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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Immigration has been a source of contention within the United States since the country’s boundaries were established. Policy makers, politicians, and the general population have believed that immigrants are one cause of high crime rates and take jobs away from Americans. In 2000, the National Opinion Research Center’s General Social Survey interviewed a nationally representative sample of adults to measure perceptions of immigration within the United States. They found that 73% of Americans believed immigration was causally related to crime and 60% believed that immigrants were very likely to cause Americans to lose jobs (Rumbaut, 2008). These are not the only concerns Americans have about immigration. In Hirschman’s (2014) study many Americans believe that high rates of immigration will threaten American values, culture, and institutions (Bouvier, 1992; Brimelow, 1995; Huntington, 2004). President Obama addressed these concerns in November 2014 during his Immigration Accountability Executive Actions conference hearing. President Obama plans to change immigration policy allowing illegal immigrants who have been in the United States for the past five years to start the process of receiving their green cards, and he expressed that Americans may not agree with this action (Obama, 2014).

Many Americans feel threatened by immigration and consequently, this may potentially impact the number of hate crimes. Hate crime has been defined differently by many states and by many scholars. The definition used for this research is, “the offender’s discriminatory use of
violence to enforce a particular social hierarchy that is biased against the targeted status
category” (Weisburd & Levin, 1994). The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has been
collecting data on hate crimes since the 1990s, with only a few changes broadening the scope of
hate crime throughout the past 25 years. Federal hate crime statute includes five different
categories of hate crimes: race, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity/national origin, and
disability (FBI, 2012). Hate crimes can be committed against a person, property, or society as
long as the offender shows bias. It is necessary to study the relationship between immigration
and hate crime to help determine what the future might hold for immigrants and hate crime
trends considering President Obama’s new Executive Action and the perceptions of the general
population.

The status of immigration research in criminal justice can be organized into three
categories. First, there is a plethora of research concerning individual–level association between
immigrants and criminal offending, but little on immigrants as victims (Mears, 2001; McDonald,
1997). Second, there is a shortage of research on the macro-level relationship between
immigration and crime rates and the economy, including hate crime rates (Kubrin, 2012; Reid,
Weiss, Adelman, & Jaret, 2005). Third, there is little research in the collective literature that
examines immigration and crime rates longitudinally (Kubrin, 2012). These gaps in the literature
need to be explored if the true relationship between immigration and hate crime and the economy
is to be fully addressed; which is why this study will look at both hate crime rates and
immigration rates as well as economic resource dependency longitudinally and on a macro-level.

The focus of this study is to examine hate crime and immigration trends within the
continental United States between the years 2000 through 2008 to see if immigration predicts
hate crimes. Variables such as hate crime, immigration rates, and economic resource dependency have been collected for each state annually. Analyses will examine the relationship between immigration and hate crime, within each year.

This study will utilize the instrumental model of group conflict as its theoretical framework. The instrumental model of group conflict hypothesizes that the combination of resource stress and the salience of a potentially competitive outgroup leads to perceived group competition for resources which then leads to attempts to remove the source of competition (Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998). Three constructs were created for this study to represent key components of the theory: resource stress, outgroups, and outgroup competition. First, resource stress is the perception that there are not enough resources, that resources are distributed unequally, or the desire to have resources distributed unequally, such as having resources distributed only to certain groups and not others. (Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998). Economic resource dependency will be analyzed to account for resource stress. Kane (2003) stated that economic resource dependency is a combination of a state’s unemployment rate, percentage of people with income below poverty level, and percentage of households receiving public assistance. Together, in this study, these data will measure the scarcity of resources within each U.S. state. Second, competitive outgroups can be any kind of group perceived as different from the ones who feel threatened (Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998). This study will analyze immigrants as the competitive outgroup. Third, the instrumental model of group conflict examines the removal of outgroup competition. This can include discrimination and negative attitudes. This study will use hate crime rates as the unit of measure for the removal of the source of competition.
It has been established that there is a gap in the literature overlapping immigration, hate crime, and the economy. There is also a shortage of longitudinal studies done on immigration and hate crime and the economy. This study will help fill that gap, but also offer a retrospective look into how immigration and hate crime and the economy relate to each other by studying the years 2000 through 2008. Due to the current changes in immigration policy, more research is needed in this area to understand the effect an increase in immigration will have on hate crime.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to assess relevant literature related to immigration, economy, and the prevalence of hate crime. This chapter will also discuss group conflict as it is the conceptual framework in which the research resonates from. Group conflict theories have one concept in common, that there is a conflict of interests between groups (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). This research will focus on the instrumental model of group conflict proposed by Esses, Jackson, and Armstrong (1998). The instrumental model of group conflict suggests that the combination of resource stress and the salience of potential competitive outgroups leads to real or perceived competitions between groups for resources. Perceived competition then leads to attempts to remove the sources of competition (Esses et. al, 1998). Following this context, the theory will lead into the discussion of immigration and hate crime and the mediating role of economic resources. In addition, this chapter will highlight available literature that specifically studies immigration and the prevalence of hate crime.

Instrumental Model of Group Conflict

There are several theoretical perspectives that feature in studies about immigration and crime. Some of these include the social identity theory, scapegoat theory, and the theory of symbolic racism. However, none of these theories adequately explain, by themselves, the relationship between immigrants and immigration, and crime. The instrumental model of group conflict explains the immigration-crime relationship well because it adds the premise that when there is resource stress there will be an attempt to remove the competition. The instrumental
model of group conflict suggests that there are several factors that can determine the degree of perceived resource stress, including scarcity of resources, unequal distribution of resources, or the desire for unequal distribution of resources.

There are three factors that can determine the degree of perceived resource stress. The scarcity of resources is the most frequent contributor to perceived resource stress. Scarcity of resources can be real or perceived and can increase the chances that groups will believe that access to resources is limited (Esses et al., 1998). For example, an economic depression may cause people to believe that there are not enough resources, such as enough jobs to go around. Second, the unequal distribution of resources among groups within a society can possibly lead to groups believing there are less resources for society. For instance, many Americans may believe that there will be less government assistance for them if there is an influx of refugees. Lastly, is the desire for unequal distribution of resources among groups, which is related to the belief or perception that there is not enough for all groups. Some groups may believe that their needs for resources take precedence over other groups. For example, a rural town may believe they need more assistance than an inner city neighborhood and desire an unequal distribution between the two groups.

In all three of these cases the common theme is that there is the perception that there are not enough resources for everyone. Esses and colleagues (1998) proposed that some groups are perceived to be more competitive than others, particularly salient and distinctive outgroups. Outgroups can be divided into dimensions, either relevant or irrelevant, that depict the type of competitiveness one may perceive. Relevant dimensions to obtaining resources, such as skills, can cause groups to be seen as more competitive. Irrelevant dimensions such as ethnicity or
national origin can also set apart a group of competitors based on their distinctiveness. Outgroups that can be easily identifiable based on relevant and irrelevant dimensions are those considered salient and distinctive.

No matter how a group is constructed, group competiveness leads to attempts to gain more resources which may result in challenging other groups. Zero-sum beliefs are also a major part of the instrumental group conflict theory. Zero-sum beliefs are the view that the more the other group obtains the less there is available for one’s own group (Esses et al., 1998). The instrumental model of group conflict theory suggests that the in-group will attempt to remove the competitive outgroup (Esses et al., 1998). This could take the form of discriminatory attitudes towards the outgroup. In the case of immigrants as the outgroup, discriminatory attitudes toward the outgroup could take the form of support of anti-immigration laws. With these premises in mind, which are a combination of resource stress and salience of potential competitive outgroups leads to perceived group competition for resources which leads to attempts to remove the source of competition, this thesis will attempt to connect the instrumental model of group conflict to the proposed research of immigration, economics, and the prevalence of hate crimes.

Immigration

Immigration studies have focused on immigration in relation to crime in general. This may be due to the political and public debate that immigrants increase crime (Bersani, 2014). Numerous studies have found that the public believes immigrants engage in more criminal activities than non-immigrants, exhaust welfare resources, increase unemployment for residents of the host nation, overwhelm the school and health systems, and challenge social order (Butcher & Piehl, 1998; Chapin, 1997; Hawkins, 1995; McDonald, 1997; Sachs, 1996; Schuck, 1996,
Yeager, 1997). These beliefs by the majority group could be considered zero-sum beliefs. For example, when immigrants retain jobs, there could be a perceived loss of employment opportunities within the resident population.

Most notably, studies have shown that in regards to criminality, immigration has been shown to have a null or a negative relationship (Alaniz, Carmill, & Parker, 1998; Bersani, 2014; Butcher & Piehl, 1998; Lee & Martinez, 2002; Lee, Martinez, & Rosenfeld, 2001; Martinez, 2000; Martinez, Rosefeld, Mares, 2008; Nielsen, Lee, & Martinez, 2005; Ousey & Kubrin, 2009; Reid et al., 2005). This suggests immigrants may not be a reasonable explanation to increases of crime rates in a given area. However, the above stated public beliefs by the majority group could influence victimization of immigrant groups, which could explain an increase in crime rates.

McDonald (1997) states that crime associated with immigration may be the result of higher rates of immigrant victimization rather than immigrant offending. There is some evidence to support McDonald’s (1997) claims. Immigrant youth are often vulnerable targets for violent crime. Immigrant youths often experience harassment and victimization within communities and this may also be evident in U.S. schools (Koo, Peguero, & Shekarkhar, 2012). In fact, racism, discrimination, prejudice, xenophobia, and unfamiliar customs are all a part of the social and cultural experiences for immigrants (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Kao, 1995; Olsen, 2008; Peguero, 2009).

There are factors that have been found to play a role in attitudes and discrimination towards immigrants. Berry (2001) found that those who look “different” than the majority group in an area may experience discrimination (e.g., Syrian refugees in Germany). Berry (2001) goes on to state that immigrants may be reluctant to assimilate to the majority to avoid being rejected.
This means that immigrants, to some degree, care what the host population thinks about them, enough that they may be hesitant to accept the majority’s culture because they do not want to be rejected by those they are trying to emulate. Population also plays a role in criminal offending, specifically, the larger the number of people in an area the more opportunities there are to offend and there is less informal social control (Land, McCall, & Cohen, 1991; Martinez, 2000). Population of the minority is a determinate factor of the level of perceived group threat (Blalock, 1967; Quillian, 1995). This is because the struggle for resources will grow more intense as the number of competitors grows. As the number of immigrants grows they may gain and impact political influence, threatening members of the host country’s political power. Hopkins (2010) explains that an influx in immigration can precipitate anti-immigration ordinances as well as cause legislation to pass that enforces English as the official language. These factors - appearance, possibility of rejection, general population as well as population of the minority - should be considered when looking into the acceptance of immigrants in a country, but the economy remains the one factor that has the most impact on acceptance of immigrants.

**Immigration and economy.**

Immigration studies have looked at the economy to see if a relationship exists between the acceptance of immigrants and the strength of the economy (Palmer, 1996; Quillian, 1995; Stephan, Ybarra, Bachman, 1998; Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996) Studies from across the world have shown that immigration and economic resources have a relationship. Palmer (1996) found that from 1975 to 1995, unemployment closely tracked with the negative attitudes towards immigrants in Canada. Higher unemployment influenced higher negative attitudes towards immigrants. In Europe, Quillian (1995) found in a multilevel analysis, across 12 European 

countries, that the combination of poor economics and larger immigrant groups predicted anti-immigration attitudes in that country.

The United States has a long history of immigration and has been identified as a nation of immigrants. Thus it comes as no surprise that there are a number of studies examining the impact of immigrants on a number of factors such as the economy. For instance, Florida, New Mexico, and Hawaii were found to have unfavorable attitudes towards immigrants when the citizens’ perceptions of job loss and social assistance were believed to be re-directed to immigrants (Stephan, Ybarra, Bachman, 1998). Meaning the host population believed that social assistance was being re-directed or given to immigrants. This caused the host population to have negative attitudes towards immigrants who migrated there. One trend study analyzed unemployment and attitudes about immigration. Espenshade and Hempstead (1996) found that from 1946 to 1993 higher unemployment rates predicted greater opposition to immigration as well as a call for a decrease in immigration. These findings suggest that the host country believe that they are in a competition for resources and that it strongly influences their attitudes towards immigrants and immigration. Immigration can cause fears of social, economic, cultural, and political impact to escalate (Stacey et al., 2011). These heightened fears may lead to a surge in hate crime as immigrant populations grow.

**Hate Crime**

There have been several social movements that have changed the way the United States defines and controls discriminatory behavior. These ideological changes were brought on by major political shifts including the civil rights movement (Maroney, 1998) and victim’s rights movement (van Dijk, 1988) which changed the legislature within the states and the federal
governments. The first piece of federal hate crime legislation in the United States was the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 (Shively, 2005). The Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 states that the Justice Department has to collect data on crimes which "manifest prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity" (Hate Crime Statistics, para 1, 2010) from law enforcement agencies across the country, and to publish an annual summary of the findings (Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990). This allowed for the federal government to track the prevalence of hate crimes within the U.S.

However, hate crime was not criminalized at the federal level until 1994 when legislature passed the Hate Crime Sentencing Enhancement Act. This act allowed the federal government to enhance or increase the punishment of convicted defendants who committed a federal crime motivated by bias. Specifically, “a crime in which the defendant intentionally selects a victim, or in the case of a property crime, the property that is the object of the crime would have to be because of the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation of any person” (Hate Crime Legislation, para. 6, 2015). For example, if a person committed an assault, but their victim was selected based on ethnicity, their punishment could be enhanced from three to five years in the department of corrections.

Perpetrators of hate crime tend to be white, male youths with low scholastic achievement (Green, McFalls, & Smith, 2001). Green, Abelson, and Garnett (1999) also found that hate crime perpetrators are more likely to favor restrictions on immigration, discuss sensational media reports, and listen to racist music. This does not necessarily mean that those who have these attributes will commit a hate crime. Just that those who have these attributes such as young,
white males, with low scholastic achievement who favor immigration restrictions as well as discuss sensational media reports have a higher likelihood to do so.

The media can legitimize stereotypes which may instigate hate crime (Esser & Brosius, 1995). The media can legitimize stereotypes by making sure certain races or ethnicities are shown when talking about the crime report of the city. The media’s word usage as well as focusing on negative aspects of minority communities may also legitimize stereotypes. These media reports shape the majority’s perception, which could influence or instigate hate crime.

Hate crime victims are unique compared to other victims, because legislation outlines exactly who can be considered a victim of a hate crime. Those who are hate crime victims must show that the crime committed against them was motivated in bias based on these factors: race, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity/national origin, and disability. This is unlike other victims because other victims need only report a crime happened. Scholars make the argument that victims of hate crimes are those who are attacked due to perceived “differences”. Chakraborti and Garland (2012) find that “difference” may cause others to feel threatened because “differences” go against preconceived notions of identity that are governed by ideological structures of society. Consequently, to keep those that are different in their “proper” place, hate crime emerges. Lyons (2006) states that hate crime victims most often are part of a marginalized and stigmatized group. This may not only include minorities or gender “differences”, but can be expanded to unprotected groups like the homeless or sex workers. Current federal legislation does not include all of the “differences” that could be perceived.

Many scholars have studied factors that may lead to an increase or impact the prevalence of hate crimes. These factors include racial composition, ethnic heterogeneity, population
density, and economic disadvantage. For instance, Green, Strolovitch, and Wong (1998) found in New York that crimes against racial and ethnic minorities were highest in mostly white neighborhoods, especially when there had been an influx of minority groups. Grattet (2009) had similar findings in Sacramento, which experienced increases in all types of hate crime (ethnicity, race, religious, gender, etc.) when minority population changed in a predominantly white neighborhood.

**Hate crime and economy.**

Hate crime has been said to be the product of frustration of competition for material resources (Green, McFalls, & Smith, 2001). Inconsistent findings between hate crime and employment could be due to a number of factors, including data quality, level of aggregation, the time period under consideration, and/or differences in setting (Pinderhughes, 1993, Tolnay & Beck, 1995; Green et al., 1998; Krueger & Pischke, 1997; McLaren, 1999). Previous studies have found that the economy and hate crime have a relationship. For instance, in New York City an ethnographic study of hate crime perpetrators found themes of unmet economic needs and displaced frustrations (Pinderhughes, 1993). For example, a common factor among hate crime perpetrators was that they were likely to be upset about the unemployment rate, joblessness, and governmental assistance. Further, these economic frustrations were blamed on outgroups. Scarcity of resources has been shown to have a relationship with hate crime. Tolnay and Beck (1995) investigated black victim lynching patterns over time and found that when whites believed that their scarce resources were threatened they would attack. They specifically looked at the fluctuations of the price of cotton. When cotton prices were high, lynching was low and vice versa (Tolnay & Beck, 1995).
Conversely, other studies have found no evidence of a relationship between hate crime and certain economic resources, like employment. Green, Glaser, and Rich (1998) studied New York City using monthly data for a period of nine years. They tested the relationship between the frequency of hate crime and the unemployment rate. The study failed to link intolerant behavior and unemployment. This was corroborated by Krueger and Pischke (1997) in their Germany study. They studied newspapers between the years 1991 to 1993 to track the number and nature of anti-foreigner crime. Results showed that in East Germany wages and unemployment had no significant relationship with anti-foreigner crime (Krueger & Pischke, 1997).

**Hate Crime and Immigration**

Stacey and colleagues (2011) analyzed Hispanic hate crime and recent Hispanic immigration to see if there was a relationship between hate crime and immigration. They hypothesized that places where and when Hispanic immigration has grown crimes against Hispanics would rise. They studied this relationship by using states as the unit of analysis and gathering official data from 2000 through 2004 from the Uniform Crime Report, immigration yearbooks, the decennial Census, and the American Community Survey. Stacey and colleagues (2011) found a positive relationship between state-level variation in anti-Hispanic hate crime and recent Hispanic immigration. This means that as the level of Hispanic immigrants rises, so does the amount of anti-Hispanic hate crime.

McLaren (1999) studied the relationship between right-wing extremism, foreigners, and the unemployment rate in Germany from 1972 through 1992. Right-wing extremism is defined as “an ideology of considering inequality between people as a nature-given principle, combined with an acceptance of violence as a legitimate way of acting” (McLaren, 1999 pg. 171). In
essence, right-wing extremism is a type of hate ideology wherein members target racial or ethnic minorities or are dedicated to a single cause, which relates to hate crime. McLaren (1999) used official reports of right-wing extremism and unemployment rates. Foreigners were considered anyone who was not of German descent (McLaren, 1999). The time-series analysis performed found that the unemployment rate was significant only when coupled with increases in the size of the outgroup, at which point violence could be then directed at said outgroup.

Overall the literature evaluated lacks a thorough analysis of immigration, hate crime, and the economy within the United States. Existing research has found that attitudes about immigration are significantly linked to the unemployment rates of a geographic area in question. As the economy suffers, attitudes towards immigrants become unfavorable (Epenshade et al., 1996; Palmer, 1996; Quillian, 1995; Stephan et al., 1998). While hate crime and the economy, most notably unemployment, have not been consistently linked throughout the years (Green et al., 1998; Krueger & Pischke, 1997; Pinderhughes, 1993; Tolnay & Beck, 1995). Stacey and colleagues (2011) found a significant relationship between a rise in immigration in a state and the amount of hate crime committed against that particular outgroup. These findings indicate support for a relationship between the rise in immigration and a subsequent rise in hate crime. When hate crime, immigration, and the economy are examined together, results support a significant relationship between these variables (McLaren, 1999). These past studies have laid the footwork in establishing that there are relationships between the economy, immigration rates and hate crime.

Although relationships have been established, no studies to date that have examined all three variables - hate crime, immigration, and the economy - that included a nationwide sample
of the continental U.S. This a serious gap in the literature particularly in light of the expectant
trends in immigration law that President Obama recently addressed. This macro-level trend
study will fill the gap in the literature by analyzing immigration rates, hate crime rates, and a
summed index of economic factors to see how these variables interact together. By using an
instrumental model of group conflict theory proposed by Esses and colleagues (1998), this
research attempts to explain how immigration and the economy are affecting the frequency of
hate crime throughout the U.S.

The current study was influenced by several key studies. Most notably by Kane’s 2003
study that helped produce the economic resource dependency variable. By replicating his
variable this study was able to measure the economic frustration or stress of each state. Another
instrumental study that aided in the data collection process of the current study was Stacey and
colleagues (2011) study which examined hate crime and immigration. Using the same official
data sources, this study was able to use similar methods to measure hate crime and immigration.
Without these contributing studies and their insights the current study would not have been able
to investigate the links between hate crime and immigration and the impact the economy has on
hate crime.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

A review of the literature has demonstrated that there is a lack of research examining the extent of the relationship between immigration and hate crime, particularly through longitudinal methods. This research will utilize a longitudinal trend study method of data collection. Longitudinal is a research design that involves repeated observations of the same variables over long periods of time—often decades (Lanier & Briggs, 2014). Longitudinal data collection will allow the researcher to study trends, specifically to determine if high rates of immigration affects rates of hate crime. It will also show if higher or lower economic resource dependency throughout the years is related to either immigration rates or hate crime rates. This study will also use a trend study method. Trend studies focus on a particular population, which is sampled and scrutinized repeatedly; while samples are of the same population, they are typically not composed of the same people (Lanier & Briggs, 2014). Given the interest in one particular subset of the population over a period of years, this is the chosen method for the research design. The longitudinal trend study method will be more reliable than cross-sectional research designs because by examining factors over time one can better isolate a cause-and-effect relationship. Since it is done over a period of time, there will also be more generalizable to the population. The data used in this study was from official secondary data from multiple government sources.

Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that states with high economic dependency and high rates of immigration will predict high rates of hate crime for each year being studied (2000-2008).
Data Collection

Official crime data was collected for each year from 2000 to 2008 for each state in the continental United States. Variables that were used in this study are amount of hate crime, amount of immigration, unemployment rate, percentage of people with income below poverty level, and percentage of households receiving public assistance. Each variable was collected for each year for each state within the continental United States. Table 3.1 depicts the variables and agencies or data sets they came from. Each data set was electronically accessed through public records.

Table 3.1 Variable and Agency/Data Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Agencies/Data Sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation-Uniformed Crime Reports (UCR) (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security-Immigration Yearbooks (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Bureau of Labor Statistics-Local Area Unemployment Statistics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of People with Income Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau- American Community Survey (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Households Receiving Public Assistance</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau-American Community Services (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of Key Variables

Dependent Variable.

Hate crime rate.

The dependent variable in this study, hate crime rate, measured the number of victims who experienced a motivated crime through bias against race, religion, or nationality. This was measured for each state in each year and was gathered from the Uniform Crime Report (UCR). The UCR counts one offense for each victim of a crime against a person, and one offense is counted for each occurrence of crime against property or against society. Currently, hate crime is collected from reporting police agencies to the UCR for 11 offense categories such as murder, robbery, and forcible rape. Those crimes that were motivated by the bias of race, nationality, and/or religion are counted and put into a table of raw numbers per state per year. Other types of hate crime motivation were excluded from the current analyses, because they were not theoretically related to immigration victimization.

The hate crime rate in this study was created by adding the raw number of hate crimes motivated by race, nationality and/or religion per state and then dividing by the total population covered by the police agencies (since it is not mandated for police agencies to report to the UCR, those that do also report the population covered by the agency. Agencies who reported their population covered by their agency were added together per state, giving the total population covered per state for all reporting agencies). These numbers were then transformed in to rates per 100,000 for each state. This variable represents the removal of outgroup competition within the instrumental group conflict model. Descriptive information for this and the other variables in the analyses can be found in Table 3.2.
**Independent variables.**

*Immigration rate.*

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) gathers immigration data using the Computer Linked Application Information System (CLAIMS) of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, which holds information from the applications for lawful permanent resident status (DHS, 2014). This study used the raw data from the immigration yearbooks, provided by DHS, to ascertain rates of immigration by dividing the number of immigrants obtaining legal residence in each state by that state’s population multiplied by 100,000. This provided the rate of immigration (per 100,000 people) per state annually. The immigration rate acts as the outgroup in the instrumental model of group conflict theory.

*Economic resource dependency.*

In this study, economic resource dependency measured the resource stress per state. Kane (2003) used economic resource dependency as a summed index of the unemployment rates, the percentage of households in poverty, and the percentage of households receiving public assistance. Following Kane’s (2003) model, these variables were added together and were ran as one variable for the final nine OLS regressions. The higher the amount of economic resource dependency, the greater higher the need for resources.

*Unemployment rate.*

Unemployment rate is gathered by the Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS). The estimate of unemployment is an aggregate of the estimates of (1) those who were last employed in industries covered by state unemployment insurance laws and (2) those who either entered the labor force for the first time or reentered after a period of separation (LAUS, 2009).
Percentages of households in poverty/receiving public assistance.

Both percentages of households in poverty and percentage of households receiving public assistance were gathered by American Community Services (ACS). Questionnaires are sent out in four different modes: internet, mail, telephone and personal visit. The ACS includes 12 monthly independent sample, meaning they collect samples once a month. Data collection for each sample lasts for 3 months. During first-phase sampling, they assign blocks to sampling strata, calculate sampling rates, and select the sample. During the second phase of sampling, the ASC selects a sample of non-responding addresses for Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005).

Table 3.2. Variable Characteristics Across Nine Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime Rate</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Rate</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Resource Dependency</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan of Analysis

This research seeks to understand the predictive power of immigration rate and economic resource dependency has on hate crime. It is hypothesized that states with high economic dependency and high rates of immigration will be associated with high rates of hate crime annually from 2000 to 2008. In order to test this hypothesis nine OLS regressions were conducted. These models were conducted in order to isolate the relationship between immigration rates and economic resource dependency by year, and see if there were trends
through the nine years. Each model will run the three variables. Hate crime rates as the
dependent variable and economic resource dependency and immigration rates as the independent
variables.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the results of the study. This research was guided with one research question in mind: to explore whether or not immigration and economic resource dependency predicts higher rates of hate crime. Nine ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions were performed with the dependent variable of hate crime rate and the independent variables of immigration rate, and economic resource dependency. This was done in an effort to explain the relationships between hate crime and immigration on a longitudinal and macro-level basis over the course of nine years.

Prior to performing the OLS regression the data was screened. It is important to screen data for accuracy, missing data, extreme values, and to assess the adequacy of fit (Mertler, & Vanatta, 2002.) The data was evaluated for accuracy by performing frequency distributions and descriptive statistics to ensure the quality of the data. Missing data was not an issue in this study because data was gathered from official data sources that did not report any missing data from the time periods this data was gathered. Several extreme values were found within the hate crime per state sample. However it was determined that the case should not be dropped from the analysis. In regards to normality, both immigration rates and hate crime rates presented a moderate positive skew. To account for the skewness, the square root of immigration rates variable and hate crimes rates variable were transformed and used in the analysis.

Results
As depicted in tables 4.1 and 4.2, the OLS regression shows a moderate positive relationship between hate crime rates and immigration rates from years 2000 through 2002 with a significant at the .001 level. Thus showing that as the rates of immigration rise so does the prevalence of hate crime. Between the years 2003 and 2004 it shows a weaker positive relationship between hate crime and immigration with a significance at the .01 level. However, immigration rates did not have a significant relationship with hate crime rates from years 2005 through 2008. Although not significant, the OLS regression shows that the relationship between hate crime and immigration is even weaker than previous years. It appears that in the early 2000s immigration strongly accounted for hate crime. Between the years 2000 and 2002 the R² value ranges from .331 to .455 signifying that these models explain for almost half of the hate crime committed. It is unclear as to the change in significance between 2000 through 2004 and 2005 through 2008.

Economic resource dependency did not have a significant relationship with neither hate crime rates nor immigration rates throughout the time line researched. The relationship between economic resource dependency and hate crime is negative and weak. By this analysis, there is no support for the hypothesis that states with high economic dependency and high rates of immigration will predict high rates of hate crime for each year being studied. Economic resource dependency showed no relationship with hate crime nor immigration rates which does not support the instrumental model of group conflict proposed by Esses and colleagues (1998).
Table 4.1. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression of Hate Crime Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Rate</td>
<td>.905/ .504***</td>
<td>1.098/ .599***</td>
<td>.735/ .470***</td>
<td>.722/ .359**</td>
<td>.575/ .367**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Resource Dependency</td>
<td>-.026/ -.018</td>
<td>-.027/-1.66</td>
<td>-.040/ -.278</td>
<td>-.023/-1.39</td>
<td>-.027/-1.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 4.2. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression of Hate Crime Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td>b/Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Rate</td>
<td>.471/ .239</td>
<td>.360/ .203</td>
<td>.383/ .230</td>
<td>.384/ .241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Resource Dependency</td>
<td>-.041/ -.269</td>
<td>-.047/ -.288</td>
<td>-.052/ -.354</td>
<td>-.014/ -.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

Summary

This study was designed to address the gap in the available literature about hate crime prevalence, economic dependency, and immigration rates within the United States. Data was collected annually between the years 2000 to 2008 for hate crime, immigration, and economic resources, per state within the continental U.S, to understand the relationship between these variables. It was hypothesized that states with high economic dependency and high rates of immigration will predict high rates of hate crime for each year being studied (2000-2008).

Overall, finding from the current study did not support the purported hypothesis.

This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge about hate crime, immigration, and economic resources in several ways. First, there is an abundant amount of literature on crime and immigrants, from the viewpoint that immigrants cause crime to rise. However, there is very little research that study immigrants as the victims of crimes as the cause for higher crime rates, specifically hate crime rates. This study shows that from a period of 2000 through 2004 hate crime rates climbed as levels of immigration rates increased. This may be due to the native born or host country rejecting immigrants and thus trying to eliminate them as a threat or express their discontent.

Second, there are no studies to date that study the macro-level (unit of analysis being the state) relationship between immigration rates, hate crime rates, and economic resource dependency within the U.S. The extant literature focuses on hate crime and the economy or
immigration and the economy. McLaren (1999) conducted a study in Germany that considered the three variables. She found that all three variables did have a relationship. However, this is inconsistent with the findings of this study. This study found economic resource dependency does not affect hate crime. This could be due to a number of factors. This study used unemployment rates, percentage of public assistance, and percentage of household below the poverty line. It could be that these measures did not capture the essence of resource stress enough to show a relationship. Another possibility is that the economy simply was bad enough to cause resource stress among all groups. Evidence towards macro-level economy stress is not supported in this research.

Lastly, there is little research in the aggregate literature that examines immigration and crime rates longitudinally (Kubrin, 2012). Most research uses a cross sectional design. This may be due to the availability of data. This research contributes to the literature by being longitudinal in design by studying the time line of 2000 through 2008. Longitudinal research allows the researcher to study trends and see how variables interact over a period of time. Longitudinal data can be more reliable than cross sectional research designs because there is more data to analyze as well as it is more generalizable to the population. Nonetheless, there were some limitations to this research.

Limitations

There are several limitations within the study that could have affected the analysis and results of this study. Generally, history and exogenous variables may affect this study. History is when external events that occur may influence the study’s findings (Lanier & Briggs, 2014). History could influence this study because of the longitudinal data collection method. If there is
an event like a terrorist attack, war, economy crises, etc. it could affect hate crime data without any relation to immigration. Exogenous variables are factors external to the study that influence the relationship between the variables being examined (Lanier & Briggs, 2014). Exogenous variables could threaten this study. An example for exogenous factor external to the study that could affect the proposed research is the terrorism attack of 9/11, illegal immigration rates, and/or the political atmosphere. Most of these factors cannot be accounted for and thus were not controlled for in this study.

Other limitations specific to the study are the original data collection process and the measurement of hate crime. First, the original data collection process for each of the data sets combined may have changed from 2000-2008. However, using derived measures such as percentages and rates helps with comparisons between years. Rates and percentages help different sample totals to be compared and help quantify the amount of change over time. Second, for hate crime to be reported to the FBI, to then be published in the UCR, the state must first classify the crime as hate crime according to the UCR definition. Hate crimes are not easily classified and may lead to underreporting (Lyons & Roberts, 2014). King and colleagues (2009) suggest that although the Hate Crime Statistics Act requires reporting, many jurisdictions may not comply or report a zero count. Without a thorough understanding of the reporting limitations of hate crime, researchers are most likely to encounter similar problems. Lastly, data were collected only through the years 2000 through 2008 even though data from 2009 until the present were available. Data beyond 2008 were not included in the current study due to the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act, 2009. This federal law impacted the type of victims protected and broadened its jurisdiction.
Conclusion

In summary, the research hypothesis was not supported by the findings in this study. The present study did not find any significant relationships present between the annual hate crime rates and economic resource dependency within the states, and was therefore unable to support the (theory here) This study used an OLS regression to analyze the three variables. The OLS test did not find significance between economic resource dependency and hate crime, accordingly there is no support for the research hypothesis. However, the OLS test produced significant results between immigration and hate crime between the years of 2000 through 2004. This could be due to the Real ID Act of 2005. The Real ID Act of 2005 enacted, “national standards for drivers licenses and non-license identification cards were established; definitions of terrorist organizations and terrorist activity were expanded; criteria for eligibility was modified; judicial review of certain immigration decisions were further limited; waiver authority to construct barriers along the border was expanded; an aviation screening database was established.” (Kuntz & Stawski, 2005 Real ID Act, Overview, para. 1, 2005). This could be one possible reason why hate crime and immigration rates did not have a significant relationship after the year of 2004. These limitations to immigrants and the expansion of definitions for terrorist organizations may have placated potential perpetrators of hate crime to the point that the relationship between hate crime and immigration became non-significant. This ties into the need to study political ambience. The Real ID act of 2005 is vastly different agenda than Obama’s Executive Action (2014) on immigration and what it proposes. If enough citizens disagree with Obama’s Action on immigration this could lead to hate crime and immigration once again having a significant
relationship. Further research is needed to clearly understand the importance of political atmosphere and how current legislation impacts hate crime.

The results of this study adds to the mixed findings in the literature on hate crime and economy. The results of this study coincides with studies by Green and colleagues (1998) and Krueger and colleagues (1997) by showing no relationship between the economy and the prevalence of hate crime. But, on the other hand, it differs from the results of Pinderhughes (1993), Tolnay and Beck’s (1995) and McLaren’s (1999) studies that did find said relationship between the two variables (hate crime and economy). It is possible that the current study did not measure the true economic needs of the country. This study relied on official data sources like the Bureau of Labor and the U.S. Census Bureau. Economic frustrations may be better represented by polling individuals. Further examination of hate crime, immigration rates, and the economy should be pursued, particularly while studying the attitudes towards immigrants as well as the political ambiance of the area in question.
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