls within their pathology, white Americans will fear the entry of blacks, *any blacks*, into their communities. And so long as that is the case, America's black-white problem will continue to afflict the nation” (Polikoff 2006, 390). The fear which Polikoff reminds us of is what motivates hate violence in our communities and continues the segregation of blacks. As we work to decrease hate crime, increase opportunities and remove the concentrated disadvantage of segregation, we can move in the direction of a nation that truly has liberty and justice for all.

## References

- Aldrich, H. E. 1999. *Organizations Evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bell, J. 2002. *Policing Hatred: Law Enforcement, Civil Rights, and Hate Crime*. New York: New York University Press.
- Berk, R. A., E. A. Boyd, and K. M. Hamner. 1992. Thinking More Clearly about Hate-Motivated Crimes. In *Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men*, ed. G. M. Herrick and K. T. Berrill. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Blalock, H. M. 1957. Per Cent Non-White and Discrimination in the South. *American Sociological Review* 22:677–82.
- Blalock, R. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Blau, P. M. 1977. *Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Societal Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Bobo, L. 1988. Group Conflict, Prejudice, and the Paradox of Contemporary Racial Attitudes. In *Eliminating Racism*, ed. P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor. New York: Plenum Press.
- Bobo, L., H. Schuman, and C. Steeh. 1986. Changing Racial Attitudes Toward Residential Integration. In *Housing Desegregation and Federal Policy*, ed. J. M. Goering. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Borooah, Van Kant. 2001. *Logit and Probit: Ordered and Multinomial Models, Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences* 138. London: Sage Publications.
- Bowling, Benjamin. 2003. Racial Harassment and the Process of Victimization: Conceptual and Methodological Implications for the Local Crime Survey. In *Hate and Bias Crime: A Reader*, ed. Barbara Perry, 61–76. New York: Routledge.
- Charles, C. Z. 2001. Processes of Racial Residential Segregation. In *Urban Inequality: Evidence from Four Cities*, ed. A. O'Connor, C. Tilly, and L. Bobo, 217–71. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Choi, Yancey. 2003. *Who is White? Latinos, Asians and the New Black/Non-black Divide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Clark, W. A. V. 1993. Neighborhood Tipping in Multiethnic Racial Context. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15:161–72.
- . 1991. Residential Preferences and Neighborhood Racial Segregation: A Test of the Schelling Segregation Model. *Demography* 28:1–19.
- Collins, R. 1975. *Conflict Sociology: Toward an Explanatory Science*. New York: Academic Press.
- Crump, Jeff. 2004. Producing and Enforcing the Geography of Hate: Race, Housing Segregation, and Housing-Related Hate Crimes in the United States. In *Spaces of Hate: Geographies of Discrimination and Intolerance in the U.S.A.*, ed. C. Flint. New York: Routledge.
- Cutler, D. M., V. L. Glaeser, and J. L. Vigdor. 1999. The Rise and Decline of the American Ghetto. *Journal of Political Economy* 107:455–506.
- Doob, C. B. 2005. *Race, Ethnicity and the American Urban Mainstream*. Boston: Pearson.
- Dreier, P., J. Mollenkopf, and T. Swanstrom. 2001. *Place Matters: Metropolitan Politics for the Twenty-first Century*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.
- Ellen, I. G. 2000. *Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The Prospects for Stable Racial Integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Farley, R., and D. Colasanto. 1980. Racial Residential Segregation: Is it Caused by Misinformation about Housing Costs? *Social Science Quarterly* 61 (3–4): 623–37.
- Farley, R., E. L. Fielding, and M. Krysan. 1997. The Residential Preferences of Blacks and Whites: A Four-Metropolis Analysis. *Housing Policy Debate* 8:763–800.
- Farley, R., and W. H. Frey. 1994. Changes in the Segregation of Whites and Blacks during the 1980s: Small Steps Toward a More Integrated Society. *American Sociological Review* 59:23–45.
- Feagin, J. R., and M. P. Sikes. 1994. *Living with Racism: The Black Middle Class Experience*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Feagin, J. R., and H. Vera. 1995. *White Racism: The Basics*. New York: Routledge.

- Flint, C. 2004. Introd. to *Spaces of Hate: Geographies of Discrimination and Intolerance in the U.S.A.*, ed. C. Flint, 1–20. New York: Routledge.
- Frazier, J. W., F. M. Margai, and E. Tettey-Fio. 2003. *Race and Place: Equity Issues in Urban America*. Cambridge, MA: Westview Press.
- Frey, William H., and Dowell Myers. 2002. *Neighborhood Segregation in Single Race and Multi-Race America: A Census 2000 Study of Cities and Metropolitan Areas*. Washington DC: The Fannie Mae Foundation.
- Frey, W. H., and R. Farley. 1996. Latino, Asian, and Black Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Are Multiethnic Metros Different? *Demography* 33 (1): 35–50.
- Galster, G. C. 1992. *Research on Discrimination in Housing and Mortgage Markets: Assessment and Future Directions*. Washington DC: Fannie Mae Foundation.
- Gelber, K. 2000. Hate Crimes: Public Policy Implications of the Inclusion of Gender. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 35 (2): 275–89.
- Gerstenfeld, P. B. 2004. *Hate Crimes: Causes, Controls, and Controversies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Glaeser, E., and J. L. Vigdor. 2001. *Racial Segregation in the 2000 Census: Promising News*, The Brookings Institution Survey Series, [http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/reports/2001/04demographics\\_edward%20%20%20glaeser%20and%20jacob%20%20%20vigdor/glaeser.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/reports/2001/04demographics_edward%20%20%20glaeser%20and%20jacob%20%20%20vigdor/glaeser.pdf).
- Green, D. P., J. Glaser, and A. Rich. 1998. From Lynching to Gay-Bashing: The Elusive Connection between Economic Conditions and Hate Crime. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75:82–92.
- Green, D. P., D. Strolovich, and J. S. Wong. 1998. Defended Neighborhoods, Integration, and Hate Crime. *American Journal of Sociology* 104:372–403.
- Healey, Joseph F. 2003. *Race, Ethnicity, Gender and Class in the United States: Inequality, Group Conflict and Power*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Herek, G. M., and K. T. Berrill. 1992. *Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Iceland, J., and D. H. Weinberg. 2002. *Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980–2000*. Washington: U. S. Census Bureau.
- Iganski, P. 2001. Hate Crimes Hurt More. *American Behavioral Scientist* 45 (4): 626–38.
- Iganski, P., E. Burney, and Institute for Jewish Policy Research. 2002. *The Hate Debate: Should Hate Be Punished as a Crime?* London: Profile Books in association with the Institute for Jewish Policy Research.
- Kennedy, Stetson. 1990. *The Klan Unmasked*. Boca Raton, FL: Florida Atlantic University Press.
- Krivo, L. J., and R. D. Peterson. 1996. Extremely Disadvantaged Neighborhoods and Urban Crime. *Social Forces* 75:61950.
- Kubrin, Charis E., Tim Wadsworth, and Stephanie DePietro. 2006. Deindustrialization, Disadvantage and Suicide among Young Black Males. *Social Forces* 84 (3): 1559–79.
- Levin, J. 2002. *The Violence of Hate: Confronting Racism, Anti-Semitism, and Other Forms of Bigotry*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Levin, J., and J. McDewitt. 2002. *Hate Crimes Revisited: America's War on those Who are Different*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Levine, R. A., and D. T. Campbell. 1972. *Ethnocentrism*. New York: Wiley.
- Lieberson, S. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants since 1880*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Logan, John R. , 2001. *Ethnic Diversity Grows, Neighborhood Integration Lags Behind*. Albany, NY: Lewis Mumford Center at the State University of New York.
- Logan, J., B. J. Stults, and R. Farley. 2004. Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis: Two Decades of Change. *Demography* 41 (1): 1–22.
- MacLean, Nancy. 1994. *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Massey, D. S. 1995. Getting Away with Murder: Segregation and Violent Crime in Urban America. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 143:1203–32.
- Massey, D. S., and N. A. Denton. 1987. Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, 1970–1980. *American Sociological Review* 52:802–25.
- . 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McPhail, B. A. 2002. Gender-Bias Hate Crimes: A Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse: A Review Journal* 3 (2): 125–43.
- Menard, S. 1995. *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis*, Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences 106. London: Sage Publications.
- Messner, Steven F., and Reid M. Golden. 1992. Racial Inequality and Racially Disaggregated Homicide Rates: An Assessment of Alternative Theoretical Explanations. *Criminology* 30:421–47.
- Messner, Steven F., and Scott J. South. 1992. Interracial Homicide: A Macrostructural-Opportunity Perspective. *Sociological Forum* 7:517–36.
- Meyer, S. G. 2001. *As Long as they Don't Move Next Door: Segregation and Racial Conflict in American Neighborhoods*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Morenoff, Jeffrey D., and Robert J. Sampson. 1997. Violent Crime and the Spatial Dynamics of Neighborhood Transition, Chicago, 1970–1990. *Social Forces* 76:31–64.
- Nolan, J. J., III, Y. Akiyama, and S. Berhanu. 2002. The Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990: Developing a Method for Measuring the Occurrence of Hate Violence. *American Behavioral Scientist* 46 (1): 136–53.
- Olzak, S. *The Dynamics of Ethnic Competition and Conflict*. 1992. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Orr-Klopfer, M. Susan. 2005. *The Emmett Till Book*. Napa, CA: Lulu Press.
- Ovadia, S. 2003. The Dimensions of Racial Inequality: Occupational and Residential Segregation Across Metropolitan Areas in the United States. *Crime and Community* 2 (4): 313–33.
- Parker, Karen F., and Patricia L. McCall. 1999. Structural Conditions and Racial Homicide Patterns: A Look at the Multiple Disadvantages in Urban Areas. *Criminology* 37:447–73.
- Parker, Robert Nash. 1989. Poverty, Subculture of Violence, and Type of Homicide. *Social Forces* 67:983–1007.
- Patterson, Orlando. 1997. The Ordeal of Integration: Progress and Resentment in America's "Racial" Crisis. Washington, DC: Civitas/Counterpoint.
- Perry, B. 2001. *In the Name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crimes*. New York: Routledge.
- Petrosino, C. 1999. Connecting the Past to the Future: Hate Crime in America. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 15:22–47.
- Polikoff, Alexander. 2006. *Waiting for Gautreaux: A Story of Segregation, Housing, and the Black Ghetto*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Schuman, H., and L. Bobo. 1988. Survey-Based Experiments on White Racial Attitudes Toward Residential Integration. *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (2): 273–99.
- Schuman, H., C. Steeh, and L. Bobo. 1985. *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Suttles, G. D. 1972. *The Social Construction of Communities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Swain, C. M. 2002. *The New White Nationalism in America: Its Challenge to Integration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thernstrom, S., and A. Thernstrom. 1997. *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Tolnay, S. E., and E. M. Beck. 1995. *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882–1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Torres, S. 1999. Hate Crimes Against African Americans: The Extent of the Problem. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 15 (1): 48–63.
- Turner, J. C., B. Stanton, M. Vahala, and R. Williams. 1982. *The Ku Klux Klan: A History of Racism and Violence*. Montgomery: Southern Poverty Law Center.
- Turner, M. A., S. L. Ross, G. C. Galster, and J. Yinger. 2002. *Discrimination in Metropolitan Housing Markets: National Results from Phase I HDS 2000, Final Report*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- United States Census Bureau. Census Regions and Divisions of the United States.

- 
- United States Department of Justice. 2007. *Hate Crime Statistics*, 2006.
- Vold, G. B. 1985. *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wadsworth, Tim, and Charis E. Kubrin. 2004. Structural Factors and Black Interracial Homicide: A New Examination of the Causal Process. *Criminology* 42 (3): 647–72.
- Weller, Worth H. 1998. *Under the Hood: Unmasking the Modern Ku Klux Klan*. North Manchester, IN: DeWitt Books.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zubrin, Charles, Camille. 2001. Socioeconomic Status and Segregation: African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians in Los Angeles. In *Problem of the Century: Racial Stratification in the United States*, ed. D. S. Massey, 271–89. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Legislation:

- Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996. Public Law 104–155.
- Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990. Public Law 101–275.