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This research examines the association between community conditions and anti-Latino hate crimes as informed by earlier research. The traditional social disorganization perspective argues that hate crimes against Latinos are more likely in communities characterized by economic disadvantage, residential instability and heterogeneity. On the other hand, the defended communities perspective suggests that hate crimes against Latinos are more prevalent in majority white communities experiencing an in-migration of Latinos. At the same time, the defended communities’ perspective suggests that economic strain in majority white communities has a positive affect on hate crimes. Using hate crime data collected from the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations from 2003 to 2013, the present study examines the effects of the defended communities in majority black communities given the racial and ethnic landscape of Los Angeles County. The findings confirm that community conditions described by the traditional social disorganization perspective influence racially motivated hate crimes. With the exception of residential stability, economic disadvantage and heterogeneity are significantly associated to anti-Latino hate crimes as described by the traditional social disorganization perspective. In contrast, there is limited evidence to confirm the effect of the demographic change and/or economic conditions on anti-Latino hate crimes or racially motivated hate crimes as suggested by the defended communities’ perspective. The analyses call attention to the importance of merging theoretical constructs and examining groups outside of anti-black and anti-white given demographic changes in communities across the United States. The conclusion suggests that research drawn from theories on communities and crime could provide a practical framework for examining hate crimes as they offer important policy implications for local communities.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, numerous civil rights organizations, law enforcement agencies, policymakers, and practitioners have reported an alarming increase in hate crimes targeting Latinos\(^1\) (Anti-Defamation League, 2012; Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund, 2009; National Hispanic Media Coalition, 2012; Police Executive Research Forum, 2012; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2009). These reports have engendered public concern about the safety of Latinos in communities across the United States as the Latino population has continued to grow from 35.7 million in 2000 to 55.4 million residents in 2014 as a result of the immigration population flow from Latin America since the 1960s (Krogstad & Lopez, 2015). While scholars have indicated that “racial intolerance drops as the size of the minority population grows enough to challenge the status quo” (Levin & McDevitt, 2002, p. 56), most research has focused on blacks in the literature on racial bias, which has left many to wonder whether the known associations hold true for Latinos (Corinne et al., 1983; Martinez & Iwama, 2014; Stewart et al., 2015). While recent studies have found a strong association between anti-Latino sentiment and community conditions (Chavez, 2008; Eitle & Taylor, 2008; Rodriguez et al., 2008; Stewart et al., 2015), our understanding on anti-Latino hate crimes and community context remains limited. The present study aims to address this gap in the literature by examining the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos using hate crime data from Los Angeles County, an area that has undergone tremendous changes following the growth of the Latino population (Brown & Lopez, 2013).

\(^1\) Hispanics and Latinos are used interchangeably in the present study due to different sources of information citing different terms to describe this population.
Previous Literature on Hate Crimes

Social scientists have long established that violence is geographically concentrated and associated to structural conditions of communities (Lee et al., 2001; Martinez et al., 2008; Park & Burgess, 1924; Shaw & McKay, 1942/1969; Sampson et al., 1997). Yet, only a handful of studies have examined the link between hate crimes and communities (Green et al., 1998b; Green & Spry, 2014; Shively, 2005; Shively et al., 2013). One contributing reason for this gap in the literature is that hate crime was not recognized as a crime until the 1980s when civil rights’ organizations brought the public’s attention to the racial violence directed against minorities (Grattet et al., 1998; Jenness, 2007; Levin & McDevitt, 2002; McVeigh et al., 2003). Hate crimes has since evolved into a defined and condemned criminal conduct that is now distinguished from ordinary crime. Although forty-five states and the District of Columbia have since passed some type of hate crime statute involving criminal penalties for bias or hate motivated violence and/or other statutory provision linked to hate or bias motivation (Anti-Defamation League, 2016), there is a large degree of cross-state variation in hate crime definitions and the groups of individuals that are offered protections under the state laws. Another reason for this gap in the literature is the lack of consistent and reliable data on hate crimes (Green & Spry, 2014; McDevitt & Iwama, 2016; Nolan et al., 2006). With the passage of the Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA) of 1990, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) started to gather hate crime statistics in order to get a better understanding on the patterns and trends of hate crimes. Since this effort began, it became clear that there is a great deal of variation in the reporting of hate crimes across different jurisdictions in the United States (Shively, 2005). Research has shown that the differences in hate crime legislation, data collection procedures, law enforcement training, and departmental
policies and practices make it difficult to compare and contrast hate crime reporting across the state and country (Grattet & Jenness, 2008; King, 2007; Shively, 2005; Stacey, 2015).

**Current Literature on Hate Crimes**

In order to circumvent some of the existing limitations found in earlier hate crime research, a handful of studies have focused on examining hate crime data from single jurisdictions rather than multiple jurisdictions (Green et al., 1998a, 1998b; Jenness & Grattet, 2001). This research has tested theoretical perspectives based on earlier 20th century studies by the Chicago School, which suggest a link between crime and communities following changes to the nation’s population (Park & Burgess, 1924/1967). On the one hand, some scholars suggest that hate crimes, like other crimes, will be more prevalent in socially disorganized communities (Grattet, 2009; Green et al., 1998b; Lyons, 2007). The traditional social disorganization perspective suggests that communities with high levels of economic disadvantage, residential instability, and racial heterogeneity are incapable of exercising effective social controls to prevent crimes from occurring in relation to the lack of communication and interest among residents (Shaw & McKay, 1942/1969). On the other hand, scholars argue that racially motivated hate crimes are more prevalent in racially homogeneous communities experiencing an immigration of minority residents as informed by the defended communities perspective (Green et al., 1998b; Suttles, 1972). As Green and colleagues (1998b) argue, the influx of minorities in defended communities “represents the catalyst for action among those who seek to preserve racial homogeneity” (p. 376). In addition, these scholars also suggest that racially motivated hate crimes will increase in defended communities under economic strain as informed by prior
research on the relationship between racial violence and economic conditions (Olzak, 1992; Pinderhughes, 1993; Tolnay & Beck, 1995).

Overall, the findings from this research suggest a strong association between racially motivated hate crimes and community conditions. However, this research has focused exclusively on explaining the prevalence of hate crimes against blacks at the community-level and, therefore, it is unclear whether the same relationships can explain hate crimes against Latinos (Stacey et al., 2011; Suro & Escobar, 2006). While anti-black hate crimes represent the largest targeted group of hate crimes (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015a), the association between anti-Latino hate crimes and communities is particularly important today in light of the effect that the Latino population growth has had on demographic and economic conditions in communities. In addition to the well-known demographic effect, the Latino population growth has also had a significant impact on the local economy with Latinos representing about 54 percent of the workers added to the labor force from 2000 to 2010 (Kochhar, 2012). While the U.S. Census Bureau projects that the Latino population will double to over 100 million over the next four decades suggesting a rise in the perceived Latino threat (Chavez, 2013; Krogstad, 2014; Stewart et al., 2015), the association between communities and the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos remains unclear.

Purpose of the Present Study

Therefore, the following question remains: do community conditions influence the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos? Building on the prior research, the current study responds to this question by testing two primary theoretical perspectives using hate crime data drawn from the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations. First, this study tests
whether hate crimes against Latinos are more prevalent in socially disorganized communities characterized by economic disadvantage, heterogeneity, and residential instability as informed by the traditional social disorganization perspective (Shaw & McKay, 1942/1969). Second, this study tests whether anti-Latino hate crimes are more prevalent in racially homogeneous communities experiencing changes in the Latino population as informed by the defended communities perspective. Finally, this study explores the interaction between economic conditions and defended communities by testing whether anti-Latino hate crimes are more prevalent in racially homogeneous communities experiencing economic disadvantage as informed by earlier studies on hate crimes and racial violence (Green et al., 1998b; Olzak, 1992).

The present study contributes to the literature in a number of ways. First, the study extends the theoretical perspectives on communities and crime to explain how community conditions can explain the prevalence of anti-Latino hate crimes given the growth of the Latino population over the last decade. Second, it provides insight into the effects of community conditions on anti-Latino hate crimes in Los Angeles County, an area that highlights the nation’s changing racial and ethnic landscape as a majority-minority county. Third, it explores the effects of economic conditions on anti-Latino hate crimes that have been suggested by earlier studies using different measures than those previously used to illustrate economic strain, which have found mixed results, to improve upon the study of hate crimes and economic conditions. Fourth, prior research has indicated, “most of the policy, practice, law, and infrastructure that is brought to bear on hate and bias crime exist at the state and local levels” (Shively et al., 2013; p. xvi). In contrast to earlier studies using police districts as the unit of analysis, the present study tests the impact of community conditions using census tracts as the unit of analysis, which have been previously used in community-level research, to improve our understanding on the effect of
demographic and economic conditions and to provide more direct policy implications at the local-level. With numerous reports arguing that hate crimes against Latinos have risen since the early 2000s in light of the growing Latino population and widespread anti-Latino sentiment, the present study advances the existing knowledge on hate crimes by exploring whether the changes in the Latino population, as well as other demographic and economic conditions, are associated to the prevalence of anti-Latino hate crimes in 21st century communities.

Outline of the Present Study

Chapter 1 begins by reviewing the major challenges in hate crime research and describing recent studies on anti-Latino sentiment and hate crimes that have shaped some of the current understanding on Latinos and communities. In chapter 2, I place this research within the larger discussion of communities and crime by following some of the findings in the earlier literature by scholars from the Chicago School at the beginning of the 20th century. Chapter 3 reviews some of the prevailing explanations from the hate crime literature that focus on demographic and economic conditions as an attempt to understand the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos in communities. Major perspectives from the literature on communities and crimes are discussed and how they could be tested on hate crimes against Latinos to explain this phenomenon. In chapter 4, I describe why Los Angeles County serves as the ideal setting for this research given its demographic and economic transformation directly linked to the growing immigration population arriving from Latin American countries over the last few decades. Chapter 5 describes the hate crime data collected by the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations (LACCHR) from 2003 to 2013. This data is paired with demographic information gathered from the American Community Surveys by the U.S. Census Bureau to help determine
whether the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos are associated to demographic and economic conditions of communities as informed by theories on communities and crime. Following a discussion on the data sources, variables, steps taken to prepare the data for analyses, and analytical techniques employed, I present the results in chapter 6 testing my hypotheses as informed by conditions described in the social disorganization and defended communities perspectives on hate crimes against Latinos in Los Angeles County. Finally, chapter 7 concludes with a discussion on the implications of this research and its findings for scholars, politicians, and the public alike.
CHAPTER 2

HATE CRIME BACKGROUND

Almost thirty years have passed since the federal government first added protections for hate crimes motivated by bias against an individual’s actual or perceived race, color, religion, or national origin with the passage of the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990. Nevertheless, hate crimes are still currently recognized as a major problem in the United States in light of the political rhetoric expressed against groups of individuals that only serves to reinforce and reconstruct racial and ethnic differences in communities (Berman, 2015). Most recently, the demographic shifts reflecting the Latino population growth have been linked to the increasing anti-Latino hostility and violence (Stacey et al., 2011). Yet, aside from highly publicized anti-Latino hate crime cases (Berman, 2015; DiNatale & Sacchetti, 2015; Planer, 2009; Stacey, 2015; The New York Times Editorial, 2008), little is known about the prevalence of these attacks and the extent to which local changes are associated to the victimization of Latinos. While federal and state hate crime statutes have sought to address this phenomenon, the limitations found in the national hate crime data reporting systems have made it difficult to understand the size and scope of these crimes in many areas across the U.S. and, subsequently, explain why these incidents are occurring.

This chapter begins by providing a brief overview on the development of federal hate crime legislation designed to provide an understanding on the violence directed against minority groups such as Latinos. While the primary goal of the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 was to establish a national database to access hate crime statistics to better understand this phenomenon (Nolan et al., 2002), I provide a review of the limitations that exist in the data collection, which
make it challenging to understand this problem. Nevertheless, a few studies have sought to explore the recent concerns and speculations of anti-Latino hate crimes using national hate crime statistics. While many would consider whether this area warrants continued scholarly attention given the limitations in the data sources, I demonstrate how findings from recent studies on widespread hostility and negative attitudes against immigrants has generated concern about the victimization of Latinos, which places a premium in understanding the local context of these acts (Vazquez, 2011; Zatz & Smith, 2012).

**Defining and Identifying Hate Crime**

Throughout history, crimes driven by bias have occurred, particularly against newcomers and minorities whose growing presence is commonly viewed as a threat to existing social groups (Chacon & Davis, 2006; Chavez, 2008; Levin & McDevitt, 2002; Shively et al., 2013; Steffensmeier & Demuth, 2001; Stowell, 2007; Wang, 2012). The United States alone has witnessed a series of violence and discrimination targeting each new wave of immigrants because of their actual or perceived race, ethnicity, language, and other traits. Early efforts to gather information on crimes motivated by bias were conducted by advocacy and civil rights organizations, such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, currently known as the National LGBTQ Task Force. As early as the 1970s and 1980s, they began to publish information on these incidents based on reports they received to highlight the seriousness of this type of offense. However, these efforts to collect information were restricted to gathering information on certain types of offenses and against certain targeted groups (Anti-Defamation League, 1992, 2001; Grant et al., 2011).

---

2 The term hate and bias crime are often used interchangeably. Hate crime is the term most commonly used and as such has been chosen as the main term to be used in the present study.
Another source of information arose during the 1970s and 1980s from ethnographers who sought to understand this type of crime by observing the violence that took place in urban communities experiencing significant changes (DeSena, 1990; Rieder, 1985; Suttles, 1972). For example, Rieder (1985) observed residents of a predominantly white, middle-class neighborhood in Brooklyn in the mid-1970s express a fear that “minorities were poised to take over the city” (p. 125). He discovered residents responding to this fear by adopting different forms of resistance, which included racial hostility, as well as violent attacks, such as firebombing their houses, to deter the movement of minorities, mostly blacks and Hispanics, into their community. At the same time, similar violent acts reported by the media in other urban areas also drew the public’s attention and, as a direct result, some of the earliest collections of hate crime reports by law enforcement took place in major cities such as Baltimore, Maryland, Boston, Massachusetts, and New York City, New York. The local police in these areas sought to identify patterns and trends of these racially motivated attacks in order to prevent future incidents from taking place in their communities (McDevitt & Iwama, 2016).

Despite the local reports on some of these attacks, the general public viewed them as isolated incidents or instances of social unrest without any national hate crime data collection to understand the actual location, size, and scope of the problem (Perry, 2009; Tafoya, 1991). Recognizing that these types of incidents have severe and negative consequences on communities and its members, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1983) conducted an investigation on these incidents and concluded that there existed a number of contributing circumstances in addition to the rhetoric of hate and acts of violence. In particular, the Commission contended: “Effective police responses to incidents of racial and religious violence are necessary to keep such incidents from spreading. If the police fail to respond or respond in
ways which clearly demonstrate a lack of sensitivity, perpetrators can interpret the police inactivity to indicate official sympathy or even official sanction” (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1983, p. 14). Furthermore, they urged the federal government to conduct further examination of bias-motivated violence with preliminary findings indicating that underreporting of such incidents was more severe than originally alleged.

**Hate Crime Legislation**

In order to understand the nature and magnitude of the problem, the Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA) was first introduced in 1987, re-introduced the following years, and finally enacted by U.S. Congress in 1990 (Marovitz, 1993; Nolan et al., 2002; Shively et al., 2013). Under this legislation, Congress was able to recognize and effectively address this issue in a number of ways. First, the HCSA established a standard definition of hate crimes to distinguish it from non-hate crimes by describing hate crimes as,

“…crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity, including where appropriate the crimes of murder, non-negligent manslaughter; forcible rape; aggravated assault, simple assault, intimidation; arson; and destruction, damage or vandalism of property (Hate Crime Statistics Act 1990).”

Second, it recognized the need to gather data on the prevalence of hate crimes in order to determine patterns and develop preventive strategies to address the issue. The Department of Justice was tasked to acquire information on hate crime statistics from law enforcement agencies across the country to provide information on this type of crime (Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Finally, the federal hate crime statute introduced enhanced penalties for crimes motivated by bias as a deterrence measure and to acknowledge that hate crimes have a negative impact that extends beyond the individual victim and affects the community as a whole (Freeman, 1996).

While HCSA was later amended to include categories for gender, gender identity, persons with disabilities, and juveniles, Grattet and Jenness (2001) argue that the most salient categories, such as race and national origin, reflect, “the oldest, most established and most recognized axes of oppression” (p. 33). In other words, the reporting patterns and trends of these types of incidents are much clearer than the more recently introduced categories due to the lengthy public discourse and widespread public acceptance of these categories as groups that require protection in hate crime legislation. However, concerns on the underreporting of all protected categories of hate crimes remain due to contributing factors at the local level, such as law enforcement training, that may affect the reporting of hate crimes in general (Shively, 2005).

**Hate Crime Data Collection**

In accordance with HCSA, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) became responsible for the national collection of hate crime data having previously undertaken the role of collecting, publishing, and archiving crime statistics since 1930. Under a separate but similar reporting system from their Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) Program, the FBI began to collect information in 1991 on hate crimes reported by thousands of city, college, university, county, state, tribal and federal law enforcement agencies, who voluntarily participate in their hate crime data collection. In 2014, a total of 15,494 city, county, state, university and college, tribal, and federal agencies submitted hate crime statistics to the UCR Program covering 93.4 percent of the total U.S.
population in 2014 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015a). Due to the availability of annual information, the ability to disaggregate the data to a smaller unit of analysis (e.g., city, college, university, etc.), and the public accessibility of this data, this reporting system has been widely used by scholars to assemble findings on patterns and trends in hate crimes (Grattet & Jenness, 2001; Shively et al., 2013; Stacey, 2015). However, two additional sources of information, the National Incident Based Reporting System and the National Crime Victimization Survey, were developed much later to respond to some of the limitations in the FBI’s hate crime reporting system described below.

The FBI introduced the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) in 1991 as a means of providing for a more comprehensive, detailed report of crime incidents than permitted by the UCR system. For example, NIBRS sought to address the limitations in the UCR system such as the hierarchy rule, which restricted law enforcement agencies to report only the most serious offense per incident disregarding multiple offense incidents. By eliminating this rule, NIBRS permits law enforcement agencies to account for all offenses that occur during the reported incident that are considered “mutually exclusive” (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015b). In 1995, bias was added as a motivating factor for crimes and the participating rate by agencies has steadily been growing with many agencies now submitting reports to both the UCR system and NIBRS. Unfortunately, like the UCR data collection system, NIBRS also depends on the participation of law enforcement agencies. Moreover, the hate crime data collected by NIBRS covers fewer jurisdictions than those that report to the UCR system. For example, in 2014, 6,520 law enforcement agencies participated in the NIBRS data collection representing about one-third (35.2 percent) of the total number of law enforcement agencies that participate in the UCR data collection system (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015a). Therefore, while
NIBRS provides a more comprehensive look on the hate crimes being reported to police, it only accounts for hate crimes reported by a much smaller portion of the nation’s population than those reflected in the UCR data.

In comparison to the UCR and NIBRS hate crime data collections, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) provides a useful alternative to collecting hate crime information from law enforcement agencies. The NCVS, which is an annual data collection conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau for the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), began asking respondents in 2000 if they had been the victims of vandalism and various interpersonal crimes and whether they involved bias as a factor in the offenses committed against them\(^3\) (Harlow, 2005; Wilson, 2014). In comparison to police reports, victimization surveys avoid the problems of dependence upon the public’s willingness to report crimes to police and are not highly dependent upon statutory definitions of hate crime or law enforcement investigations, training, and record keeping. Unfortunately, common challenges with victimization surveys in general include obtaining unbiased samples of sufficient size, employing sampling and measurement instruments designed to capture respondents with experiences and traits of interest, and the respondent’s recollection of events and their willingness to disclose such events, which are often traumatic in nature (Shively et al., 2013). Additionally, while the NCVS data supports the assessment of national trends across all hate crimes, it cannot be used to examine hate crime trends using smaller units of analysis such as state- or county-level (Addington, 2008). It is also difficult to examine trends in specific subcategories of hate crime, such as those targeting Latino victims. Current efforts are being made to reassess the coverage and reliability of the NCVS data to use in future research

\(^3\) When BJS first began collecting information from the NCVS, they developed the questionnaire items to identify victims of hate crimes with the U.S. Census Bureau.
examinations on the reporting of crimes such as hate crimes (Shook-Sa et al., 2015).

**Limitations in Hate Crime Data Collection**

Aside from the limitations faced by each of the national data collection sources (UCR, NIBRS, and NCVS), there are a number of challenges with collecting hate crime data in general. First, local law enforcement agencies reporting hate crime statistics are subject to the states hate crime legislation. Unfortunately, hate crime legislation varies widely by state in terms of (1) the specific traits legally defined as targets of hate crime motivation; (2) whether and how they address criminal penalties and civil remedies; (3) the range of crimes covered; (4) whether the statutes require data collection, and for what crime types, and (5) whether training about hate crime is required for law enforcement personnel (McDevitt et al., 2000; Shively, 2005; Shively et al., 2013). For example, California hate crime statutes protect individuals against violence or threats of violence aimed at them or their property based on their race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, political affiliation, sex, sexual orientation, age or disability or position in a labor dispute, or because of a perceived characteristic based on one of these categories. Unlike many other states, California includes protection for crimes motivated by age and political affiliation. Also, as a part of the Bane Act in California’s civil law (Cal. Pen. Code § 422.75), it “provides for sentencing enhancements of one to three years for certain bias-motivated felonies” against targeted groups protected by California hate crime laws.

In comparison, Indiana is one of five states who does not have any hate crime penalty enhancement laws and does not mandate police training on how to respond to hate crimes. Nevertheless, Indiana has bias crime reporting legislation that defines a bias crime as
"...an offense in which the person who committed the offense knowingly or intentionally: (a) selected the person who was injured; or (b) damaged or otherwise affected property by the offense because of the color, creed, disability, national origin, race, religion, or sexual orientation of the injured person or of the owner or occupant of the affected property was associated with any other recognizable group or affiliation" (Indiana Civil Rights Commission 1999).

While this legislation provides law enforcement agencies with a standard definition for the purpose of gathering hate crime data, agencies are unable to respond effectively to these crimes without any penalty enhancement in their hate crime laws. Many advocates argue that this type of legislation, in turn, leads to the underreporting of hate crime by community members since agencies are unable to offer their citizens protections against such crimes (Nasatir, 2014). Consequently, these variations across state laws are reflected in the national hate crime data collection effort, which undermines our ability to understand the nature and scope of hate crime at the national-level.

Second, the HCSA mandated that the federal government collect data on hate crimes, but it did not require state or local law enforcement agencies to participate in FBI’s data reporting program (McDevitt et al., 2003; Nolan, & Akiyama, 1999; Nolan et al., 2004). According to the 2014 hate crime statistics, 15,494 law enforcement agencies provided hate crime data, but only 1,666, or 10.8 percent, of those agencies reported hate crimes in their jurisdictions. With a majority of the agencies reporting zero hate crime incidents to the FBI, these hate crime statistics continue to underestimate the actual number of incidents involving hate crimes (Levin & Nolan, 2011; McDevitt et al., 2003; Shively, 2005). For instance, local law enforcement agencies in Los
Angeles, California reported 44 racially motivated hate crimes according to the 2014 FBI hate crime statistics (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015a). In contrast, law enforcement agencies in Houston, Texas reported a total of four racially motivated hate crimes in 2014 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015a). Even while accounting for the different population sizes of each city, Los Angeles with an estimated 3.9 million residents and Houston with an estimated 2.2 million residents, the disparity in reporting practices is evident (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015a; U.S. Census Bureau, 2016).

Finally, in addition to the restrictions imposed on hate crime statistics by the hate crime legislation, researchers also suggest that the disparities in the hate crime reporting may be a function of internal factors at the local level in addition to true incidence (McDevitt et al., 2003). Primary among these internal factors is the challenge in police officers recognizing that an incident was motivated by bias with many studies suggesting numerous definitional ambiguities in what behavior characterizes hate crimes generally and bias motivation more specifically (Bell, 2002; Boyd et al., 1996; Garofalo & Martin, 1993; Martin, 1995; McVeigh et al., 2003; Nolan et al., 2004). For example, Haas and colleagues (2011) found that classification errors undermined the accuracy of hate crime statistics in West Virginia after examining the magnitude of error in official hate crime reporting. The largest number of undercounts appeared to stem from the failure of officers to recognize “bias indicators” when present in a given situation. Additionally, police organizations commonly do not have the necessary structures, resources or culture to support officers who work in highly discretionary environments to successfully identify bias motivation among the criminal incidents to which they respond to (Balboni & McDevitt, 2001; Bell, 2002; McDevitt et al., 2003).
Hate Crimes Against Latinos

As a consequence of these limitations, there has been a steady decline in the production of hate crime research. Yet, the growing presence of Latinos at the end of the 20th century has been linked to the negative portrayal of Latinos and, subsequently, reinvigorating the racial and ethnic tensions in some communities that have started to grapple with questions on diversity and assimilation. Reports by advocacy and civil rights organizations have illustrated an increasing number of attacks against Latinos in communities across the United States in association with this negative sentiment (Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund, 2009; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2009). For example, the National Hispanic Media Coalition found that news and entertainment media heavily influence how non-Latinos view Latinos and immigrants (Barreto et al., 2012). They discovered that negative portrayals of Latinos and immigrants, which were pervasive in news and entertainment media over the course of the survey, negatively influenced the public opinion of non-Latinos even in cases where they initially held positive opinions of Latinos. In an effort to address these concerns as well as address this gap in the hate crime literature, two empirical studies sought to address some of the questions on the size and scope of hate crimes against Latinos, but reached similar conclusions suggesting further investigation on the topic (Noriega & Iribarren, 2011; Norriea et al., 2012).

In response, Congress passed a House Appropriations Bill directing the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to "evaluate trends in hate crimes against new immigrants, individuals who are perceived to be immigrants, and Hispanic-Americans, and to assess the underlying causes behind any increase in hate crimes against such groups" (U.S. House of Representatives, 2009, p. 679). The two-part study funded by NIJ was conducted by Abt Associations and Northeastern
University and sought to address whether these trends are detectable given the present context imbued by anti-immigrant sentiment in the first phase of the study (Shively et al., 2013). Using hate crime statistics from the FBI’s UCR data, the authors identified a statistically significant increase in anti-Latino hate crimes in the mid-2000s and a slight downturn at the end of the decade. The second phase, on the other hand, re-affirmed the limitations in the national hate crime data collection in emphasizing that the uneven geographic distribution of crimes across different communities makes it difficult to explain what conditions may have led to the rise in hate crimes in the mid-2000s. Furthermore, the authors highlighted the need to conduct research using a smaller unit of analysis such as a community-level in order to directly inform and address local hate crime policies and to help communities respond to both offenders and victims in those communities.

Another study by Stacey and colleagues (2011) examined changes in anti-Latino hate crimes over time using UCR hate crime statistics to shed some light on the anti-immigrant sentiment. Additionally, the authors sought to explain these changes using a theoretical framework to identify whether there was an association between these state-level patterns and the Hispanic immigration population growth. As hypothesized by the minority threat framework, the authors found supporting evidence that recent changes in the Hispanic immigrant population were positively related to hate crimes against Hispanics. While these results are consistent with those found in the study by Shively and colleagues (2013), the study is subject to some of the same limitations given their source of data, as well as other challenges involving the level of analysis and basic assumptions. First, the UCR hate crime statistics, while useful for depicting changes over time, present numerous challenges, as mentioned earlier, that could influence the results given variations in state hate crime statutes and data collection methods. Second, while
the authors acknowledge that states are “highly relevant policy units for an analysis of hate crimes,” they also admit that using smaller units of analysis such as cities or neighborhoods may not have yielded a similar finding given discrepancies in the racial composition and economic conditions across communities (Stacey et al., 2011; p. 293).

Most importantly, the authors’ assert, “anti-immigrant sentiment fueled by changing patterns of immigration also may put nonimmigrant Hispanics at risk of being victimized by hate crime” (Stacey et al., 2011, p. 283). This proclamation rests on two basic assumptions. First, the authors use immigration rates calculated from legal immigration population counts to test their hypothesis assuming that legal and illegal immigration populations will follow the same patterns across space and over time. Across space, they assume that immigrants, regardless of their immigration status, will settle in the same destinations in the United States. Research suggests that this assumption holds true even though new immigrant destinations have recently started to emerge (Grieco et al., 2012). For example, areas such as Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, and New York, which have been called immigrant “gateways” over the last 50 years, continue to attract immigrants on a grand scale with many communities long-resided by immigrant populations, immigrant poverty rates similar to those of the native population, and relatively higher rates of naturalization, although English proficiency remains low (Singer, 2004). At the same time, researchers have discovered that the majority of illegal immigrants, about 9 million of the estimated 11.2 million illegal immigrants, residing in the United States live in “mixed-status” families, which refers to families with both an illegal immigrant and a legal immigrant member (Taylor et al., 2011). With illegal and legal immigrants highly correlated in terms of settlement and growth patterns, the authors’ assumption that both populations would generate similar findings in relation to their impact on anti-Hispanic hate crimes is well-founded.
Another assumption the authors make is that Hispanics are commonly perceived as immigrants (Stacey et al., 2011, p. 279). Although many opponents of immigration argue that immigrant hostility is based on the consequences of immigration, not the identity of immigrants, researchers have found the latter to be true (Clement, 2014). For example, Chavez (2008) argues that the current opposition to immigrants becoming citizens is based on the assumption that immigrants are criminals and, therefore, those perceived to be immigrants, such as Mexicans, are also criminals. Similarly, the anti-immigration discourse depicting them as a threat to the United States is based on the following notion:

“Latinos, whether immigrant or U.S.-born, are a homogeneous population that somehow stands apart from normal processes of historical change… immutable and impervious to the influences of the larger society and thus are not characterized as experiencing social and cultural change. They are uneducated, monolingual Spanish speakers, segregated into ethnic enclaves. Because they lead separate social and linguistic lives, one must assume that they marry only their own kind. They are locked into Catholic doctrine, leading to high fertility rates... seldom represented as agents of positive change, because their unwillingness to integrate denies them the opportunity to influence the larger society in any appreciable way, except in the negative – as a threat to existing institutions (e.g., education, social services, medical)” (Chavez, 2008, p. 41).

In one of the first and few studies to test the emotional impact of group cues on political attitudes and behavior, Brader and colleagues (2013) found evidence that racial or ethnic cues trigger emotional reactions, such as anxiety, which can cause changes in opinion and behavior
independently of changes in beliefs about the severity of the immigration problem. Specifically, they found that Latino immigrants largely triggered hostile attitudes and actions by citizens when considering the harmful consequences of immigration. In a separate study, Valentino and colleagues (2013) also found that these negative opinions against Latinos held true among whites when examining their perceptions of harm to American jobs and values, as well as support for immigration restrictions, allowing immigrants to take jobs in the United States, and allowing immigrants to receive government benefits. Evidently, the authors’ assumption is supported by recent polls of national opinions on immigration indicating the endorsement of measures aimed at restricting the flow of illegal immigration and the path to citizenship (Kohut et al., 2011). Valentino and colleagues (2013) affirm: “With regard to the immigration opinion in the United States, this process has led the list of possible group targets to settle primarily on one – Latinos – for much of the past two decades” (p. 164-165).

Chapter Summary

The development of a national hate crime data collection system under the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 is considered to be a major milestone in the history of the United States by drawing our attention to the prevalence of hate crimes around this country. On the one hand, it has created a heightened awareness among local law enforcement agencies that are responsible for investigating whether there are sufficient objective facts to conclude that a bias crime has taken place. On the other hand, policymakers, practitioners, and community members continue to debate on how to define and identify a hate, how prevalent these types of crime are, how to prevent future crimes from occurring, and how to address the needs of victims in these cases. Furthermore, the accuracy of the national hate crime data collection is questionable for a number
of reasons. Despite data collection efforts through the UCR, NIBRS, and the NCVS, it is difficult to understand the scope of hate crimes due to the different types of data being collected making it difficult to accurately assess the prevalence of these crimes.

In spite of these limitations, reports and studies have shown that a rising number of anti-Latino hate crimes require our attention as the political and public debate surrounding the rising immigration population carries negative overtones on how some may perceive Latinos in their communities. While two empirical studies have discovered a significant rise in hate crimes against Latinos in conjunction with the growing immigration population across the United States, it is still unclear what causes these incidents to occur in some communities. Given that effective local policies can be developed to reduce the occurrence of these events, it is important to begin to explore what characteristics in communities can explain the variation in the different levels of hate crimes (Zatz & Smith, 2012). The following chapter addresses this concern by examining the literature on communities and crime and how it can be applied to understanding the association between hate crimes and community conditions.
CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The advent of hate crime as a topic of national concern in the 1980s led to a growing interest among a number of scholars across various areas of study including criminology, political science, psychology, and sociology (e.g., Barnes & Ephross, 1994; Boyd et al., 1996; Dunbar et al., 2005; Gutierrez, 1996; Herek et al., 1997; Levin & Rabrenovic, 2001; McDevitt et al., 2003; Perry, 2003). Research explicitly addressing hate crime has grown from the occasional piece in the 1980s (e.g., D’Augelli, 1989; Finn, 1988a, 1988b; Finn & McNeil, 1987; Herek et al., 1989; Sinensky & Freeman, 1988; Southern Poverty Law Center, 1989) to a steady flow over the next two decades subsequent to the passage of the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 (e.g., Bell, 2002; Eitle & Taylor, 2008; Dharmapala & Garoupa, 2004; McDevitt et al., 2003; Perry, 2002; Shively et al., 2001; Taylor, 1991; Winters, 1996). One of the major conclusions from this large body of literature is that hate crimes have severe consequences that affect, not only the victims and their families, but entire communities.

While the hate crime legislation and data collection fostered this growing body of hate crime research, less attention has been paid to providing a theoretical explanation for this phenomenon. Given the inconsistency in the hate crime data, most hate crime research has focused on the impact of the legislation and law enforcement practices on reported hate crimes (Cronin et al., 2007; Hall, 2011; King et al., 2009; McDevitt et al., 2003; McVeigh et al. 2003; Nolan and Akiyama 1999). Studies looking to explain this phenomenon have largely employed a sociological approach that has examined the relationship between hate crime and
Competing hypotheses have primarily emerged from the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives with mixed results indicating support for one perspective over the other in explaining the prevalence of hate crimes.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the correlates of hate crimes and develop hypotheses from the leading perspectives in the hate crime literature to test on hate crimes against Latinos. First, I will provide an overview on previous studies that have examined the economic and demographic conditions in which hate crimes are more likely to occur. Next, I will summarize the two leading arguments, the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives, and the research that has shown support for each of these perspectives in explaining the prevalence of hate crimes. Finally, I’ll describe the hypotheses that will be tested to explain the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos in the present study.

**Economic Explanations for Hate Crime**

Scholars using economic conditions to explain hate crime often interpret it as an outcome of displaced frustration and competition for material resources. For example, Hovland and Sears (1940) conducted one of the first controlled studies testing the displaced frustration hypothesis. They argued that the frustration caused by the economic downturns in the South led Southern whites to transform this frustration into aggression aimed at vulnerable racial targets. Using data from 14 states in the South from 1882 to 1930, they found a strong inverse

---

4 Although there are studies that address individual-level attributes such as psychological causes that predispose different individuals to aggression and violence against a victim’s social group, this approach faces the challenge in tracking individuals over time and recording their behavior to test the individual-level attributes believed to dispose individuals to commit hate crimes.
relationship between anti-black lynching and two economic measures, cotton prices and an economic index called the Ayres index. In a re-analysis of this relationship by Mintz (1946) and, later, by Hepworth and West (1988), neither study found evidence to support a relationship between anti-black lynching and cotton prices and discovered a weak relationship between anti-black lynching and the economic index used in Hovland and Sears’ study. On the other hand, Beck and Tolnay (1990) also examined the association between cotton prices and the lynching of blacks and found evidence that violence against blacks was associated to the economic misfortunes of whites, particularly marginal white cotton farmers, while examining data from 1882 to 1930. In a more recent examination of lynching data, Green and colleagues (1998a) found no evidence to support the relationship between economic downturn and anti-black lynching after replicating Hepworth and West’s (1988) study and extending it through the Great Depression era. However, they contextualize their conclusions by suggesting that the current political conditions may act as a mediating factor to this relationship. Specifically, they suggest, “the relationship between economic discontent and intergroup aggression may hinge, then, on the ways in which political leaders and organizations frame and mobilize such grievances” (p. 89).

Other studies featuring economic conditions have also explained hate crimes as a possible outcome of a competition for material resources, in addition to political conditions. For example, Olzak (1990) hypothesized that racial violence would increase in relation to a rise in economic competition resulting from an influx of immigrants, the urbanization of blacks, economic contractions, and political challenges to white supremacy in the South. Using data from 1882 to 1914, she discovered that economic slumps during this time period, as well as the rising competition caused by an increase in the immigrant population, were significantly associated to increasing violence against blacks. Furthermore, the rise in the level of hate crimes during the
most recent economic recession in 2007 and 2008 has been linked to the widespread blame placed on the rising immigrant population (e.g., “they” are stealing our jobs, “they” are costing us too much in welfare) as published in mainstream media and extremist websites (Anti-Defamation League, 1992; Gerstenfeld, 2013; Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations, 2013; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2009).

Although this relationship has been promoted as a promising explanation for predicting the recent rise in the level of hate crimes (Pinderhughes, 1993; Tolnay & Beck, 1995), studies have found little evidence to support this hypothesis. For example, Espiritu (2004) found the impact of economic conditions in explaining the variation in hate crime incidents reported in the 1990s across the United States to be inconclusive. Green and colleagues (1998a) also found little evidence to support the relationship between economic conditions and hate crimes using unemployment rates and New York City Police Department hate crime data collected from 1987 to 1995 (Green et al., 1998a; Jenness & Broad, 1997). While they acknowledge that the divergent findings might stem from the different time periods under investigation, they highlight the questionable methodology used in earlier studies examining anti-black lynching and economic downturns at the turn of the 20th century and suggest further research to examine this complex relationship.

Demographic Explanations for Hate Crime

Much of the scholarly work on demographic patterns and hate crimes has been informed by hypotheses stemming from the realistic group conflict theory. According to the realistic group conflict theory, “intergroup hostility is produced by the existence of conflicting goals and reduced by the existence of mutually desired superordinate goals attainable only through
intergroup cooperation” (Jackson, 1993, p. 397). One hypothesis, the defended communities perspective, stemming from the literature on realistic group conflict theory conceives demographic changes as the catalyst for increasing hate crime in a community. Specifically, the defended communities perspective suggests that residents share a common identity, which hinges on their community’s racially homogeneous qualities, and a sudden growth of the minority population will produce outbursts of violence that revolve around trying to protect their community’s identity and maintain the quality of life in their community. According to Suttles’ (1972) ethnographic study of Chicago, he found that some communities, which he called “defended neighborhoods,” were bound by a common identity, such as race or ethnicity, which they conserved through a variety of different practices including “delinquent gangs, by restrictive covenants, by sharp boundaries, or by a forbidding reputation” (Suttles, 1972, p. 21). For example, street corner gangs may claim “turf” and scare off outsiders using defensive tactics for the purpose of segregating conflicting populations and maintaining their common identity.

In another ethnographic study revealing changes in the lives of Jews and Italians in a Brooklyn community during the 1970s, Rieder (1985) also observed residents of the predominantly white community express blatant prejudiced attitudes and adopt hostile behavior, including acts of violence, towards the in-migration of Latino and African American families into their communities. This bias stems from their fear that a growing number of minorities would change the community’s image. Of course, these attitudes and behaviors reflect the pervasive attitudes and behaviors across lower- and middle-class communities in the 1960s and 1970s in part due to the fear of “white displacement” as well as notions of economic strain. In contrast to Rieder (1985), DeSena’s (1990) ethnographic study focuses on informal methods of resistance applied by a predominantly white, blue-collar neighborhood in Brooklyn, New York
called Greenpoint. Specifically, she observes the use of housing, the church, and the role of women to resist changes to the demographic makeup of the community. However, she finds evidence to support the “defended neighborhoods” perspective, as initially illustrated by Suttles (1972) by arguing that the community’s resistance is a product of the changing ethnic composition during the in-migration of Latino residents to communities in Brooklyn, New York in the 1980s. While these studies find support for the defended neighborhoods perspective, the qualitative nature of their work makes it difficult to reproduce across other spaces and times to understand how defended communities could be tested to explain hate crimes during the present context.

Other hypotheses drawn from the realistic group conflict theory examining the link between racial composition and racially motivated hate crimes have revealed mixed support (Tolnay et al., 1989). The power-threat hypothesis, for example, predicts that hate crime incidents are more likely in areas with a large concentration of minorities (Blalock, 1967). Tolnay and colleagues (1989) tested this argument by examining the association between black concentration and anti-black lynching in the South. Using data from earlier studies that found support for the power threat hypothesis, the authors highlighted methodological issues in these earlier studies influencing the authors’ results. In their own examination that repairs some of these shortcomings, they find no support for the power threat hypothesis using the same datasets (Corzine et al., 1983; Reed, 1972; Tolnay et al., 1989).

Another set of arguments derived from the realistic conflict group theory have hypothesized that racially motivated hate crimes will be greatest in areas where minorities makeup a substantial portion of the population and reach a certain point before the prevalence of
hate crimes begins to decrease. Although there is little agreement on what the tipping point is, some scholars have argued that interracial hate crimes, as well as racially motivated crimes, could increase as communities become heterogeneous, where each group makes up 50 percent of the population, due to the increasing likelihood of interracial criminal encounters (Blau, 1977; Green et al., 1998b; Sampson, 1984). However, the examination of these hypotheses has been limited and the results have shown mixed support in their ability to predict racially motivated hate crimes.

**Theoretical Syntheses**

Given the mixed results in the aforementioned studies testing these conditions, some hate crime scholars have tested perspectives that consider both the influence of demographic and economic conditions to explain the prevalence of hate crimes. In order to begin to understand how these conditions may explain hate crimes against Latinos, I present two leading perspectives that offer testable hypotheses on the association between demographic and economic conditions and hate crimes based on different social processes occurring within the community. While both the leading perspectives – the defended communities and social disorganization – stem from early sociological research, each perspective offers a different explanation in terms of how the demographic and economic conditions influence the prevalence of hate crimes in communities.

*Social Disorganization Perspective*

Acknowledging the increasing diversity of urban communities at the beginning of the 20th century, Shaw and McKay (1942/1969) argued that crime was a product of socially disorganized communities, which were effected by economic disadvantage, residential mobility,
and ethnic heterogeneity. These structural characteristics were perceived to disrupt a community’s network of social relations particularly as newcomers and foreigners begin settling into urban communities inhibiting their ability to communicate and form relationships (Sampson & Groves, 1989). These conditions, in turn, accounted for variations in the capacity of communities to develop controls to prevent crimes from occurring. Using demographic and economic measures from the U.S. Census, Shaw and McKay (1942/1969) found evidence to support this perspective indicating a positive association between delinquency and socially disorganized communities in major urban cities.

While interest on the social disorganization perspective has reemerged following a rise in the immigration population at the end of the 20th century (e.g., Browning, 2002; Bursik, 1988; Duncan et al., 2003; Gibson et al., 2002; Kirk, 2009; Kubrin, 2009; Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003; Maimon & Browning, 2010; Matsueda, 2006; Morenoff et al., 2001), only a handful of studies have explored its ability to explain racially motivated hate crimes. For example, Lyons (2007) tests the hypothesis to predict hate crimes against blacks and whites in Chicago, Illinois. Drawing from the traditional theoretical assumption, the study finds support for the perspective in predicting anti-white hate crimes. In contrast to anti-black hate crimes, he finds that anti-white hate crimes are more likely to occur in areas characterized as socially disorganized. Lyons (2007) concludes: “The different patterns for anti-black and anti-white hate crime underscore the importance of disaggregating hate crimes by bias motivation” (p. 848). Grattet (2009) also examines the neighborhood conditions that affect bias crimes and other crimes, in general, in Sacramento, California. While the author finds support for the social disorganization perspective predicting crimes, in general, there is only partial support for this perspective in predicting hate crimes. Grattet (2009) finds, “ethnic conflicts are likely to erupt in settings where there is little
capacity for informal social control to manage or mediate tensions between groups” (p. 147). Specifically, communities, which are characterized by poverty and residential turnover, predict outcomes of hate crime that may convey evidence in support of the social processes described in the social disorganization perspective. However, the study aggregates all hate crimes including crimes targeting, race, sex, gender, and religion in the examination of the social disorganization perspective.

Despite these mixed results, it is evident that there is an advantage to testing the social disorganization perspective in explaining hate crime against Latinos in communities. First, it advances the hate crime literature by testing a leading theoretical perspective to explain hate crimes at the community-level. Second, the present study seeks to explore whether the social disorganization perspective explains the prevalence in reported hate crimes targeting Latinos given the mixed results based on the targeted group. Therefore, in this study, I test the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1**: Anti-Latino hate crimes are more prevalent in socially disorganized communities characterized by concentrated disadvantage, residential mobility, and heterogeneity, as informed by the social disorganization perspective net of other factors.

**Defended Communities Perspective**

While Suttles (1972) introduced the defended communities thesis based on his observations in Chicago, Green and colleagues (1998b) re-conceptualized the argument to explain hate crimes against minorities in New York City. In line with earlier studies by
ethnographers on the defended communities perspective, Green and colleagues (1998b) argue that hate crimes against minorities are a consequence of white communities resisting efforts against the sudden influx of minorities as measured by the change in their population into the community. Seeking to expand the application of the defended communities perspective in communities outside of those previously examined by ethnographers, their study sought to generalize the finding into communities across New York City by using indicators from the U.S. Census to measure for demographic composition and change. Using hate crime reports from the New York City Police Department aggregated to police districts, they find that hate crimes against minority groups – Asians, Blacks, and Latinos – coincided with patterns of demographic change of those targeted groups into predominantly white communities across the city as hypothesized by their defended communities model.

Although Green and colleagues (1998b) posit that hate crimes against Latinos are prevalent in white communities experiencing an in-migration of Latinos, other studies explore this assumption in other types of communities. For instance, Lyons (2007) tests the impact of the defended communities perspective in predicting anti-white hate crimes in majority black communities experiencing an in-migration of white residents. While Lyons finds no support for the defended communities perspective for predicting anti-white hate crimes, the findings indicate support for predicting anti-black hate crimes. To further expand this line of research, the present study considers whether the defended communities perspective predicts anti-Latino hate crimes in majority black and majority white communities experiencing an in-migration of Latino residents as described in the following hypothesis:
Hypothesis 2: Anti-Latino hate crimes are more prevalent in majority white/black communities experiencing changes in the Latino population as informed by the defended communities perspective net of other factors.

Green and colleagues (1998b) further posited a relationship between racially motivated hate crimes and economic conditions in communities. In other words, they suggested that racially motivated hate crimes were associated to economic circumstances due to the competition for economic resources. Specifically, they tested this assumption in defended communities arguing that hate crimes will be more frequent in economically depressed white communities where less affluent residents are likely to resort to crimes in contrast to more affluent residents who would resort to using other defensive measures such as security cameras and fencing. While they find no evidence to support this argument, other research has found some support for this assumption. For example, Grattet (2009) finds that hate crimes are positively associated to concentrated disadvantage in majority white communities experiencing a chance in their minority population.

In order to test this assumption on anti-Latino hate crimes, the present study uses a measure of economic disadvantage as informed by previous studies to test whether this indicator affects the prevalence of hate crimes in majority white/black communities. Recent studies on public sentiment suggest that the growing Latino population and the perceived economic threat significantly predicts punitive Latino sentiment, which could suggest a rise in anti-Latino hate crimes given the demographic composition and change in some communities (Stewart et al., 2015). However, no study has, to date, tested this assumption on anti-Latino hate crimes. Therefore, I explore this proposition in the present study as described in the following
hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 3:* Anti-Latino hate crimes are more prevalent in majority white/black communities experiencing an in-migration of Latinos and experiencing concentrated disadvantage net of other factors.

**Chapter Summary**

Despite the decline in hate crime research mired by the limitations in the data, this line of research warrants continued attention given the national concern of attacks against Latinos following the inflammatory political rhetoric against Latinos and immigrants. As informed by earlier studies, the present study seeks to address a gap in our hate crime literature by emphasizing the importance in examining the link between structural conditions and hate crime in relation to the effects of demographic change and economic disadvantage. Two leading approaches that examine these conditions in communities to explain hate crime are tested in the present study. First, the traditional social disorganization perspective suggests that hate crimes against Latinos are more likely in areas characterized by concentrated disadvantage, residential instability, and ethnic heterogeneity as a result of the community’s weakened social controls and their inability to prevent crimes from occurring. Second, the defended communities perspective suggests that hate crimes against Latinos are prevalent in areas with majority white/black populations experiencing an in-migration of Latinos, which facilitates defensive behavior in these communities. Additionally, the third hypothesis explores the impact of economic disadvantage in majority white/black communities and whether it influences the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos. This study seeks to advance both the literature on hate crimes and our understanding of the impact that communities have on crimes by examining data from Los
Angeles County. In the following chapter, I will discuss how Los Angeles County addresses some of the data limitations cited in chapter 2, epitomizes the emerging multicultural composition of American cities as a majority-minority city in the 21st century given the demographic and economic context, and offers an opportunity to test these theories in a Western city with most of the hate crime literature dominated by the examination of Midwestern and eastern cities.
CHAPTER 4

LOS ANGELES AND IMMIGRATION

As the key driver in the country’s population growth, the Latino population has had a significant impact in many communities across the United States. According to the most recent Census data, the county with the largest Latino population by far is Los Angeles County, which holds about 4.9 million Latino residents. As a traditional immigrant gateway, many Latino immigrants arriving to Los Angeles County have settled in traditional Latino communities since the end of the 20th century. Yet, much of the recent Latino population growth, which is being driven by U.S.-births, has started to migrate into non-traditional Latino communities (Brown & Lopez, 2013). While this change has transformed the demographic and economic conditions of many communities (DeSilver, 2015; Edwards, 2015; U.S. Census Bureau, 2016), some areas remain segregated by race, ethnicity, and class leading scholars to wonder whether this reflects an undercurrent of racial and ethnic intolerance (Krogstad, 2015). For instance, findings from a public survey of Los Angeles County residents found that a majority of residents (58%) expressed a negative opinion on the state of race relations in the region with a larger percentage of black and Latino residents expressing this sentiment, 70% and 64% respectively, than whites or Asians, 52% and 36% respectively (Baldassare, 2005). Therefore, as many counties begin to mirror the Latino population growth in Los Angeles County as more communities become increasingly diverse, I examine whether the demographic and economic conditions of communities in Los Angeles County are associated to the prevalence of hate crimes against

---

5 This is in response to the public survey by the Public Policy Institute of California, which asked Los Angeles County residents the following question: “How would you rate race relations in L.A. County today?” Based on the responses to the survey, a vast majority of county residents responded negatively indicating that they were “not so good” or “poor” (Baldassare, 2005).
Latinos given the racial and ethnic divide that continues to exist in many communities across the United States.

I begin this chapter by describing the evolution of Los Angeles County following the arrival and departure of different groups of individuals that brought about changes to its racial and ethnic makeup and economic condition. Starting with its transformation from a small, largely Latino remote area in the mid-19th century into a large multicultural and metropolitan region by the end of the 20th century, I discuss how the underlying accumulation of racial, ethnic, and class tension has, at times, forced it to come to terms with the intergroup hostility following violent attacks against those perceived to be “outsiders.” The current chapter seeks to provide a detailed examination on the evolution of Los Angeles County in order to understand how these conditions in the 21st century might help us forecast hate crimes against Latinos, a group that may continue to be treated as “outsiders” as they continue to expand into other parts of the county previously uninhabited by Latinos.

**Demographic Conditions**

Following the U.S. conquest of the territory of Alta California from independent Mexico in 1848, white settlers began arriving in large quantities changing much of the landscape of Los Angeles. Many of the Mexican residents were pushed out of their communities by white settlers in areas around the Plaza and relocated to areas east of downtown Los Angeles. The largest concentration of Mexican residents was found in the communities of Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles. Near the end of the 19th century, whites made up the majority of the population and the economy, language, and political system shifted away from the influence of Mexican Americans towards white dominance. Yet, the start of the 20th century brought in another radical shift in the
demographic makeup of the population as African Americans began to relocate to Los Angeles from southern states due to the promise of a better opportunity at securing freedom, housing, and employment. While discriminatory practices existed in Los Angeles, the level of racial hostility experienced by African Americans was not as severe as other parts of the country. Rather, the presence of other racial and ethnic groups, such as Chinese and Japanese immigrants, as well as Mexican Americans, changed the target of white racism towards these groups versus African Americans. This bias led to the passage of legislation, such as the Alien Land Law (1913), which prohibited Asian immigrants from owning land, and the Mexican Repatriation, which forced millions of people of Mexican descent to leave the United States regardless of their citizenship status between 1929 and 1936 (Kun & Pulido, 2013). These legal discriminatory practices soon began to look a lot more like those in the rest of the United States.

Nevertheless, another wave drew in more African Americans and Latinos during and after World War II more than doubling the size of the African American population from 75,206 to 213,897 and tripling the size of the Latino population from 61,248 to 249,173 between 1940 and 1950 (Essington et al., 2001). Many of the residents in Los Angeles County, including the pre-existing African Americans, resented the newcomers and the growing racial hostility led to discriminatory housing practices, heightened Jim Crow practices, and anti-Mexican sentiment. The polarization between Mexican-Americans and white servicemen in Los Angeles reached a peak during the zoot suit riots, which demonstrated the racial friction that existed between these two groups. In the early 1940s, Mexican Americans adopted the zoot suit subculture, which was visibly marked by their clothing style involving a long coat with baggy pegged pants, a pork pie hat, a long key chain, and thick-soled shoes (Griswold del Castillo, 2000). These “zoot suits” sharply revealed the difference between Mexican American youth and the young white
uniformed servicemen stationed in Los Angeles. After members of a Mexican American gang were charged for a highly publicized murder in 1942 called the Sleepy Lagoon case,\(^6\) anti-Mexican sentiment intensified with a series of violent incidents between young Mexican Americans and white servicemen. As a result of the murder trial, many young Mexican-Americans, who wore zoot suits and called themselves “Pacheco’s,” were linked to gang activity and, perceived to be criminals. While the violent attacks were often initiated by the white servicemen, police officers arrested “Pacheco’s” for public disturbance and local newspapers supported this characterization of Mexican American youth often depicting them as “baby gangsters and Pachuca hoodlums” (Griswold del Castillo, 2000, p. 370). Once the zoot suit riots finally subsided in June 1943, the governor of California ordered an investigation and the recommendations by the committee included a revision to public policies involving the equal treatment of all citizens by police officers, but made no direct reference to improving the conditions of or relations with Mexican American residents and their communities.

By the end of the 20\(^{th}\) century, another wave of immigrants largely arriving from Latin American countries introduced changes to the demographic, economic, and social patterns of Los Angeles County. For example, South Central Los Angeles, previously majority African American, was made up of an equal percentage of white (31.8%), black (29.4%), and Latino (31.1%) residents by 1980 (Navarro, 1993). One decade later, Latinos reached the majority (46.0%) while whites and blacks made up less than one-quarter of the residents (21.9% and 24.5%, respectively). At the same time, the state’s economy became plagued by an increasing level of poverty, unemployment, and social upheaval, which it was incapable of responding to

---

\(^6\) Nine Mexican American teenagers belonging to the 38**th** Street Gang were convicted and sentenced for the murder of a man found in an area known as the “Sleepy Lagoon” in the summer of 1942 (Larralde, 2010). These convictions were reversed after an appeal in 1944 illustrating insufficient evidence in the initial trial.
Navarro, 1993). For example, the Los Angeles Times reported, “denial rates for nearly all federal grant and local programs are running at fifty percent or higher,” which in turn left many residents with a sense that the federal and local aid process is not working (Kinigsberg, 1992). Finally, the discrimination and hostility among residents in Los Angeles reached a peak during the 1992 Los Angeles riots (Miles, 1992). Following the Rodney King trial verdict in April of 1992, both African American and Latino residents participated in the riots that took over numerous communities, particularly the South Central Los Angeles area. While the primary issue that sparked the riots was police brutality by white officers against blacks, a number of studies reported that these riots also exemplified the widening rift between other racial and ethnic groups, such as blacks and Latinos (Navarro, 1993). In their examination of the 1992 Los Angeles riots, for example, Bergesen and Herman (1998) argue, “Backlash violence is not limited to one group or one circumstance. This is not to say that resistance by whites to black in-migration has ended – residential segregation continues to be high…. But Latino or Asian in-migration into residential neighborhoods occupied by blacks can generate a backlash” (p. 51). By the end of the 20th century, white residents moved out of the central part of Los Angeles County and into the outskirts or even outside of the county. On the other hand, black residents became more isolated in their communities and Latino residents continued to grow in size in communities located in the north and central part of the county (Ethington et al., 2001).

According to the 2014 Census data, the spatial distribution of racial and ethnic groups make it clear that there continues to be a pattern of segregation among white, black, and Latino residents in communities today as illustrated in Figures 1 thru 3. First, white residents, who

---

7 In April 29, 1992, a jury in Ventura County acquitted four Los Angeles Police Department officers for the beating of Rodney King (Miles, 1992). This incident, which was caught on tape, illustrated police brutality that sparked a national debate on racial injustice.
represented the minority starting with the 1990 census, now make up about one-third of the residential population and are concentrated in areas along the west side of Los Angeles County (see Figure 1). The west side extends from the Santa Monica Mountains in the north to the South Bay region in the south where the percentage of white residents is particularly high in the wealthier areas such as the Pacific Palisades. As noted earlier, white residents began to move outside of central Los Angeles during the mid to late part of the 20th century. While some white residents moved towards the west side of Los Angeles County, many also moved outside of the county to other areas (Allen & Turner, 1997).
Figure 1. Percentage of White Residents in Los Angeles County Tracts
While the white population has shifted to the west part of the county, black residents continue to reside in several parts of south and central Los Angeles County. Throughout history, black residents have represented a minority presence and currently making up less than one-tenth of the population (8.9%). Yet, their share of the population has gradually declined starting with the 1990 Census (Ethington et al., 2001; U.S. Census Bureau, 2015, 2016). Many black residents currently reside in areas previously settled by white residents such as Windsor Hills and View Park communities, as illustrated in Figure 2. However, some traditional black communities such as Watts, which were known as black communities throughout most of the 20th century, have recently become majority Latino communities. Contrary to the movement of white residents following an in-migration of blacks and Latinos, most black residents have chosen to stay in many of their communities and, therefore, are more apt to be living in multiracial areas such as the Watts area. However, middle-class and more affluent blacks have moved towards the San Fernando Valley and many moved to parts outside of the county (Allen and Turner, 1997).
Figure 2. Percentage of Black Residents in Los Angeles County Tracts

San Fernando Valley

View Park-Windsor Hills

Percent of Black Residents
- < 1%
- 1% - 10%
- 10% - 50%
- 50% - 90%
- 90% - 99%
- > 99%
Finally, Latino residents, who have become a growing presence in many communities, are heavily concentrated in traditional Latino communities located in East Los Angeles County as shown in Figure 3. Nevertheless, as their presence has grown, many Latinos have started to expand to other parts of the county such as south and central Los Angeles that were traditionally settled by African American residents. For instance, Pastor and colleagues (2011) found that the vast majority of traditional African American communities in Los Angeles experienced a sharp to moderate decline in their population as Latinos moved in, particularly in communities located in South Los Angeles. Even areas considered “emerging African American communities” at the end of the 20th century due to the rise in number of African American residents, eventually experienced a decline after 2000 following an influx of Latino residents. Similarly, this growth has affected other Los Angeles County areas outside of south and central Los Angeles such as the San Fernando Valley (see Figure 3). Known as the Valley, this area became a major focus of new homebuilding in the period after World War II and many white residents began to move into these communities. By the end of the 20th century, however, its development began to attract many black residents followed by Latino residents. While white residents made up a majority of the Valley during the mid-20th century, the demographic patterns have now shifted with many communities becoming increasingly diverse and others turning into majority Latino communities.
Figure 3. Percentage of Latino residents in Los Angeles County Tracts
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Economic Conditions

As described earlier, many of the changes to the demographic landscape of Los Angeles County were influenced by periods of economic opportunity that attracted different waves of immigrants from other parts of the country and around the world. Escaping the lack of job opportunities due to the widespread practice of employment discrimination in the South, African Americans began to move into the area with the promise of better job opportunities in Los Angeles. Able to secure some middle-class occupations, African Americans considered this time period a “golden era” as the first wave of African American “immigrants” from the South began to build homes and develop several communities along parts of South Los Angeles. The second wave of African American “immigrants” started to arrive during World War II and continued into the late 1960s with the promise of employment stemming from the World War II defense industry, which created a constant demand for laborers in ship, plane, and steel production. This period of economic prosperity was characterized by a decline of unemployment and a rise in skill levels among its African American residents. However, this period of opportunity was short lived for African Americans as it became clear that “the preference of industrial employers for Mexican over black workers – especially in the metal and food industries – had become thoroughly entrenched, further eroding opportunity for black workers in blue-collar occupation” (Sides, 2003; p. 94). This set the stage for what some scholars consider economic conflict between black and Latino residents (Pastor 2013).

Following this period of economic opportunity, several major economic shifts took place that have since changed the economic fortunes of all of the Los Angeles residents. Starting in the 1970s, the deindustrialization led to a decline in middle-class manufacturing jobs that provided a
means of economic security for residents with modest levels of education (Pastor 2013). Because African Americans were the least favored in these jobs, they were often the first to be let go by their employers and, therefore, suffered the most from this period. The military spending that took place in the 1980s and the “reindustrialization” of certain sectors, such as light manufacturing and garments, provided some opportunities for residents, but these industries were based on a cost-efficient practice. Whereas earlier employment opportunities permitted employees with the chance to move up the career ladder and improve their economic status, these jobs represented lower-quality and lower-paying jobs, which only attracted the newer immigrants. However, this era was followed by the 1990s economic recession during which Los Angeles County witnessed a 41.4 percent loss in the manufacturing jobs that was the highest in comparison to the rest of the state (7.7%) and country (19.6%) (Pastor, 2013).

More recently, this decline in manufacturing jobs has been replaced by a rise in lower-wage service sector jobs that began to grow at the turn of the 21st century. The increasing number of Latino immigrants has kept these industries alive in the United States according to many economists, who generally agree that immigrants provide both labor complements and substitutes, which has further divided public opinion on Latinos. On the one hand, some believe that “Latinos are not only taking space but also taking jobs and lowering income,” which is negatively impacting African Americans in particular (Pastor, 2013, p. 47). As immigrants continue to work longer hours and accept lower wages, national-level studies have found that African American residents suffer from joblessness. On the other hand, Ong and Valenzuela (1996) discovered that African Americans who remained employed actually enjoy slight wage increases as a result of the complementary labor effect (p. 175). While disparities do exist, they point out that the disparities in economic opportunities are largely the result of racial/ethnic
inequality with whites, in relation to the different levels of education, which puts them behind in terms of work readiness. Therefore, the authors argue that employment competition between African Americans and Latinos would not be a problem if there were equal opportunities to begin with to provide them with the right skills and tools for better employment.

**Latinos and Local Context**

As Latinos’ presence in communities across the United States has began to grow, particularly in black residential and business areas, scholars examining interracial attitudes have found contrary opinions among groups shaped by the local context of their communities (Johnson et al., 1997; Oliver & Wong, 2003; Pulido, 2006; Regalado, 1994). Historically, white residents have in general enjoyed greater political power and economic leverage as the majority group in the United States. Notwithstanding, changes in the demographic and economic context of some communities generating new majority-minority areas has influenced how some white residents perceive Latinos with some viewing them as a threat to their community while others do not. While most studies on whites’ attitudes towards Latinos focuses on their disposition towards immigrants and immigration policies, some recent studies have examined these relations focusing on their perceptions of Latinos as an ethnic group. For example, Oliver and Wong (2003) concluded that whites residing in cities with a significant Latino population like Los Angeles demonstrated greater hostility towards Latinos than those who live in cities like Atlanta with a smaller share of Latinos. While focusing on a smaller unit of analysis, however, Oliver and Wong (2003) find that whites in largely white neighborhoods adopt greater negative stereotypes of minorities and perceive a greater threat from immigration than those who do not live in such neighborhoods. And yet, McClain and colleagues (2011) find that white residents, in
general, do not perceive that new Latino residents pose a threat regardless of the racial or economic context in Little Rock, Arkansas. Rather, they find that white residents perceive their relationship with Latino residents as positive in their communities.

Contrary to the perception of white residents, scholars have been examining relations between African Americans and Latinos for some time as the growing presence of Latinos in urban areas has largely concentrated in African American communities. Despite the flurry of studies indicating negative relations between these two groups, little is known about the local context that may contribute to how African Americans perceive Latinos (Wilkinson, 2015). For example, Johnson and colleagues (1997) examined race relations in Los Angeles and found that blacks felt threatened by Latinos as a result of their limited power and considerable struggles in communities in relation to their economic and housing circumstances. Consequently, African American residents in Los Angeles who felt threatened also expressed support for anti-immigration policies and practices if the presence of Latinos and immigrants continued to rise. On the other hand, Oliver and Wong (2003) found that African Americans who live in a diverse community were less likely to express racial resentment. For instance, Sawyer (2011) found that a substantial number of black residents join forces with Latinos when it comes to anti-immigrant and political campaigns as was the case during the election of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa in 2005 and the 2008 presidential election for Barack Obama.

Although the number of studies analyzing perceptions of Latinos given local context diverges in terms of their findings, there is a growing interest at understanding how local context shapes these relations. As Latinos enter different communities, the social settings change and, therefore, relations also change among its members. Yet, despite the level of interest in
examining racial encounters and relations that are occurring today, we know little about the prevalence of hate crimes that can result from the negative encounters between these separate groups of individuals. Furthermore, our understanding of hate crimes motivated by bias against Latinos is limited in spite of their growing presence and impact that Latinos have had on demographic and economic conditions.

By examining the relationship between hate crimes and community conditions, Los Angeles County can contribute to our overall understanding of hate crimes for a number of reasons. First, the demographic changes in Los Angeles County have greatly influenced much of the attitudes and behaviors among the different racial and ethnic groups, which are important to understand and address in looking at violent acts motivated by bias against a particular group. Historically perceived as a threat by both white and African American residents, it is critical to understand how these changes influence hate crimes against Latinos. Second, the economic changes influenced by the growing presence of Latinos also merits consideration given the association to perceptions of threat against Latinos by residents in communities, particularly those at a greater disadvantage. Finally, Los Angeles County has been the setting to some of the most well-known historical incidents that have illustrated some of the racial violence that arises from underlying hostility among racial and ethnic groups in some communities (Felker-Kantor, 2013; HoSang, 2013). Even today, this sentiment has continued to make cooperation between some groups difficult and contributing factors such as housing discrimination\(^8\) has only further encouraged this separation between African American and Latino residents in some communities (Kun & Pulido, 2013).

\(^8\) Kun and Pulido (2013) provide an example of this type of housing discrimination in a Los Angeles community called Boyle Heights, where African Americans were refused housing leading to a dominant Mexican population in East Los Angeles (p. 12).
Chapter Summary

Historically, Los Angeles has always been considered one of the most racially diverse areas in the nation. Over time, it has experienced dramatic shifts in its population with the arrival of white settlers followed by African Americans, Asians, and Latinos, each of whom arrived in waves to the area over different time periods. Related to this population growth, the economic growth in Los Angeles, which reached its peak in 1957 with the aircraft and aerospace industry, attracted many of these groups into the area from different parts of the country and world with the hope of securing employment. However, the decline in the economy in combination with the residential movement of African Americans and, later, Latinos into majority white communities has led many of its white residents to flee to the suburbs and other counties.

Currently, the demographic and economic distribution of Los Angeles County remains the same with some shifts in the settlement of Latino residents into traditional African American communities while both groups continue to grapple with a declining economy. As a result, some of the mounting racial and ethnic tensions supported by research show very different findings with the local context shaping some of the perceptions of its residents. As Camarillo (2007) notes, “In these new cities of color, inter-group relations are playing themselves out in ways reminiscent of earlier eras when native-born Americans encountered new immigrants and racial minorities as they settled in cities in large numbers” (p. 16). While many might expect that increased residential mobility, in addition to racial/ethnic transformation in communities, might create prospects for understanding, it can also create an opportunity for increased violence. Furthermore, the “sense of ownership poses potential concerns as Latinos – both immigrant and native born – move into historically Black neighborhoods” (Frasure-Yokley & Greene, 2013, p.
Needless to say, Los Angeles County offers an interesting setting to examine these issues given the evidence illustrating some of the racial and ethnic tension in the past and the concerns in on these relationships in the future. As informed by previous studies on hate crime and racial tensions, I examine how hate crimes against Latinos are influenced by demographic and economic context in communities in Los Angeles County. The growing presence of Latinos has had a clear impact on the demographic and economic context of communities, as well as perceptions of its residents, but less is known about its influence on the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos. Having reviewed the demographic and economic context of Los Angeles County in this chapter, I now turn to describing the data and methods that will be used to test my hypotheses.
The present chapter begins by describing the hate crime data collection in Los Angeles County, the unit of analysis, and the measures used in the study to examine the association between local conditions and hate crimes. As mentioned earlier, the present study builds upon existing hate crime research by testing the effects of local structural conditions on hate crimes against Latinos as informed by the defended communities and the social disorganization perspectives. Additionally, the chapter reviews the analytical techniques used in the study to address some challenges and limitations.

**Data Sources**

*Hate Crime Data*

This study uses hate crime data collected by the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations (LACCHR). The commission has been compiling, analyzing, and producing annual reports of hate crime data submitted by city police agencies, sheriffs’ offices, educational institutions, and community-based organizations over the last three decades. The commission was originally appointed by the Los Angeles County government following the “Zoot Suit” riots in 1944 in order to “seek out the causes of racial tension and devise all means possible to eliminate them” (Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations, 1969, p. 4). Later, the commission was re-established as an official agency with the Los Angeles County government in 1958 to continue fostering intergroup relations, empowering communities, and disseminating information. As a result, the commission has established numerous partnerships with law
enforcement agencies, schools, local organizations, policymakers, practitioners, and community leaders to achieve their mission at promoting positive relations across different groups and communities.⁹

The hate crime data collected by the commission includes information on bias motivation (e.g., anti-Asian, anti-Black, anti-Latino, anti-Native American, anti-White, etc.) and the location of the event making it suitable to contribute to the neighborhood-level research on hate crimes. The data collection also includes other information on the events such as the type of offense (e.g., aggravated assault, simple assault, intimidation, disorderly conduct, etc.), victims’ background information (e.g., gender, age, race/ethnicity), suspects’ background information (e.g., gender, age, race/ethnicity), and type of location where the incident took place (e.g., business, public place, residence, school, etc.), which are examined and coded by LACCHR staff. The hate crime reports submitted to the commission are carefully reviewed to eliminate any duplicates, such as the same hate crime being reported by both law enforcement agency and school district, and to ensure that each case counted as a hate crime meets the criteria of the legal definition of a hate crime in accordance with the state law. According to California’s hate crime statute (Cal. Pen. Code § 422.55 to 422.95), hate crime charges may be filed “when there is evidence that bias, hatred, or prejudice based on the victim’s real or perceived race/ethnicity, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, gender, or sexual orientation is a substantial factor in the commission of the offense” (Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations 2013, p. 3). Once the incidents are identified as a hate crime, the reports are categorized based on

⁹ For example, LACCHR assists the Hate Violence Prevention Partners of LA (HVPPLA), which includes the Bienestar, Brotherhood Crusade, Central American Resource Center, California Conference for Equality and Justice, the Muslim Public Affairs Council, and the Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund, that seeks to develop more effective grass-root efforts to reduce hate-based behaviors in Los Angeles County (Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations, 2015).
targeted group instead of relying on actual identity of the victim as a proxy. In some cases, victims are targeted based on their perceived identity, rather than their true identity and/or targeted on more than one protected category. For example, in 2014, the commission was able to identify anti-immigrant slurs, such as “Wetback!” or “You don’t belong here,” used in 21 incidents, of which 15 were also targeting Latinos. These types of cases are not uncommon given the anti-immigrant sentiment commonly expressed against Latinos. In such cases, the commission classified these crimes based on the ethnic group they were targeting since immigrants are not a protected category according to the California hate crime statute.

Nevertheless, there are certain limitations inherent in using hate crime statistics as an indicator of hate crime prevalence. One area of concern relates to the underreporting of hate crimes by victims and witnesses. On the one hand, Sandholtz and colleagues (2013) found that the percentage of hate crime victimizations reported to the police declined from 46 percent to 35 percent between the two periods of data collected from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), 2003-2006 and 2007-2011. On the other hand, King (2007) argues that they may also reflect the actual prevalence. Minority victims, in particular, have been perceived as less likely to report crimes to the police, but some argue that this is not necessarily the case (Shively et al., 2013; Zaykowski, 2010). For example, Lopez and Livingston (2009) found that the majority of Latino respondents, about 78 percent, said they would report an incident to the police based on a national survey of Latinos conducted in 2008. Furthermore, they argue that the black and white respondents in the NCVS reports included the Hispanic portions of each of those populations, which may lead to misinterpretations by under-estimating the number of Latino victims, who may have been reported as either black or white.
Another area of concern that has also been raised by numerous scholars on hate crime data collection is departmental commitment and mandates, which may influence the likelihood of law enforcement officials identifying, investigating, and reporting hate crimes (Nolan & Akiyama, 1999; McDevitt et al., 2003). Despite statewide hate crime laws, research indicates that external community factors play a significant role in the enforcement and reporting of hate crimes (Grattet & Jenness, 2008; McVeigh, et al. 2003; Nolan & Akiyama, 1999). For example, research indicates that human relations commissions have a positive effect on hate crime reporting who at a minimum keep “a watchful eye on police policies and, at maximum, an active pressure group standing by to ensure that [hate crime] policies get translated into action” (Grattet & Jenness, 2008, p. 17-18; McDevitt et al., 2000). In general, long standing local organizations such as LACCHR, are found to shape local law enforcement agencies in responding to the mandate to enforce hate crime laws and encourage reporting by both residents and law enforcement officials by aiding victims in reporting crimes (Grattet & Jenness, 2005).

**Socio-demographic Data**

In order to explore the community conditions associated with hate crimes against Latinos in Los Angeles County, the present study draws the socio-demographic information from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Surveys (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey that releases single- and multi-year estimates that describe the average characteristics of an area (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). These survey results are based on aggregated information that is spread evenly across the time period so that it does not over-represent any particular month and/or year within the period. Starting with the 2010 decennial census, the ACS was designed to replace the decennial census long form and, therefore, it currently represents one of the major sources of
demographic and economic data used by social researchers, as the decennial census has been in previous decades. In contrast to the ACS single-year estimates, the five-year estimates provide information at the tract-level on population, housing, and occupation characteristics (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). Therefore, I use the ACS five-year estimates from 2005 to 2009 and 2010 to 2014 to create the measures for the study.

**Unit of Analysis**

The present study examines hate crimes at the neighborhood-level, which I approximate using census tracts (Grattet, 2009; Krivo & Peterson, 1996; Lyons, 2007). The census tracts were drawn according to the 2010 U.S. Census boundaries, which reported 2,346 census tracts in Los Angeles County. Previous studies conducted in Los Angeles County have concluded that census tracts provide researchers with the best option to examine neighborhood effects on social outcomes because they are moderately sized in population, defined on social ecological criteria, and generally compact and not crossed by major geographic boundaries such as freeways, major boulevards, and parks (Kubrin & Ishizawa 2012; Sastry et al., 2006). While early scholars saw urban neighborhoods as “natural areas” created by groups of individuals and institutions that share certain qualities, such as economic sentimental interests, race, and vocation, recent studies have found that definitions of neighborhood boundaries vary according to a number of dimensions or perspectives such as by individuals living on the same block or in relation to the environment under consideration such as home, school, and workplace (Burgess, 1928; Lee et al., 2001; Logan & Collver, 1983; Park, 1915). As a result, many researchers have used census
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10 The ACS single-year estimates do not provide any information on demographic and economic characteristics at the tract-level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008).
tracts as a proxy for neighborhoods, particularly in cases where resident perceptions are not being measured (Martinez et al., 2008).

The final number of tracts included in the present study is 2,314. Tracts with missing information, located in one of the islands off the Pacific coast, or reporting zero residents such as those in areas where airports or parks are located are not included in the analyses (N=32). A very small number of racially motivated hate crimes were reported in these areas. While many Los Angeles County tracts are admittedly larger and more heterogeneous than tracts in other parts of the country with an average of about 4,000 residents, they are substantially smaller units than those used in previous community-level studies on hate crime. Previous studies examining racially motivated hate crimes utilized police districts as their level of analysis (Green et al., 1998a, 1998b; Lyons, 2007).

**Dependent Variables**

*Anti-Latino Hate Crimes*

The primary dependent variable is a count of anti-Latino hate crimes reported from 2003 to 2013. LACCHR reported 794 anti-Latino hate crimes committed during the study period. Table 1 describes the type of offense, location, and the background of the victims involved in these incidents. Similar to incidents reported in the national hate crime data collection and other hate crime studies (Green et al., 1998b; Harlow, 2005; Lyons, 2007; Sandholtz et al., 2013), a majority of hate crimes reported involved violent offenses such as aggravated assault and simple assault (25.8% and 35.1% respectively) and nearly one-half of the reported hate crimes occurred in public places (e.g., streets, sidewalks, parks) (43.1%).
Table 1. Characteristics of Anti-Latino Hate Crimes, 2003-2013 (N=794)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Characteristics</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Murder</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Assault</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Organization</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Communication</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Public Building</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Place</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Site/Organization</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations (2014) provided the following illustrative examples from the anti-Latino hate crime reports that convey the nature of these incidents:

A Latina woman and her children (ages 3 and 11) had a yard sale. They were confronted by a black woman who said, “I am going to get you. I am tired of you guys. You fucking Mexicans, you need to go back to Mexico. Get off the block.” The suspect began picking up items off tables and throwing them. She then picked up a metal rake and chased the victims. Once detained by police, the suspect said, “Die motherfuckers. I am going to kick your ass when I get out. I’m going to have the block blown up. I’m going to kill all these motherfuckers.” (p. 29).

On a Metro train a passenger offered an elderly Latino couple a seat. A black woman said, “Fuck them Mexicans. I want the seat.” The victims asked her in Spanish to calm down. The suspect asked, “What the fuck you say to me?” She then raised a bat in the air and yelled, “I’ll fuck you up, get up, I’ll fuck you up with this!” The suspect then turned to two Latinas sitting nearby and said, “What the fuck are you looking at? Fuck you Mexicans! Fucking beaners! Bitch, I’ll fuck you up!” The suspect prepared to strike the victims and yelled, “Beaners! Immigrants!” All four passengers exited the train to avoid being hit. The suspect said, “Goodbye you fucking Mexicans!” (p. 29).

While both cases illustrate hate crimes conducted in public places and involving violent offenses, as indicated in a majority of the reported hate crimes, these cases also describe the suspects’ information, which is infrequently reported by victims. According to Roxell (2011), a
vast majority of reported hate crime incidents do not indicate any information on the suspect because “it is more common for crimes to be reported when the perpetrator is not known to the victim than when perpetrator and victim are acquainted” (p. 200). Another reason for the underreporting of suspect information in hate crime reports is based on the type of crime. For example, Green and colleagues (1998b) argue, “in many cases, however, particularly those involving threatening notes and vandalism, the perpetrator’s race is not known or reported” (p. 381).

Nevertheless, the information accrued from some of the narratives of the hate crime reports by LACCHR indicate that a vast majority of cases are interracial with an equal number of black and white suspects committing anti-Latino hate crimes. Contrary to popular beliefs, anti-Latino hate crimes generally do not appear to be linked to interracial gang violence. For example, according to the commission’s annual report in 2012 on hate crime, none of the Black-on-Latino hate crime reports appear to be gang-related. Although some studies have indicated an association between interracial violence and gang violence in some areas, our understanding of gang violence varies drastically across municipalities (Papachristos & Kirk, 2006). For example, Papchristos and Kirk (2006) argue that municipalities generally classify incidents as gang-related based on membership or motive. Areas such as Los Angeles classify incidents as gang-related based on membership while Chicago classifies incidents as gang-related based on motivation. Therefore, hate crimes targeting Latinos that involve gang members are more likely to get classified as gang violence whereas hate crimes involving no evidence of gang membership will be classified as a hate crime. This classification separates these two different types of crimes and provides some confidence that the cases being examined are not interwoven with interracial gang violence. Additionally, research by Cid G. Martinez (2016) on black and Latino gang relations in
South Los Angeles reveals a racial divide between black and Latino gang members that are largely shaped by avoidance versus conflict contrary to media portrayals depicting repeated violent episodes between these two groups (Hernandez, 2007). Therefore, while interracial gang violence may contribute to some of the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos, they may not explain hate crimes in all neighborhoods, such as areas where interracial gang violence is not prevalent.

Regarding the characteristics of victims targeted in anti-Latino hate crimes, about one-quarter of the victims were under the age of 18 (26.9%) and over two-thirds were male (67.8%). As mentioned earlier, racially motivated hate crimes are identified and categorized based on the group being targeted whether or not it matches the actual race/ethnicity of the victim. According to the Los Angeles County hate crime reports, the vast majority of victims involved in anti-Latino hate crimes were in fact Latino (90.0%), but the remaining percentage of the victims were American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black, Middle Eastern, White, other race/ethnicity or unknown.
Table 2. Characteristics of Victims of Anti-Latino Hate Crimes, 2003-2013 (N=794)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim Characteristics</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victim Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victim Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victim Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Racially Motivated Hate Crimes

Data were also collected on reported racially motivated hate crimes from the LACCHR data collection. The hate crime data collected from 2003 to 2013 serves as a good comparison to anti-Latino hate crimes. Between 2003 and 2013, both anti-Latino and racially motivated hate crimes increased between 2004 and 2005 by about 97% and 54%, respectively, before decreasing after 2007 (see Figure 4). Since 2009, the total numbers of reported racially motivated and anti-Latino hate crimes in Los Angeles County have remained stable much like the total numbers reported in the national hate crime statistics (Shively et al., 2013).

Figure 4. Total Number of Reported Racially Motivated and Anti-Latino Hate Crimes in Los Angeles County, 2003-2013
Of the 3,639 racially motivated hate crimes reported from 2003 to 2013, the vast majority of crimes targeted African Americans (59%), which is similar to patterns found in reported racially motivated hate crimes across the country according to the national FBI hate crime statistics (see Table 3). However, Los Angeles County reported fewer anti-white hate crimes and twice as many anti-Latino hate crimes than national patterns indicate. Therefore, contrary to the setting of other hate crime studies that report too few anti-Latino hate crimes to examine, Los Angeles County reports a greater number of anti-Latino hate crimes than other parts of the country.

Table 3. Comparison of Racially Motivated Hate Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias Type</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-White</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Black</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Multi-Racial</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Other Ethnicity/National Origin</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent Variables**

In line with previous research on the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives, this study tests the independent variables described in the sections below using tract-level data drawn from the American Community Survey (see Table 4).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>Total number of all persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Latino Population</strong></td>
<td>Total number of Hispanics/Latinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Born Population</strong></td>
<td>Percent of Foreign-Born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterogeneity Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of non-Hispanic black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of non-Hispanic white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of non-Hispanic Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Disadvantage Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female headed households with children under 18</td>
<td>Percent of all female headed households (with own children under 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Percent of all persons below poverty line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance</td>
<td>Percent of all families received public assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Percent of the civilian labor force ages 16 and over who are unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Stability Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in last year</td>
<td>Percent of the population ages five and over who have moved in the last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupancy</td>
<td>Percent of owner-occupied housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults to Children Ratio</td>
<td>Total number of persons aged 18 years and older to total number of persons aged 17 years and younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Occupation</td>
<td>Percent of the population aged 16 and older employed in a professional or managerial capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Males</td>
<td>Percent of the population ages 18 to 24 and male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Disadvantage

Previous studies have indicated that areas with economic disadvantage are positively associated to observed levels of crime. This finding has been consistent even while testing in a variety of settings throughout the United States and using different measures to operationalize economic disadvantage (Kovandzic, et al., 1998; Kubrin & Ishizawa 2012; Merton, 1938). Furthermore, researchers have found that concentrated disadvantage is a strong positive predictor of crimes across different types, such as violent and property crimes, although few have tested this on observed levels of hate crime (Grattet, 2009).

As informed by earlier studies, I use the following variables to construct an indicator of economic disadvantage: percentage of single female-headed households living with their own children under the age of 18, the percentage of persons living below the poverty line, the percentage of households receiving public assistance, and the percentage of the civilian labor force aged 16 and older who are unemployed (e.g., Martinez & Stowell, 2010; Morenoff et al., 2001; Ousey & Kubrin, 2009; Stowell et al., 2009). In order to construct this index, I standardize each of the variables and then calculate the average sum of the standardized variables.11

Residential Stability

Social disorganization research has illustrated a link between crime and the residential turnover in communities (Lee et al., 2001; Martinez et al., 2008; Sampson et al., 1999; Sampson, et al., 2005). Specifically, communities comprised of residents who remain in the area for a longer period of time are negatively associated to levels of crime, net of other factors, while

11 Many studies also apply principal components or alpha-scoring factor analysis with an oblique rotation to calculate this measure, but both produced the same results (Morenoff et al., 2001; Sampson et al., 1997).
communities marked by a constant change in its residents are positively associated to levels of crime. Shaw and McKay (1942/1969) believed that individuals who reside in their communities for a short period of time are less likely to develop bonds with other community members and, therefore, develop solutions to issues such as crimes in their local community. While there is no clear indication on how long individuals need to reside in a community to reduce the likelihood of crime or what variables to use to construct this measure, previous studies have used the following variables drawn from the census data to construct this measure: the percentage of owner occupied housing units and the percentage of households occupied by residents for greater than one year (Morenoff et al., 2001; Sampson et al., 2005; Stowell et al., 2009).

The “stability index” is based on the summation of equally weighted z-scores divided by the number of items as informed by previous research (Morenoff et al., 2001). This index reflects the social disorganization perspective argument made by Shaw and McKay (1942/1969) that areas characterized by high levels of residential stability will have correspondingly low levels of crime. In the present study, we will test this index on racially motivated and anti-Latino hate crimes.

**Heterogeneity**

The social disorganization theory also argues that the racial/ethnic heterogeneity of a community will be positively associated to crimes because of the inability of its residents to communicate and form strong bonds in order to solve problems and prevent crimes from taking place (Kornhauser, 1978). In order to capture this measure of heterogeneity, previous research has used an index that was initially designed to measure intergroup relations, but is commonly used as an indicator of heterogeneity in a community (Blau, 1977; Sampson, 1985; Sampson &
Groves, 1989; Stowell, 2007). Specifically, this index measures the population diversity across four primary racial/ethnic groups drawn from the following variables found in the census data: the percent of non-Hispanic white, the percent of non-Hispanic black, the percent of non-Hispanic Asian, and the percent of Hispanic/Latino. The index is calculated based on the following formula:

\[(1 - \sum p_i^2)\]

where \(p_i\) represents the fraction of the population in a given racial/ethnic group (Sampson & Groves, 1989). This measure of heterogeneity takes into account the relative size and the number of groups in the population, with a score of one reflecting the maximum heterogeneity. Stowell (2007) notes that this measures is “more theoretically parsimonious than controlling for the size of a particular minority population (i.e., blacks)” in capturing the degree of heterogeneity in a particular area (p. 57).

**Change in the Latino Population**

As informed by earlier research, the defended communities perspective argues that the long-standing racial predominance in a community experiencing an in-migration in their minority population is positively associated to levels of hate crime against minorities. In order to test the racial predominance of an area, the present study includes a set of dummy variables that distinguish between majority white and black tracts. Communities are defined as predominantly white or black if the respective groups constitute more than 50% of the tract population. I also include a measure of the change in the Latino population by calculating the difference between
the percentage of the Hispanic/Latino population in the 2005-2009 ACS\textsuperscript{12} and the 2010-2014 ACS (Grattet, 2009; Green et al., 1998b; Lyons, 2007).

In addition to these measures, the key indicator of the defended communities’ perspective is the interaction illustrated by the change in the Latino population in a majority white or majority black community. This term is calculated by multiplying the majority white or majority black indicator by the change in the Latino population to illustrate this effect. Specifically, Green and colleagues (1998b) argue that a positive interaction would suggest that a greater likelihood of hate crimes against Latinos exists in predominantly white communities experiencing an in-migration in the Latino population. At the same time, I also suggest that there may be a greater likelihood in reported hate crimes against Latinos in predominantly black communities experiencing an in-migration in the Latino population.

Furthermore, I also test whether majority white or majority black communities experiencing economic shortcomings are associated to hate crimes against Latinos as suggested by Green and colleagues (1998b). I test this hypotheses using an indicator that is calculated by multiplying the majority white or majority black indictor by the economic disadvantage index. Specifically, I hypothesize that a greater likelihood of anti-Latino hate crimes may exist in

\textsuperscript{12} Due to the boundary changes of the census tracts from the 2010 decennial census, the 2005-2009 ACS five-year estimates, which are based on 2000 Census tract boundaries, were adjusted to match 2010 census tracts using a statistical tool developed by Logan and colleagues called the Longitudinal Tract Data Base (LTDB) (Logan et al., 2014; Tatian, 2003). This tool was used in the present study to estimate the total population and Hispanic population drawn from the 2005-2009 ACS into the 2010 tract boundaries. These estimates were used to calculate the percent of Hispanics/Latinos in the 2005-2009 ACS. This information was then matched to the 2010-2014 ACS data and the difference was calculated to capture the change in the percent of the Hispanic/Latino population between these two time periods. As a result of these tract boundary changes, a very small portion of the tracts in the 2005-2009 ACS dataset was dropped because the tracts were moved to adjacent counties (N=33). Regarding the changes made to the tracts that stayed within the county, about one-half of the tracts in the 2005-2009 ACS dataset were either split or merged into other tracts (N=1,314) according to the 2010-2014 ACS tract boundaries. The latter tracts remained unchanged.
predominantly white communities experiencing economic disadvantage. At the same time, I also test to see whether there is a greater likelihood of anti-Latino hate crimes in predominantly black communities experiencing economic disadvantage.

Additional Control Variables

The analytical models also include a number of additional control variables as illustrated in earlier studies. First, I include a control for the percent of the population that is foreign born and the percent of young males between the ages of 18 and 24 who are considered at a high risk for criminal involvement (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1986). Previous studies have found both indicators to be significantly related to levels of crime (Krivo et al., 2009; Lee & Martinez, 2002; Lee et al., 2001; Morenoff & Sampson, 1997).

Additionally, I include measures of affluence as indicated by earlier research on communities and crime (Martinez et al., 2010; Sampson & Morenoff, 2004; Stowell, 2007). While measuring for economic disadvantage, Sampson and Morenoff (2004) warn against ignoring the impact of concentrated affluence that is generally ignored in measures of economic disadvantage. As a proxy for neighborhood affluence, I use a measure of the percentage of the population aged 16 years and older that is employed in a professional or managerial capacity. Studies indicate that communities with affluent residents, such as those employed in a professional or managerial profession, may act as a protective factor against crime (Martinez and Stowell, 2012). Another structural covariate included in the model testing the social disorganization perspective is the relative presence of adults per child, which is measured by a ratio of adults who are 18 years and over to children under 18 years of age, that is used in
previous literature to capture elements of informal monitoring across neighborhoods (Sampson et al., 1999).

**Analytical Techniques**

*Negative Binomial Models*

To examine the influence of community characteristics as informed by the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives on anti-Latino hate crimes, I estimate these models using a negative binomial variant of Poisson regression. Like many other criminological studies examining crimes, the present study uses counts of hate crimes, which are discrete with a number of tracts reporting zero hate crimes. The Poisson distribution has been the standard approach because it “characterizes the probability of observing any discrete number of events (i.e., 0, 1, 2, …), given an underlying mean count or rate of events, assuming that the timing of the events is random and independent” (Osgood, 2000, p. 23).

Nevertheless, the basic Poisson regression model is considered inappropriate when there is apparent overdispersion in the crime data (Greene, 1994; Osgood, 2000). As Osgood (2000) notes, “Applying the basic Poisson regression model to such data can produce a substantial underestimation of standard errors of the β’s which in turn leads to highly misleading significant tests” (p.28). Generally speaking, overdispersion is a violation of the Poisson restriction that the variance of the observed random variable equals its mean. Consequently, before we begin to conduct the analyses, I illustrate the overdispersion of reported racially motivated and anti-Latino hate crimes. Figures 5 and 6 show the histograms of racially motivated and anti-Latino hate crimes per tract as positively skewed with the majority of tracts reporting zero hate crimes.
Figure 5. Racially Motivated Hate Crimes per Census Tract

Figure 6. Anti-Latino Hate Crimes per Census Tract
Because a majority of tracts report zero anti-Latino and racially motivated hate crimes, it is unsuitable to use the Poisson distribution that assumes that the conditional mean and variance are equal. One commonly used alternative to the Poisson distribution is the negative binomial regression model (Berk & MacDonald, 2008; MacDonald & Lattimore, 2010; Osgood, 2000). The negative binomial regression model relaxes the assumption of a normal distribution by combining the Poisson distribution of event counts with a gamma distribution of the unexplained variance in the true mean event counts (Grattet, 2009; Green et al., 1998b; Kubrin & Ishizawa, 2012; Lyons, 2007; Stowell, 2007). Thus, the negative binomial distribution combines both distributions such that the expected mean of the outcome of anti-Latino hate crime counts (Y) follows a Poisson distribution and the variance is equal to the Poisson and gamma distribution as shown in the following formula below:

\[ E(Y) = \mu, \quad \text{var}(Y) = \mu + \mu^2 / k^{-1} \]

The parameter \( k > 0 \) describes the shape of the gamma distribution that is skewed to the right (MacDonald & Lattimore, 2010). Furthermore, as recommended by Osgood (2000), I include tract population as an exposure variable (population at risk) and constrain this coefficient to equal one.

Spatial Dependence

Previous studies on communities and crime argued that communities are interdependent of one another and, therefore, there is reason to believe that the level of crime in one community

---

13 Other diagnostics tests, such as the likelihood-ratio test and two-way graphs of predicted values of the Poisson and negative binomial models, also illustrated the overdispersion of the outcome variables and provide evidence to support the application of negative binomial model in the present study.
may depend on the actions and activities occurring in other areas (Light & Harris, 2012; Morenoff & Sampson, 1997; Morenoff et al., 2001; Tita & Radil, 2010). In line with this research, the present study explores the spatial effects of hate crimes based on the following reasons. First, the application of artificial boundaries in community-level research, whether based on survey data or tracts, introduces possible error since residents living in two different neighbors, or tracts, may share social ties. Consequently, the theoretical assumption that crime is associated to the local conditions (e.g., concentrated poverty, stability, heterogeneity, etc.) of the community may hold true for the local community, as well as the levels of crime in an adjacent community. Spatial models address this issue by recognizing the possibility of interdependence among artificially created communities. Second, hate crimes, much like homicide, are interpersonal crimes that are based on social interaction and, therefore, may lead to retaliatory hate crimes in neighboring communities. An attack against one member of a “community” may lead to a retaliatory attack against another member of a different “community” or encourage other attacks in other neighboring areas that hold similar beliefs as those in the local area (Craig, 1999; Lyons, 2007, 2008). Therefore, there is reason to believe that “social processes might be at work that result in the diffusion, or contagion of crime, across space” (Tita & Boggess, 2010, p. 469).

To better understand the spatial distribution of racially motivated hate crimes and anti-Latino hate crimes in Los Angeles County, I test whether or not these variables are positively autocorrelated. Spatial autocorrelation occurs when the measured values of a variable (or variables) sampled at nearby locations are not independent of one another (Cliff & Ord, 1981). When similar values cluster together in geographical space, the variable is said to be positively
spatially autocorrelated, which is a common feature in the study of crime.\textsuperscript{14} Although a number of statistical tests have been developed to measure spatial autocorrelation, one of the most commonly used and well-known tools, Global Moran’s I, measures spatial autocorrelation based on both feature locations and attribute values simultaneously (Light & Harris, 2012; Radil, 2016; Stowell, 2007). The Global Moran’s I statistic assesses the extent to which the pattern of values are spatially random using a spatial weights matrix.\textsuperscript{15} Subsequently, the null hypothesis indicates that there is no spatial clustering of the values associated with the geographic features in the study area. Additionally, I also explore the local indicators of spatial analysis to evaluate the clustering at the local level by calculating Local Moran’s I for each spatial unit and evaluating the extent to which points that are close to a given point have similar values\textsuperscript{16} (Anselin, 2005). These findings are illustrated in Chapter 6.

Given the spatial dependence, or spatial clustering, of the outcome variables, I include a spatial term in the model using a two-stage estimation process as described in previous studies (Stowell, 2007; Tolnay et al., 1996). The first step involves generating a set of predicted values created by regressing the dependent variable on all of the independent variables of interest. Second, these fitted values are then transformed into a spatial weighted average using the statistical software package, GeoDa (Anselin, 2005). The final resulting weighted average is

\textsuperscript{14} Radil (2016) argues that positive auto correlation is a key feature because of the “built environments that provide the setting for much of the study of crime” (p. 538). Specifically, he argues that the segregation patterns of individuals along education, economy, politics, culture, or other similar dimensions of identity, as well as the land-use activities that also cluster together in urban environments, forms the basis for positive spatial auto-correlation.

\textsuperscript{15} Using GeoDa software, I use a first order contiguity spatial matrix that identifies contiguous communities that share common boundaries, which is often referred to as queen contiguity (Anselin, et al., 2000). In other words, each tract is weighted by the values of all of its direct contiguous neighbors.

\textsuperscript{16} In contrast, the Global Moran’s I statistic calculates the extent to which points that are close together in space have similar values, on average (Anselin, 2005). This global analysis, therefore, assumes homogeneity across space.
included in the multivariate regressions, described in Chapter 6, as the control for spatial autocorrelation.

**Chapter Summary**

The primary goal of this study is to examine the full effects of structural conditions as informed by the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives on hate crimes against Latinos. The recent growth in the Latino population has led to significant changes in communities in terms of the demographic and economic conditions, but less is known about its impact on hate crimes against Latinos. Previous studies on structural conditions and crime have shown a strong relationship between these two using a variety of different indicators of crime and recent studies have shown a strong association between Latino population and perceived Latino threat (Stewart et al., 2015). Nevertheless, no study to date has tested these conditions at the local level on anti-Latino hate crimes in the 21st century. Therefore, this research contributes to the hate crime literature in a twofold manner. First, this research casts new light on the public assertion that the increasing number of Latinos in communities has led to a rise in hate crimes against Latinos following the public rhetoric against Latinos and immigrants. While previous studies have focused almost exclusively on racially motivated hate crimes, this study focuses on anti-Latino hate crimes given the demographic and economic impact that the Latino population has had in many areas. Second, this study offers the opportunity to examine hate crimes against Latinos in an extremely diverse, but heavily segregated urban environment of Los Angeles County. Earlier studies examining hate crimes at the community-level have focused on other urban environments such as Chicago and Sacramento, which are influenced by different types of social processes at the local-level (Grattet, 2009; Lyons, 2007). The present study, therefore, is
sensitive to the spatial distribution of reported hate crimes across Los Angeles County communities and the diversity of communities in terms of their demographic and economic conditions that are examined to explain the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos given competing perspectives in the criminological literature.
CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS

The current chapter presents the results from a series of descriptive, spatial analytic, and multivariate analyses designed to examine the relationship between community conditions and anti-Latino hate crimes as informed by the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives. First, I present a descriptive analysis on the social structural characteristics of all communities in Los Angeles County, those that reported zero anti-Latino hate crimes, and those that reported one or more anti-Latino hate crimes during the study period. This permits us to begin identifying any clear differences in social structural characteristics according to the indicators highlighted in both theoretical perspectives. Second, I employ spatial analytic techniques to indicate whether or not there is evidence of clustering, or spatial autocorrelation, in the data. Based on the findings from this analysis, I include controls for spatial dependence in the subsequent multivariate models as informed by previous studies (Cancino et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2001; Lyons, 2007; Morenoff et al., 2001; Nielsen et al., 2005; Stowell, 2007). Third, I begin to explore the relationships between measures of key community characteristics, as informed by the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives, and racially motivated hate crimes and anti-Latino hate crimes by presenting the bivariate correlations. Fourth, I present the results from the multivariate models predicting all racially motivated hate crimes as a comparison to the outcomes of the anti-Latino hate crimes. Finally, the multivariate models examining the relationship between anti-Latino hate crimes and community characteristics are examined to directly address the hypotheses informed by the defended communities perspective and the socially disorganization perspectives. In this final stage of the analyses, it is important to
disentangle the effects of demographic characteristics, economic conditions, and other community characteristics in order to begin to understand the conditions under which hate crimes against Latinos are more prevalent in Los Angeles County.

**Descriptive Analysis**

Table 5 illustrates the means and standard deviations of key community characteristics based on the following three categories of tracts: (1) all Los Angeles tracts (N=2,314); (2) Los Angeles tracts reporting zero anti-Latino hate crimes from 2003 to 2013 (N=1,860); and (3) Los Angeles tracts reporting one or more anti-Latino hate crimes from 2003 to 2013 (N=454). It is clear that a large majority of tracts did not report any anti-Latino hate crimes during the study period. In comparing the communities, there are three main disparities in the characteristics between communities reporting zero anti-Latino hate crimes and those reporting one or more anti-Latino hate crimes. First, it is evident that communities reporting one or more anti-Latino hate crimes had, on average, a larger percentage of black residents (11.49%) in comparison to communities reporting zero anti-Latino hate crimes (7.05%). Second, residents in communities reporting one or more anti-Latino hate crimes experience higher levels of poverty (22.74%) versus those reporting zero anti-Latino hate crimes (17.80%). Third, communities reporting zero anti-Latino hate crimes appear to live in more stable communities whose residents own their own homes (48.16%) versus communities that reported one or more anti-Latino hate crimes (42.36%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Tracts</th>
<th>Tracts Reporting Zero Anti-Latino Hate Crimes</th>
<th>Tracts Reporting At Least One Anti-Latino Hate Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Tracts</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Latino Hate Crimes</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>26.07</td>
<td>28.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>47.74</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>47.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Latino</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign Born</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>35.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female-headed households</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with own children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Below poverty</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Receiving public assistance</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unemployed</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owner occupied housing</td>
<td>47.02</td>
<td>26.44</td>
<td>48.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Living in the same house</td>
<td>86.74</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>86.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although this descriptive analyses provides an initial understanding on differences by communities that reported anti-Latino hate crimes, it is clear that communities reporting one or more anti-Latino hate crimes are characterized by higher levels of poverty and instability. While both types of communities illustrate a racially/ethnically diverse population, there are some minor differences. Overall, these differences highlight the importance of examining what conditions influence anti-Latino hate crimes in communities, which we begin to unravel in the following sections looking at the spatial distributions and associations as informed by theories on communities and crime.

**Exploratory Spatial Descriptive Analyses**

Using Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis (ESDA), I begin to determine whether there are any patterns of spatial association or spatial autocorrelation. First, I begin by mapping the total number of reported racially motivated and anti-Latino hate crimes by tracts to identify any spatial patterns across the county. Tracts with few counts of reported hate crimes are displayed in lighter colors and, as the number of reported hate crimes per tract increases, the shading becomes progressively darker. Figure 7 shows the spatial distribution of the number of reported racially motivated hate crimes across tracts throughout Los Angeles County. As shown in the figure, the tracts located in the northern and central sections of the county reported a greater number of racially motivated hate crimes while tracts located in along the southwestern and southeastern edges of the county tend to report fewer racially motivated hate crimes with some pockets of a larger count of reported racially motivated hate crimes in a few tracts located in the southeastern border of the county.
Figure 7. Spatial Distribution of Racially Motivated Hate Crime Counts in Los Angeles County
Figure 8 shows the spatial distribution of reported anti-Latino hate crimes and illustrates a larger number of tracts reporting zero anti-Latino hate crimes across the county. Much like the distribution of racially motivated hate crimes, a larger number of hate crimes against Latinos were reported in tracts located in the north and central parts of the county. Tracts located in the southwestern and southeastern parts of the county also reported fewer anti-Latino hate crimes than tracts located in the far northern parts of the county.

Figure 8. Spatial Distribution of Anti-Latino Hate Crime Counts in Los Angeles County
Global Moran’s I

While the figures illustrate an uneven spatial distribution of racially motivated and anti-Latino hate crimes across tracts that may suggest that tracts are not independent of each other, the Global Moran’s I statistic is calculated to test for spatial association or spatial autocorrelation (Anselin et al., 2005). Using GeoDa software, the Global Moran’s I statistic for racially motivated hate crimes indicates a positive, but insignificant Moran’s I statistic. In contrast, the Global Moran’s I for anti-Latino hate crimes indicates a positive and significant statistic (0.022; p<0.001) indicating that anti-Latino hate crimes are found in a tract and its adjacent tracts. Therefore, the question remains, “What causes spatial autocorrelation in anti-Latino hate crimes?” As discussed in Chapter 5, a number of scholars suggest that some types of hate crimes may include a retaliatory characteristic, which suggests that hate crimes may be spatially linked (Craig, 1999; Levin & McDevitt, 1993; McDevitt et al., 2002). For example, McDevitt and colleagues (2002) found about one-tenth of all hate crime cases reported by the Boston Police Department over an 18-month period revealed evidence of retaliation generally committed by single offenders and at the victim’s area of residence. However, few studies have examined how these patterns differ by the type of hate crime (e.g., anti-Latino) and most focus exclusively on anti-black and anti-white hate crimes. For instance, Craig’s (1999) study finds that an expressed desire for retaliation is associated to the participant’s race while looking at different reactions by racial groups to racist hate crimes, but focuses on the different reactions to anti-black and anti-white hate crimes by black and white participants. Nevertheless, this evidence does suggest that anti-Latino hate crimes may be retaliatory hate crimes, which explains the different spatial patterns between racially motivated hate crimes, in general, and anti-Latino hate crimes.
Local Moran’s I

In order to provide information on the specific locations of spatial patterns in contrast to the global spatial patterns as illustrated in the previous section with the Global Moran’s I, local indicators of spatial association (LISA) maps are illustrated. LISA maps are based on a localized version of Moran’s I statistics and, therefore, give an indication of the extent of significant spatial clustering of similar values around each observation (Anselin, 1995). LISA maps are used to illustrate areas that are described as “high-high” and “low-low,” which suggest clustering of similar values, as well as “high-low” and “low-high” locations, which are spatial outliers.17

In figure 9, a LISA cluster map illustrates spatial clustering and spatial outliers of racially motivated hate crimes. In general, high levels of racially motivated hate crimes are reported in the northern part of the county, while low levels of racially motivates hate crimes are apparent in the southern part of the county. Spatial outliers are generally located along the central eastern and western border of the county. According to the local Moran’s I, these findings were not significant and, therefore, the null hypothesis, which argues that there is no spatial clustering of the values associated with the geographic features in the study area, could not be ruled out.

17 Another way to describe figures 9 and 10 is based on each of the following category descriptions: “Not significant” illustrates areas that are not significant at a significant level of 0.05; “High-high” illustrates areas with high values that are surrounded by high values; “Low-low” illustrates areas with low values that are surrounded by low values; “Low-high” illustrates areas with low values surrounded by high values; and “High-low” illustrates areas with high values that are surrounded by low values (Anselin, 1995).
Figure 9. Spatial Clustering of All Racially Motivated Hate Crimes in Los Angeles County
Figure 10 illustrates spatial clustering and spatial outliers of anti-Latino hate crimes. In general, high levels of anti-Latino hate crimes are reported in the northern area Los Angeles, while low levels of anti-Latino hate crimes are apparent in the western and eastern parts of Los Angeles County. Spatial outliers are generally located the central area of the county. According to the local Moran’s I, these findings are positive and significant and, therefore, the null hypothesis, which argues that there is no spatial clustering of the values associated with the geographic features in the study area, can be ruled out.

Upon closer examination of the clusters of low levels of reported anti-Latino hate crime, it is evident that these areas are located in predominantly Hispanic/Latino communities located in East Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley. On the other hand, communities located in the clusters of high levels of reported anti-Latino hate crimes are generally located in the South-Central Los Angeles area where traditionally black communities used to reside. As discussed in Chapter 4, these communities have grown increasingly diverse having experienced a significant decline in their black population over the last two decades as a result of the growing Latino and immigrant population. Nevertheless, the concentration of these high-high clusters and low-low clusters of anti-Latino hate crimes provides some initial support for the relationship between the distribution of anti-Latino hate crimes and local conditions of these communities, which is of particular interest to the present study. Therefore, I include a control for the possibility of spatial clustering or dependence in the following anti-Latino hate crime regression models.
Figure 10. Spatial Clustering of Anti-Latino Hate Crimes in Los Angeles County
Bivariate Correlations

Before illustrating the findings from the multivariate models, Table 6 explores the relationship between the variables by presenting the correlations\(^{18}\) for the dependent and independent variables to understand the degree of linear association between the dependent variables and the independent variables.\(^{19}\) As described by the social disorganization perspective, racially motivated hate crimes is positively associated to economic disadvantage and heterogeneity and negatively associated to residential stability. Anti-Latino hate crimes illustrate the same association as suggested by the social disorganization perspective. The relationships described by the defended communities’ perspective, on the other hand, show a positive association between racially motivated hate crimes and both variables for white defended and black defended communities, but run counter to the expectations for the association between anti-Latino hate crimes and white defended communities, which is associated negatively. However, Table 6 confirms the positive associations between racially motivated and indicators for poor majority white (majority white * economic disadvantage) and poor majority black communities (majority white * economic disadvantage) as suggested in the defended communities perspective. Anti-Latino hate crimes are also positively associated to both indictors for poor majority white and poor majority black communities.

\(^{18}\) Polychoric correlations are presented as the most consistent and robust estimator for studying the degree of association between the two variables given the construction of some of the independent variables that would imply ordinal scales (Holgado-Tello et al., 2008; Kolenikov & Angeles, 2004).

\(^{19}\) See Appendix A for the full matrix of polychoric correlations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Racially Motivated Hate Crimes</th>
<th>Anti-Latino Hate Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racially motivated hate crimes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Latino hate crimes</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic disadvantage index</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential stability index</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity index</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign born</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Latino pop.</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority white</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority black</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority white * Change in Latino pop.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority black * Change in Latino pop.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority white * economic disadvantage</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority black * economic disadvantage</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult child ratio</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Prof. occupation</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Young male</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to examining the direction of these associations, this analytical technique provides a review of the correlation structures to assess the degree to which multicollinearity among the independent variables that may result in biased parameter estimates in the multivariate analyses (Stowell, 2007). Generally, previous studies have identified correlations that are equal to or greater than the absolute value of 0.80 as the threshold. Specifically, these variables are considered problematic for multivariate regression models and additional diagnostics tests are helpful to further diagnose the issue. However, with the exception of the indicator for poor majority white communities (majority white * economic disadvantage), which are the product of two of the variables listed, none exceed the 0.80 threshold as indicated in Table 6.

---

Additional diagnostics tests for multicollinearity were conducted on the variables of interest. The most widely used diagnostic for multicollinearity, the variance inflation factor (VIF), does indeed show that the indicator for poor majority white communities contains a high VIF (3.64). Nevertheless, the inclusion of powers or products of other variables lead to high VIFs (Allison, 2012). In this case, the indicator for poor white communities is a product of the economic disadvantage index and majority white communities’ variable. While it is indeed highly correlated with the majority white communities’ variable, this is not something to be concerned about because the multicollinearity is not considered to have any adverse consequences in such cases.
Multivariate Analyses

The current section presents and describes the findings from the multivariate models. As indicated earlier, the dependent variable in each table is based on the number of reported hate crimes in a given tract and, therefore, the results are based on a negative binomial estimation procedure. In contrast to linear regression estimation procedures, which include the size of the population as an independent variable, this method adds the natural logarithm of the population at risk to the regression model. Effectively, the variable has a fixed coefficient of one and the “regression becomes an analysis of rates of events per capita, rather than an analysis of counts of events” (Osgood, 2000, p. 27).

The analyses proceed in a stepwise fashion, with each of the models adding an additional component conceptually related to the relationship between community conditions and hate crimes. The first model incorporates the conditions described in the traditional social disorganization perspective. The purpose of this first model is to test the first hypothesis, which suggests that socially disorganized conditions – economic disadvantage, residential stability, and heterogeneity – will predict hate crimes net of other community factors. The next set of models test the conditions discussed in the defended communities perspective as described in hypotheses 2 and 3. As mentioned earlier, hypothesis 2 suggests that hate crimes are more prevalent in majority white/black communities experiencing changes in the Latino population net of other factors. Specifically, models 2 through 4 tests the demographic changes and economic conditions described by the defended communities perspective in majority white communities. Subsequently, models 5 through 7 explore these same conditions, but focus on their effect in majority black communities. Below I describe each of these findings in detail.
Before I begin to examine the hypothesized effects of community conditions on anti-Latino hate crimes, Table 7 illustrates the multivariate analyses that explore these effects on all racially motivated hate crimes. As shown in models 1 through 7, the structural factors described in the traditional social disorganization perspective emerge as significant predictors of racially motivated hate crimes net of other factors. While this finding is consistent with much of the criminological research on violent crimes, few hate crime studies have tested this theory and only limited support has been identified (Grattet, 2009; Lyons, 2007). With respect to the individual structural characteristics, for example, concentrated disadvantage emerges as a statistically significant predictor of racially motivated hate crimes in the models. This finding is consistent with most criminological research on violent crimes and emerges in hate crime studies testing the effect on violent hate crimes and anti-white hate crimes (Chamberlain & Hipp, 2015; Grattet, 2009; Lee et al., 2001; Sampson, 1987; Stowell, 2007). However, Lyons (2007) finds no evidence to support these effects on anti-black hate crimes and, contrary to expectations, finds that anti-black hate crimes are more prevalent in affluent communities.

Models 2 through 7 illustrate the effect of the conditions described by the defended communities perspective on racially motivated hate crimes. Consistent with previous studies, majority white communities have a positive and significant effect on racially motivated hate crimes in all three models. Nevertheless, the key feature of the defended communities perspective, which is the interaction term representing the change in the Latino population in majority white communities (majority white * change in Latino population), does not have a statistically significant effect on racially motivated hate crimes in Los Angeles County.
Therefore, these findings do not support the defended communities hypothesis that demographic change in majority white communities (majority white * change in Latino population) will lead to racially motivated hate crimes.

On the other hand, Model 4 illustrates a significant and positive association between racially motivated hate crimes and the indicator used to illustrate majority white communities experiencing concentrated disadvantage (majority white * concentrated disadvantage). This finding is not unexpected given the significant and robust effect that concentrated disadvantage has on racially motivated hate crimes. At the same time, few hate crime studies have found support for this hypothesis using a variety of different measures for concentrated disadvantage, including the index used in the present study. Nevertheless, studies have largely diverged based on the target of the hate crime and, therefore, it will be important to test this hypothesis on anti-Latino hate crimes to determine whether the same effect is found as hypothesized by the defended communities perspective.

Models 5 through 7 examine these same effects but shifting the focus on majority black communities. All three models indicate a negative and significant association between racially motivated hate crimes and majority black communities; given earlier findings, the direction of this association is expected. Yet, contrary to previous findings, the effect of the key term illustrating majority black communities experiencing a change in the Latino population (majority black * change in Latino population) is both positive and significant. These findings clearly indicate that the catalyst for action as hypothesized by the defended communities perspective is significant in majority black communities, but not majority white communities. While this finding is not robust, it suggests that a different type of dynamic exists in majority black and
majority white communities experiencing a change in their population that effects racially motivated hate crimes in general. Although previous studies have found these effects in majority white communities, this finding highlights the need to examine majority black communities in future research, which is discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

In addition to examining the effects of demographic change according to the defended communities perspective, Model 7 illustrates the economic effect by testing the association between disadvantaged black communities (majority black * concentrated disadvantage) and racially motivated hate crimes. Unlike disadvantaged white communities, disadvantaged black communities and racially motivated hate crimes are not significantly associated. Yet, less is known about the effects of economic strain in majority black communities on racially motivated hate crimes. Previous hate crime studies examining these effects have found a limited amount of evidence to illustrate this effect (Green et al., 1998b; Lyons, 2007, 2008).

Furthermore, most of the effects of the control variables are consistent with those observed in models predicting overall levels of crime. For example, the percent of the population that is foreign born is negative and significant in all models as found in many immigration and crime studies (Lee et al., 2001; Martinez et al., 2015; Stowell, 2007). This suggests that racially motivated hate crimes are less prevalent in communities with a large percentage of foreign born. Also consistent with previous studies, the adult-child ratio is also negative and significant suggesting that the fewer adults per child increases the chances of racially motivated hate crimes. Surprisingly, the coefficient for the percent of young male population is negative and significant across all models suggesting that fewer young males lead to more racially motivated hate crimes, which differs from much of the literature noting that young males are positively associated to
levels of crimes. However, Kubrin and Ishizawa (2012) also found the percentage of young male to be negatively associated with violent crime levels in Los Angeles, which may reflect different dynamics in the local context. The control variable for percent of the civilian population in a professional occupation does not reach statistical significance with the exception of Models 2 and 3, which are negatively associated to racially motivated hate crimes as informed by previous studies suggesting that increases in professionals is associated to fewer hate crimes.

Before moving into a discussion of the multivariate results for anti-Latino hate crimes, it is clear that there is little evidence to support the defended communities hypotheses in racially motivated hate crimes. To the extent that the results show that poor majority white communities are positively and significantly associated to racially motivated hate crimes (Model 4), this outcome may be associated differentially to specific groups of racially motivated hate crimes, such as anti-black or anti-Latino. The same may be true for the finding that majority black communities experiencing a change in the Latino population are positively and significantly associated to racially motivated hate crimes (Model 6). At the same time, the findings, which illustrate support for the community conditions that characterize socially disorganized communities, are not surprising given the wealth of evidence in support of the social disorganization theory. Nevertheless, these tables contain the results from the first multivariate analyses designed to test these hypotheses empirically in a different urban area than previously examined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Disadvantage Index</td>
<td>0.394 (0.068)**</td>
<td>0.401 (0.068)**</td>
<td>0.396 (0.068)**</td>
<td>0.368 (0.069)**</td>
<td>0.445 (0.069)**</td>
<td>0.439 (0.07)**</td>
<td>0.451 (0.071)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability Index</td>
<td>-0.134 (0.05)**</td>
<td>-0.134 (0.05)**</td>
<td>-0.133 (0.05)**</td>
<td>-0.135 (0.05)**</td>
<td>-0.118 (0.05)**</td>
<td>-0.122 (0.05)**</td>
<td>-0.118 (0.05)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity Index</td>
<td>0.828 (0.193)**</td>
<td>0.974 (0.204)**</td>
<td>0.968 (0.205)**</td>
<td>0.900 (0.208)**</td>
<td>0.798 (0.193)**</td>
<td>0.795 (0.193)**</td>
<td>0.806 (0.194)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign Born</td>
<td>-0.010 (0.003)**</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.003)**</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.003)**</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.003)**</td>
<td>-0.012 (0.003)**</td>
<td>-0.013 (0.003)**</td>
<td>-0.013 (0.003)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority</td>
<td>0.206 (0.095)**</td>
<td>0.202 (0.096)*</td>
<td>0.372 (0.133)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.699 (0.201)**</td>
<td>-0.815 (0.213)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Latino Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority * % Change in Lat. Pop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority * % Change in Lat. Pop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority * Economic Disadv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority * Economic Disadv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult-Child Ratio</td>
<td>-0.014 (0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.013 (0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.013 (0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.012 (0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.004)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professional Occupation</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.003)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.003)*</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.003)</td>
<td>-0.004 (0.003)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.003)</td>
<td>-0.004 (0.003)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Young Male</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.005)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-7.258 (0.267)**</td>
<td>-7.379 (0.272)**</td>
<td>-7.371 (0.272)**</td>
<td>-7.354 (0.272)**</td>
<td>-7.024 (0.275)**</td>
<td>-7.001 (0.275)**</td>
<td>-7.011 (0.274)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logged population included as exposure. N=2,314
*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.001
Anti-Latino Hate Crimes

In the present section, I turn to testing the hypotheses on anti-Latino hate crimes. As hypothesized by social disorganization theory, economic disadvantage and heterogeneity are positive and significantly associated to anti-Latino hate crimes in all models (see Table 8). These findings reflect those identified in the previous section on racially motivated hate crimes in support of the first hypothesis as informed by the social disorganization perspective with the exception of one condition. Residential stability, while holding a negative coefficient in all models as predicted, does not reach any level of significance. Therefore, there is partial support for the social disorganization hypothesis with only two of the three conditions influencing reported anti-Latino hate crimes in communities.

Recent studies have revealed similar findings on the association between crimes and residential stability despite evidence from other studies on the significant association between neighborhood instability and crime as per the social disorganization perspective (Morenoff & Sampson, 1997). For example, Boggess and Hipp (2010) find no evidence on a significant relationship between violent crime and residential instability in Los Angeles communities with the exception of communities that have a larger share of Latino residents. Looking at hate crimes in Sacramento, Grattet (2009) also find no significant association between residential turnover and anti-black hate crimes. However, Grattet (2009) did find a positive and significant relationship between violent crimes and residential instability. Therefore, the fact that racially motivated hate crimes are negatively and significantly associated to residential stability while anti-Latino hate crimes are not significantly associated reveals that there is something different about the context in which racially motivated hate crimes, in general, take place that differs from
the communities where anti-Latino hate crimes take place. This finding is discussed further in the chapter 7 and sheds some light on the importance of taking into account the composition of the community in which stability occurs and its affect on different types of crimes.

Models 2 through 7 examine the hypotheses informed by the defended communities perspective for majority white and majority black communities. Much like the findings for racially motivated hate crimes, majority white communities were positive and significantly associated to anti-Latino hate crimes in two of the three models (Models 2 and 3). With the exception of Model 4, anti-Latino hate crimes were more likely to occur in majority white communities in Los Angeles County. Because a majority of the defended communities’ research has focused on the prevalence of hate crimes in white communities, these findings fall in line with the observed link between racial composition and racially motivated hate crimes (Rieder, 1985). However, the hypothesized argument by the defended communities perspective that this link “may be due to the ways in which prejudice is mobilized by the demographic composition and change” (Green et al., 1998b, p. 398), which is tested in model 3, is not supported given the insignificant effect of interaction term for white defended communities (white majority * % change in Latino population).

In model 4, the effect of majority white communities is no longer significant, which includes the interaction term for economically disadvantaged white communities (majority white * economic disadvantage). Therefore, hypothesis 3 that suggests anti-Latino hate crimes are likely to occur in majority white communities experiencing a change the Latino population and economic disadvantage is not supported in the present findings. This reflects the findings in earlier studies testing this hypothesis, which found mixed results using different measures to illustrate economic strain in majority white communities (Green et al., 1998b; Lyons, 2007).
Focusing on these conditions in majority black communities, Models 5 through 7 examine the demographic change and economic conditions illustrated in the defended communities perspective on anti-Latino hate crimes. While the previous analyses found a positive and significant effect between racially motivated hate crimes and the key term representing the catalyst in majority black communities (majority black * change in Latino population), the findings in Models 6 and 7 find no significant impact from any of the conditions described by the defended communities hypotheses. The effect of demographic change (majority black * change in Latino population) on anti-Latino hate crimes, while positive, does not reach statistical significance. Similarly, the association between economic conditions (majority black * economic disadvantage) in majority black communities and anti-Latino hate crimes does not reach statistical significance.

With the exception of two of the control variables, the findings are consistent with earlier studies. The results in Table 8 illustrate a negative and significant association between anti-Latino hate crimes and the percent of the population that is foreign born, which supports the findings from previous studies suggesting that crimes are less prevalent in communities with a large percentage of foreign born (Lee et al., 2001; Martinez et al., 2015; Stowell, 2007). The results again find a negative and significant association between anti-Latino hate crimes and the adult-child ratio, which suggests other forms of informal social control decrease the likelihood of anti-Latino hate crimes. Findings in Table 8 also illustrate a negative and significant association between anti-Latino hate crimes and the percent of young males as noted in the previous section.

Contrary to previous research, the percent of the civilian labor force population in a professional occupation is positive and significantly associated with anti-Latino hate crimes although the coefficients are small. Comparing the average percent of the civilian labor force
population in a professional occupation between tracts with zero reported anti-Latino hate crimes (12.10%) and tracts with one or more anti-Latino hate crimes (12.25%) illustrates a very small difference. Therefore, I suggest that this finding, while surprising, may be associated to reporting patterns of anti-Latino hate crimes. For example, individuals living in communities with a larger percent of individuals in a professional occupation increase the chances that victims or witnesses are willing to report a hate crime.
Table 8. Negative Binomial Regression Models of Community Characteristics and Anti-Latino Hate Crimes (With Spatial Lag)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Disadvantage</td>
<td>0.731 (0.119)***</td>
<td>0.742 (0.119)***</td>
<td>0.724 (0.119)***</td>
<td>0.736 (0.122)***</td>
<td>0.693 (0.122)***</td>
<td>0.675 (0.123)***</td>
<td>0.671 (0.124)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability Index</td>
<td>-0.107 (0.099)</td>
<td>-0.108 (0.098)</td>
<td>-0.104 (0.098)</td>
<td>-0.105 (0.098)</td>
<td>-0.122 (0.099)</td>
<td>-0.120 (0.099)</td>
<td>-0.119 (0.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity Index</td>
<td>0.618 (0.370) *</td>
<td>0.855 (0.386) **</td>
<td>0.844 (0.385) **</td>
<td>0.875 (0.391) **</td>
<td>0.654 (0.370) *</td>
<td>0.656 (0.370) *</td>
<td>0.672 (0.370) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign Born</td>
<td>-0.023 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.005)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority</td>
<td>0.359 (0.185) *</td>
<td>0.361 (0.185) *</td>
<td>0.281 (0.249)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.454 (0.334)</td>
<td>0.394 (0.352)</td>
<td>0.481 (0.438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Latino</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.008 (0.007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority * %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Latino</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority * %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.053 (0.441)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult-Child Ratio</td>
<td>-0.028 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.027 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.025 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.024 (0.007)**</td>
<td>-0.023 (0.007)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professional Occupation</td>
<td>0.019 (0.006) **</td>
<td>0.014 (0.006) **</td>
<td>0.014 (0.006) **</td>
<td>0.014 (0.006) **</td>
<td>0.020 (0.006) ***</td>
<td>0.020 (0.006) **</td>
<td>0.018 (0.006) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Young Male</td>
<td>-0.027 (0.009) **</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.009) **</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.009) **</td>
<td>-0.025 (0.01) **</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.010) **</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.010) **</td>
<td>-0.025 (0.009) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial lag</td>
<td>-1.081 (0.362) **</td>
<td>-1.133 (0.373) **</td>
<td>-1.221 (0.382) **</td>
<td>-1.220 (0.381) **</td>
<td>-0.935 (0.345) **</td>
<td>-0.911 (0.345) **</td>
<td>-1.321 (0.39) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-7.094 (0.527)***</td>
<td>-7.214 (0.531)***</td>
<td>-7.191 (0.531)***</td>
<td>-7.211 (0.532)***</td>
<td>-7.387 (0.554)***</td>
<td>-7.397 (0.553)***</td>
<td>-7.248 (0.556)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logged Hispanic/Latino population included as exposure. N=2,314
*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.001
The second control variable that raises questions is the spatial lag term, which is significant and negative across all models. While the positive spatial dependence is dominant in spatial data analyses, negative spatial dependence is rare although some studies in econometrics have noted that it is not uncommon (Garet & Marsh, 2002; Kao & Bera, 2013). According to Kao and Bera (2013), the negative spatial dependence term may be influenced by one source of spatial dependence in the model, which requires an investigation of the data that finds negative spatial autocorrelations, which involves further redevelopments in research on spatial data analyses. Yet, another suggestion includes running the analyses without a spatial lag term to assess the different outcomes of the coefficients. Following this suggestion, Table 9 reports the results of the anti-Latino hate crime regression models without the spatial lag term. The findings from the table display similar results as shown in Table 8 with the exception of the effect of the heterogeneity index. In contrast to the models in Table 8, the heterogeneity index is no longer significant in Model 1 and Models 5 through 7. This latter finding suggests that some of the spatial clustering of anti-Latino hate crimes may also be associated with the clustering of heterogeneous neighborhoods. It is possible that the spatial effect is an artifact of the vast quantity and diversity of communities on which the lagged term is based with few reported anti-Latino hate crimes. I discuss this finding further in the chapter summary.
Table 9. Negative Binomial Regression Models of Community Characteristics and Anti-Latino Hate Crimes (Without Spatial Lag)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Disadvantage Index</td>
<td>0.748 (0.12)***</td>
<td>0.760 (0.119)***</td>
<td>0.741 (0.12)***</td>
<td>0.751 (0.122)***</td>
<td>0.706 (0.123)***</td>
<td>0.686 (0.123)***</td>
<td>0.691 (0.124)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability Index</td>
<td>-0.108 (0.1)</td>
<td>-0.108 (0.099)</td>
<td>-0.101 (0.099)</td>
<td>-0.102 (0.099)</td>
<td>-0.123 (0.1)</td>
<td>-0.122 (0.1)</td>
<td>-0.119 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity Index</td>
<td>0.542 (0.372)</td>
<td>0.812 (0.389)*</td>
<td>0.807 (0.388) **</td>
<td>0.834 (0.393) **</td>
<td>0.584 (0.372)</td>
<td>0.584 (0.372)</td>
<td>0.583 (0.372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign Born</td>
<td>-0.023 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.005)***</td>
<td>-0.021 (0.005)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority</td>
<td>0.419 (0.185) **</td>
<td>0.431 (0.185) **</td>
<td>0.352 (0.251)</td>
<td>0.448 (0.335)</td>
<td>0.358 (0.351)</td>
<td>0.552 (0.443)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority</td>
<td>0.419 (0.185) **</td>
<td>0.431 (0.185) **</td>
<td>0.352 (0.251)</td>
<td>0.448 (0.335)</td>
<td>0.358 (0.351)</td>
<td>0.552 (0.443)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Latino Population</td>
<td>-0.007 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.010 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.010 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority * % Change In Lat. Pop.</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority * % Change In Lat. Pop.</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Majority * Economic Disadv.</td>
<td>-0.149 (0.353)</td>
<td>-0.149 (0.353)</td>
<td>-0.149 (0.353)</td>
<td>-0.149 (0.353)</td>
<td>-0.149 (0.353)</td>
<td>-0.149 (0.353)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Majority * Economic Disadv.</td>
<td>-0.133 (0.438)</td>
<td>-0.133 (0.438)</td>
<td>-0.133 (0.438)</td>
<td>-0.133 (0.438)</td>
<td>-0.133 (0.438)</td>
<td>-0.133 (0.438)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult-Child Ratio</td>
<td>-0.030 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.029 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.028 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.028 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.027 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.025 (0.007)***</td>
<td>-0.025 (0.007)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professional Occupation</td>
<td>0.023 (0.006)***</td>
<td>0.017 (0.006)**</td>
<td>0.017 (0.006)**</td>
<td>0.017 (0.006)**</td>
<td>0.024 (0.006)***</td>
<td>0.023 (0.006)***</td>
<td>0.023 (0.006)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Young Male</td>
<td>-0.029 (0.01)**</td>
<td>-0.028 (0.01)**</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.01)**</td>
<td>-0.028 (0.01)**</td>
<td>-0.028 (0.01)**</td>
<td>-0.027 (0.01)**</td>
<td>-0.027 (0.01)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-7.527 (0.514)***</td>
<td>-7.678 (0.515)***</td>
<td>-7.698 (0.513)***</td>
<td>-7.712 (0.514)***</td>
<td>-7.767 (0.542)***</td>
<td>-7.767 (0.541)***</td>
<td>-7.782 (0.54) ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logged Hispanic/Latino population included as exposure. N=2,314
*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.001
Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the effects of community conditions as informed by the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives on anti-Latino hate crimes using a variety of different analytical techniques. First, the findings from the descriptive analysis in Table 5 revealed that areas with at least one anti-Latino hate crime have a larger percentage of black residents, poor residents, and renters. Second, the findings from the exploratory spatial descriptive analysis provide a visual of the spatial distribution of hate crimes in figures 7 and 8, a test of the spatial autocorrelation globally, and information on the specific locations of spatial patterns using local indicators of spatial association shown in figures 9 and 10. Generally, the findings reveal that spatial autocorrelation exists in the reported anti-Latino hate crimes and, therefore, a spatial lag term is created to control for spatial dependence in the multivariate models. Third, I present the correlations of the dependent and independent variables in Table 6 to describe the association between the independent variables and the dependent variables. These findings show no evidence of multicollinearity between variables that would be considered problematic. Fourth, I present the findings from the multivariate models in Table 7 that describe the association between racially motivated hate crimes and community conditions. These models begin to test the hypotheses drawn from the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives on all racially motivated hate crimes to begin to understand how these associations compare to those found in the examination of anti-Latino hate crimes. While I find support for the first hypothesis, which suggests an association between hate crimes and conditions characterized by the social disorganization perspective, there is no evidence to support the hypotheses suggesting an association between hate crimes and defended communities. Fifth, I turn to the findings from the multivariate models testing the association
between anti-Latino hate crimes and communities in Table 8. Similar to the findings from the examination of all racially motivated hate crimes, the findings provide evidence in support of the first hypothesis when the spatial lag term is included in the models with the exception of the residential stability index, which is not significantly associated to hate crimes. There is no evidence, on the other hand, to support the defended communities’ perspective suggesting an association between anti-Latino hate crimes and majority white or majority black communities experiencing a change in their Latino population as described in the second hypothesis. There is also no evidence to support the third hypothesis that suggests an association between anti-Latino hate crimes and poor majority white or poor majority black communities experiencing a change in their Latino population.

Because the results in Table 8 indicate that anti-Latino hate crimes and the spatial lag term are negative and significantly associated, Table 9 explores the effects of the community conditions on anti-Latino hate crimes without the spatial lag term as recommended in previous studies on how to interpret negative spatial autocorrelation\(^\text{21}\) (Kao & Bera, 2013). Interestingly, the findings are similar to the models that include the spatial lag term (Table 8) with the exception of the heterogeneity index that is no longer significant when the indicator for majority black communities is included.\(^\text{22}\) Thus, heterogeneity and majority black communities are not associated to anti-Latino hate crimes when it is assumed that clustering in anti-Latino hate crimes is not a result of spatial association. Although a thorough explanation for these different outcomes may warrant further qualitative and quantitative exploration, I provide a possible explanation for this finding based on the association between the spatial distribution of reported

\(^{21}\) Kao and Bera (2013) suggest, “negative spatial autocorrelation is likely to occur when competition between regions (or agents) outweigh cooperative factors” in their study (p. 1).

\(^{22}\) Additional correlation tests reveal no high correlation between any of the independent variables and the lag term.
anti-Latino hate crimes and demographic conditions. The findings from the exploratory spatial descriptive analysis (ESDA) illustrate a clustering of tracts with low levels of reported anti-Latino hate crimes surrounded by high levels of reported anti-Latino hate crimes ("low-high") in tracts located in South and Central Los Angeles. As mentioned in chapter 4, Black and Latino residents currently reside in many of the communities located in South and Central Los Angeles with many areas becoming increasingly diverse as the Latino population grows.23 While a number of reports show instances of interracial conflict and violence in South and Central Los Angeles as similarly reflected figure 1024 (Martinez, 2016), recent studies have illustrated attempts by members of these communities to forge ties over issues, as communities become increasingly heterogeneous forcing them to lift up their differences to work together (Kun & Pulido, 2013; Pastor, 2013). These findings may provide an explanation for the high levels of reported anti-Latino hate crimes surrounded by low levels of reported anti-Latino hate crimes based on attempts by the local communities to reduce interracial conflict and violence (Martinez, 2016). However, controlling for spatial association of anti-Latino hate crimes, the findings illustrate that the diversity of the area has a positive and significant implication, which may indicate other spatial interactions.

Overall, what do these results really mean for future research on hate crimes against Latinos? These result underscore the importance of integrating theories of hate crime to explain different types of targeted hate crimes in different locations given the changing social processes.

23 The percentage of black and Latino residents in Los Angeles County tracts was discussed in Chapter 4 with figures illustrating the percentage of black and Latino residents per tract in Figures 2 (p. 54) and 3 (p. 56), respectively.

24 Figure 10 displays the spatial clustering of anti-Latino hate crimes in Los Angeles County and areas marked as "high-high" in South and Central Los Angeles represent tracts that are reporting high levels of anti-Latino hate crimes surrounded by other high levels of reported anti-Latino hate crimes.
for each group and location (Grattet, 2009; Green et al., 1998b, 2001; Green & Spry, 2014; Levin & McDevitt, 2002; Lyons 2007, 2008; Shively et al., 2013). It is important to capture the different effects that communities have on different people given the changing demographic landscape in Los Angeles County and the United States, general. Nevertheless, it should be noted that this study is the first to examine these effects on anti-Latino hate crimes at the tract-level. With the exception of Green and colleagues (1998b), no other study has examined the prevalence of anti-Latino hate crimes at the community-level and few studies have been able to provide a sufficient amount of support to explain the prevalence of racially motivated hate crimes, in general. Further discussion of the findings, the limitations, and future implications are discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

The present study has sought to address a major concern on the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos. As discussed at the beginning of the chapter, this topic has generated a significant amount of attention based on the apprehension associated to the growing immigration population and its effects on the racial and ethnic landscape in the United States (Chavez, 2008; Martinez & Valenzuela, 2006; Portes & Rumbaut, 1996; Waldinger, 1989). Specifically, the prevailing popular sentiment of the immigrant population have been fundamentally destructive and the strong public association between immigrants and Latinos has led to a widespread concern about attacks against both U.S.-born and foreign-born Latinos (Chiricos et al., 2001; Eitle & Taylor, 2008; Holmes & Smith, 2008; Johnson et al., 2011; Martinez, 2002; Steffensmeier & Demuth 2001; Stewart et al., 2015). Although it is difficult to unravel the association between negative perceptions on Latinos and crimes targeting Latinos, the present study provides a better understanding on how changes in the racial and ethnic landscape informed by theories on communities and crimes can help us understand the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos.

While it is clear that the existing literature on immigration and crime has dramatically grown, the same cannot be said for the hate crime literature. As discussed in chapter 2, hate crimes were not recognized in the United States until the 1980s and 1990s when states and the federal government passed legislation defining hate crimes and mandating for a data collection repository to understand the size and scope of this issue. Of course, like many official crime data collections, current hate crime statistics faces a number of limitations making it difficult to
examine and, even more difficult, to explain using a theoretical framework. Nevertheless, a few studies have successfully demonstrated support for relationships between community conditions and hate crimes as informed by early ethnographic researchers during the 1970s and 1980s as described in Chapter 3. Nevertheless, some researchers have started to examine the topic adopting new theoretical approaches, focusing on different time periods, and applying new methodological techniques that can establish a cause and effect for hate crimes in communities (Cheng et al., 2013; Green et al. 2001; Haas et al., 2011; Hanes & Machin, 2014; King et al., 2009; Shively et al., 2013). Nonetheless, most of the research on hate crimes continues to focus on race (anti-black and anti-white), which fails to address some of the more recent demographic trends of the 21st century.

The U.S. Census Bureau predicts that the United States is on its way to becoming a majority-minority nation by 2050 as many counties such as Los Angeles County having already reached this demographic proportion (Taylor & Cohn, 2012). Yet, previous studies have failed to identify and understand what conditions affect the prevalence of hate crimes against Latinos. While this is hindered by the quality and quantity of hate crime data that is available (Shively et al. 2013), recent studies have started to explore the association between the widespread anti-Latino sentiment and the growing size of the Latino population and the perceived economic threat (Brader et al., 2008; Stewart et al., 2015; Valentino et al., 2013; Wilkinson, 2015). Studies have, for the most part, illustrated that the growth in the Latino population has led to a rise in punitive attitudes against Latinos (Stewart et al., 2015). Yet, less attention is paid to illustrating these conditions and their effects on racially motivated violence versus racial attitudes. This leads us to the main research question in the present study: how do demographic and economic conditions influence anti-Latino hate crimes in communities? Before I review the findings from
the analyses that directly respond to this question, I discuss how the research setting contributes to future research.

**Los Angeles Context**

As one of the first and largest majority-minority counties, Los Angeles County has experienced tremendous changes over the last few decades. The demographic and economic transformation influenced by the rise and fall of the four principal race-ethnic groups - Asians, Latinos, Blacks, and Whites – has led to a certain amount of tension as implied by patterns of residential segregation in communities along the lines of race and ethnicity, as well as class and locality (Wilkinson, 2015). Most recently, the Latino population has experienced the largest population growth in Los Angeles County currently making up nearly one-half of the county’s residents. This growth has, in turn, produced mixed opinions on Latinos’ presence with some residents feeling like Latinos are “taking over” their towns (Chavez, 2008). These anti-Latino attitudes appear to exist in areas that are racially mixed, areas that are predominantly white or black, and even in areas where Latinos have established a considerable presence over time (Wilkinson, 2015). Nevertheless, existing studies have not given us a clear understanding on the conditions under which hate crimes against Latinos are more prevalent despite the widespread anti-Latino sentiment. We have a limited understanding about whether hate crimes are more prevalent in areas that are racially heterogeneous or racially homogeneous and whether economic conditions influence this outcome. As the number of majority-minority counties increases in relation to the Latino population growth (DeSilver, 2011), it is important to understand how demographic and economic conditions across different communities affects hate crimes against Latinos in an area already established as a majority-minority county.
**Review of Research Findings**

The present study focuses on the role of the conditions as suggested by the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives on anti-Latino hate crimes. First, according to the traditional social disorganization perspective, crimes are more prevalent in areas characterized by economic disadvantage, residential instability, and heterogeneity. Second, the defended communities perspective suggests that hate crimes are more prevalent in racially homogeneous areas experiencing demographic change and economic strain. While previous hate crime studies have tested these theoretical implications (Grattet, 2009; Green et al., 1998b; Lyons, 2007, 2008), no study has systematically tested these effects on anti-Latino hate crimes in 21st century communities. In addition to contributing to the hate crime literature, the present study seeks to refine current theories on communities and crimes to explain hate crimes against different groups and in alternative settings than previously examined. The following sections discuss the findings from the study.

**Hypothesis #1: Social Disorganization Perspective**

The impact of community conditions as described by the social disorganization perspective on racially motivated hate crimes remains largely unexplored. As noted earlier, previous studies have illustrated some evidence in support of this perspective for the conditions prescribed by the traditional social disorganization theory, but findings have shown mixed results depending on the type of hate crime (e.g., anti-black, anti-white, etc.) being examined. Below I describe the findings based on the associations between anti-Latino hate crimes and economic disadvantage, residential stability, and heterogeneity as informed by previous studies on the traditional social disorganization theory.
Economic Disadvantage

While contemporary criminological research has documented a positive and significant association between economic disadvantage and different levels of crime, few contemporary hate crime studies have found evidence to support the influence of economic conditions on hate crimes.\textsuperscript{25} Indeed, most hate crime studies have relied on demographic conditions to explain hate crimes while the effect of economic strain has demonstrated no significant association and, therefore, has received less attention and support in the hate crime literature (Green et al., 1998b; Lyons 2007, 2008). Yet, consistent with theoretical expectations, economic disadvantage is found to have significant and positive impact on racially motivated hate crimes, as well as anti-Latino hate crimes, in the present study across all models and operating independent of other conditions.

According to Shaw and McKay (1942/1969), crime is more prevalent in economically disadvantaged communities as a result of a concerted effort by residents try to makeup for the short supply of opportunities and resources. Such communities are also less likely to engage in efforts to prevent crimes from occurring and, therefore, the informal social controls that would otherwise exist in areas are not found in socially disorganized communities. While the findings from the present study suggests that anti-Latino hate crimes are more prevalent in economically disadvantaged communities, the findings do not support the other conditions, mainly heterogeneity and residential instability, that are believed to disrupt the forms of social control that would prevent crimes from occurring. Yet, recognizing some limitations in the earlier

\textsuperscript{25} As mentioned in Chapter 3, there are a number of historical accounts that illustrate the effects of economic conditions on racially motivated crimes, such as African American lynchings, but recent scholarship has failed to identify similar effects given recent measures used to capture economic strain or hardship in communities (Green et al., 1998a, 1998b; Olzak, 1989).
literature, recent studies on the social disorganization perspective have sought to improve our understanding on neighborhood inequality given the current “urban reality” (Morenoff et al., 2001). Specifically, researchers have begun to recognize that housing discrimination and residential segregation found in numerous cities has led to a greater concentration of blacks and Latinos in economically disadvantaged areas making it difficult to disentangle the effects of black, Latino, and poverty (Kun & Pulido, 2013; Martinez, 2014; Morenoff et al., 2001). Therefore, I discuss how the effects of concentrated disadvantage on anti-Latino hate crimes might be better understood in terms of race and ethnicity in the following section on racial and ethnic heterogeneity.

Heterogeneity

In line with the social disorganization perspective, the effect of racial and ethnic heterogeneity is positively and significantly associated to levels of anti-Latino hate crime independent of other structural conditions. Earlier studies argued that the more diverse a community is the less likely they will be able to communicate and develop social norms to prevent crimes from occurring in their communities (Sampson, 1984; South and Messner, 1986). Nevertheless, as noted in the previous section, the effect of heterogeneity on crimes has raised some questions. Recent studies have indicated that the composition of a community and the economic status are strongly associated making it difficult to disentangle the effects of race and poverty on crime. For instance, researchers have found, “there are in fact no white neighborhoods that map onto the distribution of extreme disadvantage that black neighborhoods experience” (Morenoff et al., 2001, p. 528). Similarly, the wealthiest areas in Los Angeles County have the largest percentage of white residents while areas with a majority of black or Latino residents are also living in the poorest areas (Kun & Pulido, 2013). Therefore, minority
communities, whether majority black, Latino, or diverse, that are strongly associated to concentrated disadvantage, will theoretically lack the protective mechanisms that are based on access to social and institutional resources to prevent crimes from occurring. This conclusion provides some support for the findings illustrated in the present study whereby racially motivated hate crimes and anti-Latino hate crimes are positively and significantly associated to concentrated disadvantage and heterogeneity given their inability the means from which to prevent crimes from taking place.

Residential Stability

Contrary to economic disadvantage and heterogeneity, residential stability, revealed only partial evidence to support its impact on hate crimes. While multivariate models on racially motivated hate crimes found a negative and significant association, residential stability did not reach significant in any of the models testing anti-Latino hate crimes (tables 8 and 9). Previous criminological research has used a number of different indictors to measure residential stability, or residential instability, and tested its effect on different categories of crimes (Boggess & Hipp, 2010). Contrary to economic disadvantage, studies testing for residential stability as described in the social disorganization perspective have been less consistent. While some studies illustrate a negative and significant relationship as expected, some scholars have found no relationship and others have found a positive and significant relationship suggesting that more stability could lead to higher levels of crime (Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Patillo, 1998; Sampson & Groves, 1989; Warner & Pierce, 1993; Warner & Roundtree, 1997). Most recently, scholars have suggested alternative approaches in testing residential stability such as using a different interpretation for the indicator, using a different measure to better capture the effect, and/or illustrating a different
type of effect given the community that is being examined. For example, Boggess and Hipp (2010) found that instability was positively associated to violent crime only when using an index of general residential turnover to capture the effect. Additionally, the measure was found to be most effective and consistent in Latino communities suggesting that crimes are less likely in Latino communities with little residential turnover. Consequently, the findings in the present study, which highlight two different outcomes, as illustrated in tables 8 and 9, may simply suggest that a different measure may need to be considered to capture the hypothesized effect.

_Hypothesis #2 and #3: Defended Communities Perspective_

Regarding the findings testing the defended communities’ perspective, there are several critical and intriguing results. First, I discuss the findings from the second hypothesis, which suggested that hate crimes are more prevalent in majority white/black communities experiencing changes in the Latino population as informed by the defended communities perspective net of other factors. Second, I discuss the findings from the third hypothesis, which suggested that hate crimes are more prevalent in majority white/black communities experiencing an in-migration of Latinos and experiencing concentrated disadvantage net of other factors. Finally, I will provide a brief discussion on future implications for testing the defended communities’ perspective.

_Hypothesis #2: Defended Communities and Change in the Latino Population_

Based on the results of the second hypothesis, there is little support of an association between hate crimes and defended communities. Specifically, Green and colleagues (1998b) suggest that anti-Latino hate crimes will occur more frequently in majority white communities experiencing an in-migration of Latinos. While none of the multivariate models found support
for this argument, there is some partial support for this perspective in majority black communities. The association between racially motivated hate crimes and the interaction term describing a change in the Latino population in majority black communities is weak but significant. Yet, the association between racially motivated hate crimes and majority black communities are significant, but in the opposite direction than suggested by the defended communities perspective. According to Table 7, racially motivated hate crimes are less prevalent in majority black communities. Because previous studies have tested this perspective using majority white communities with the exception of Lyons (2007, 2008), this finding suggests that racially motivated hate crimes, in general, are not associated to predominantly black areas, which is contrary to the expectations that dominate most of the media on interracial conflict and violence in predominantly black communities (Martinez, 2016). Nevertheless, this association is not significant in the models testing the association on anti-Latino hate crimes and, therefore, there is no support for the second hypothesis in explaining anti-Latino hate crimes.

Hypothesis #3: Defended Communities and Economic Disadvantage

While prior studies have experimented with different measures that illustrate the effect of economic strain in majority white or majority black communities, the present study uses a measure of concentrated disadvantage drawn from the literature on communities and crime. In line with previous studies, I test the third hypothesis using an interaction term that describes majority white and black communities experiencing economic disadvantage. As illustrated earlier, there is no support found for this hypothesis with the exception of a positive and significant association between racially motivated hate crimes and economically disadvantaged white communities. Although little is known about this effect in the hate crime literature due to a
limited amount of support for the influence of economic strain, this finding supports some of the research that is found in the literature on communities and crime. For example, Krivo and Peterson (1996) find support for the previously held assumption that causes of crime are rooted in the structural differences among communities rather than in race/culture. Looking at different patterns of crime in economically disadvantaged white and black communities, they find that the higher levels of crime are found in both types of communities highlighting the role of extreme disadvantage. However, the association is found in majority white areas experiencing higher levels of economic disadvantage rather than majority black areas experiencing higher levels of economic disadvantage. While this finding is surprising in community level studies looking at crimes in general, this finding is supported by some of the literature on hate crimes. For example, Lyons (2008) finds that anti-black and anti-white crimes are associated to conditions. While heterogeneity and spatial proximity are associated to anti-white hate crimes, racial homogeneity and change in the minority population are associated to anti-black hate crimes. Of course, it is important to keep in mind that all racially motivated hate crimes are tested in the analysis with a larger share of anti-black hate crimes found in the data. Therefore, this finding may fall in line with previous studies examining anti-black hate crimes and defended communities as a result of the larger share of anti-black hate crimes influencing the outcomes of the study.

Overall, the third hypothesis is not supported in the examination of anti-Latino hate crimes. Green and colleagues (1998b) also note, “Experimenting with a variety of different economic indicators (e.g., poverty rates, median income) and specifications (e.g., ratios of white to nonwhite unemployment rates),… in no case did we find evidence to support the notion that incidents are more frequent in economically depressed areas” (p. 395). While there is a large quantity of research that finds a strong association between the index of economic disadvantage
used in the study and crime, there is still scarce and limited research on the relationship between race/ethnic gaps in disadvantage and the differences in crime, generally, and none that have systematically examined the differences in hate crimes (Ulmer et al., 2012). While there is no evidence to support the association suggested in the third hypothesis, the finding raises questions about how the interactions between race/ethnicity and economic advantage/disadvantage may explain hate crimes using different measures that might better capture the concentration of both poverty and affluence as introduced in other studies (Morenoff et al., 2001).

In summary, the results from the multivariate models offer some support for conditions described by the traditional social disorganization perspective as suggested in the first hypothesis and little support for the defended communities’ perspective as suggested in the second and third hypotheses (see Table 10). Although little support is found for the associations described by the defended communities’ perspective, it does raise some points about certain limitations the study faces. The following section describes some of these limitations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1: Social Disorganization Perspective</th>
<th>Racially Motivated Hate Crimes</th>
<th>Anti-Latino Hate Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 2: Defended Communities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority White * % Change in Latino Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Black * % Change in Latino Population</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 3: Defended Communities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority White * Economic Disadvantage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Black * Economic Disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations

Although this study provides an opportunity to advance the scholarly work on hate crimes and communities, there are some limitations that are tied to the data, analysis, and the findings, which reflect the difficulties in this general field of study. While the literature on factors that influence the quality and quantity of data have generated interest in examining information from single jurisdictions or cities/counties where different mechanisms that lead to poor data collection are less likely to be present, the nature of the crime lends itself to being underreported. Although the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations has a positive effect on hate crime reports by victims due to its’ educational awareness campaigns, collaborations with local community centers, partnerships with local law enforcement, or other positive contributions that may increase reports by victims, many agencies still fail to recognize bias motivations due to missing cues in the reports by the officers or failure to report indicators of bias by the victim. This is particularly a problem that is found in certain groups of minority victims due to cultural and language barriers in reporting a crime.

Second, because this work is situated in Los Angeles County, as discussed earlier, it sets a tone for its generalizability in other communities. Historically, Los Angeles County has continually experienced population shifts with the rise and fall of the four major racial and ethnic groups, black, white, Latino, and Asian, which has led to the formation of racial and ethnic coalitions to prevent racial and conflict from occurring in comparison to areas. Few areas across the United States share a similar history as Los Angeles County and, therefore, the historical context may lend itself to affecting how other communities are associated to crimes in those areas. On the other hand, it offers scholars with the opportunity to examine a majority-minority
county that is expected to change as the immigration population shifts from an increasing Latino immigrant population to an increasing Asian immigrant population. For instance, the increasing number of Asian residents may lead to a rise in hate crimes against Asians. However, the association between anti-Asian hate crimes and community conditions may change given the different communities that Asian immigrants decide to settle in.

Third, this research provides a better understanding on what conditions influence hate crimes. Nevertheless, it is important to understand whether the same relationships are found between crime, in general, and community conditions in Los Angeles County. Because I examine reported hate crimes at the tract-level, future research might consider testing the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives on violent and property crimes reported at the tract-level. Nevertheless, official crime data does not provide reports on violent and property crime at the tract-level and future research might consider gathering this data at the community-level to understand how these relationships compare and whether similar conditions are found to predict both hate crimes and general crimes, such as violent or property crimes, as tested in some of the previous research (Grattet, 2009; Lyons, 2007).

Finally, while this research advances our theoretical knowledge of hate crimes, it fails to capture the full extent of these two theoretical perspectives. For one, the defended communities thesis suggests that the tipping point that triggers a hate crime is the change in the minority population using decennial census measures. Of course, given the recent changes in the U.S. Census data that no longer collects long U.S. census surveys from their decennial survey sample, this study utilizes the American Community Surveys, which reflect estimates over 5-years. Therefore, the change in the Latino population may be inaccurately due to the large time period
of estimated data. Another point mentioned earlier on the social disorganization perspective, I am unable to measure social capital or informal social controls, which are key variables measured to test the contemporary social disorganization theory. However, this study, despite these limitations offers some advances in this line of work, but also some advantages in terms of the policy implications it presents.

Implication for Future Research

The present study sought to achieve three primary goals in examining hate crimes against Latinos. In addition to contributing to the gap in the hate crime literature, the present study also seeks to contribute to some of the literature on the victimization of Latinos and immigrants, following public rhetoric and anti-Latino and anti-immigrant sentiment. Overall, this study seeks to improve knowledge and understanding of bias crime victimization through an empirical study and contribute to the prevention of hate crimes.

Hate Crime Research

Despite the substantive importance of the topic, hate crimes research has declined steadily over the last decade in terms of testing theoretical causal explanations, drawing on new methodological approaches, and comparing outcomes for different targeted groups (Green et al., 2001; Green & Spry, 2014). Nevertheless, the present study seeks to address some of these items while highlighting the outcomes for future consideration. First, the present study seeks to address this gap in the literature by testing a theoretical perspectives on communities and crime to begin to develop a better understanding on the impact of community conditions on hate crimes. Second, the study incorporates spatial data analyses given the geo-reference dataset to explore
any spatial patterns that exist and begin to identify how they differ from other hate crimes and other types of crimes, such as violent and property, in terms of the spatial distribution and effects. Finally, the present study begins to unravel some of the mystery that exists in terms of understanding the difference across targeted groups in predicting hate crimes. For example, previous hate crime studies have discovered different effects based on the targeted group (e.g., anti-black, anti-white) that reminds us how important it is to disaggregate crimes based on the targeted individuals. Yet, few studies have explored and developed preliminary explanations for different targeted hate groups. Future research might examine competing hypotheses to develop a better examination on whether there are different outcomes for different groups given the conditions being tested.

**Latino Victimization Research**

With immigration policies and practices continuing to target Latinos and immigrants, many researchers in the area of Latino and immigrant victimization have sought to focus their efforts in understanding particular groups of victims that may be more vulnerable to violence, abuse and exploitation (Zatz & Smith, 2012). For example, Zatz and Smith (2012) highlight the effects of anti-immigrant laws and enforcement practices at increasing the level of vulnerability for Latinos and immigrants. In addition to the effects on day laborer, domestic workers, and violence in the home and community, I would further incorporate the increase in anti-Latino hate crimes as a result of these policies and practices. Yet, we know so little about the effect of the anti-immigrant legislation or the public rhetoric on bias behavior. However, as mentioned earlier, studies examining the effects of anti-immigrant sentiment on racial attitudes have illustrated a significant amount of support in recent years. Nevertheless, as Green and colleagues (1998b)
emphasize, there is the “importance of distinguishing between hostile racial attitudes and actions” and to understand how the former leads to the latter, which may lead to a hate crime (p. 398). Therefore, it is important to capture the spatial, as well as temporal effects, which could have a direct and causal effect on reported anti-Latino hate crimes given recent events. For example, similar legislation such as the Arizona Senate Bill 1070, which prompted widespread demonstrations both for and against the harsh anti-immigration bill, could prompt action either for or against Latinos or immigrants.

**Integrating Theory**

While the findings discussed in this study do find broad support for the conditions described by the traditional social disorganization theory, they also reveal the need for theoretical refinement to explain hate crimes. In line with previous studies, I argue that the indicators commonly used to measure the conditions that illustrate socially disorganized communities require further inspection. In particular, it is evident that demographic conditions have an effect on hate crimes, but the point at which the tension turns into action is lost in the literature. Green and colleagues (1998b) attempt to “glean” this explanation from the wealth of literature on racial attitudes, housing segregation, and racial violence without much success. However, it is evident that some targets of hate crime, such as anti-white hate crimes, are more prevalent in heterogeneous communities (Lyons, 2007) while others, such as anti-black hate crimes, are more prevalent in homogeneous communities (Grattet, 2009). Given this recent scholarship, it is possible that factors associated with anti-Latino hate crimes may differ from factors associated with either anti-white or anti black hate crimes. This raises questions for claims made by both the defended communities and social disorganization perspectives on the effect of demographic
conditions on hate crimes, which warrants further attention to determine how different targeted
groups are differentially associated to demographic changes given different “tipping points.”

Chapter Summary

As illustrated in this study, the relationship between hate crimes and community
conditions is complicated. The limitation in the data collection, legislation, and research raise
more questions than we are currently able to answer. Nevertheless, the effects of the growing
Latino and immigration population deserve our attention given the anti-Latino and anti-
immigrant sentiment that it has produced, which could readily translate into acts of violence
given the vulnerable state of many of these individuals. As Martinez (2011) suggests,

“…another look at the unanticipated consequences of Latino growth suggests a
possible research plan that emanates from the erroneous and negative stereotypes
of immigrants. One possibility is to analyze criminal reactions to Latinos by
examining anti-Latino hate crimes at the county or place level. Police agencies at
the municipal or place level reported that the number of hate crimes against
Latinos increased by 36% between 2003 and 2006; this increase in hate crimes
coincides with the growth of the anti-immigrant legislation across the country” (p.
710).

The present study begins to address this level of investigation on hate crimes by advancing our
knowledge regarding hate crimes against Latinos despite some methodological limitations in the

---

26 Green and colleagues (1998b) discuss a number of different theories and the consequences of determining the
racial balance before the “tipping point,” the term used to describe when racially motivated hate crimes are predicted
to occur.
analyses. While it encourages further examination into the topic, this study represents a comprehensive and theoretically informed examination of the relationship between hate crimes and community conditions. I hope that this will further advance some of the literature on hate crimes, victimization of Latinos and immigrants, and social disorganization application.
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### APPENDIX A

Table 11. Polychoric Correlations Matrix of Variables

|          | Racially Motivated Hate Crimes | Anti-Latino Hate Crimes | Disadvantage Index | Stability Index | Heterogeneity Index | % Foreign Born | Latino Change | White Majority | Black Majority | White Defended | Black Defended | White Poor | Black Poor | Adult Child Ratio | % Professional Occupation | % Young Male |
|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| 1        | -                             | -                       | -                  | -               | -                  | -               | -             | -              | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 2        | 0.51                          | -                       | -                  | -               | -                  | -               | -             | -              | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 3        | 0.11                          | 0.19                    | -                  | -               | -                  | -               | -             | -              | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 4        | -0.12                         | -0.10                   | -0.39              | -               | -                  | -               | -             | -              | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 5        | 0.09                          | 0.03                    | -0.34              | -0.05           | -                  | -               | -             | -              | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 6        | -0.04                         | -0.04                   | 0.30               | -0.26           | -0.25              | -               | -             | -              | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 7        | -0.01                         | 0.00                    | -0.04              | 0.09            | -0.02              | -0.09           | -             | -              | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 8        | -0.04                         | -0.10                   | -0.79              | 0.15            | 0.09               | -0.55           | -0.01         | -              | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 9        | 0.01                          | 0.11                    | 0.27               | 0.03            | 0.00               | -0.67           | 0.01          | -0.94          | -              | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 10       | 0.01                          | -0.01                   | -0.12              | 0.08            | 0.06               | -0.07           | 0.48          | 0.09           | -0.02          | -              | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 11       | 0.03                          | 0.03                    | -0.01              | 0.06            | 0.01               | -0.04           | 0.13          | -0.03          | 0.07           | 0.00           | -            | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 12       | 0.06                          | 0.07                    | 0.53               | -0.22           | -0.02              | 0.44            | -0.07         | 0.00           | 0.31           | -0.24          | 0.01         | -          | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 13       | 0.05                          | 0.11                    | 0.21               | -0.07           | 0.03               | -0.11           | -0.02         | -0.21          | 0.43           | -0.01         | -0.04        | 0.05       | -         | -                | -                           | -           |
| 14       | 0.01                          | 0.07                    | 0.61               | 0.08            | -0.41              | 0.11            | 0.11          | -0.59          | -0.04          | 0.01           | -0.01        | 0.29       | 0.05      | -                | -                           | -           |
| 15       | -0.03                         | -0.08                   | -0.72              | 0.15            | 0.42               | -0.48           | -0.01         | 0.78           | -0.07          | 0.09           | 0.02         | -0.63      | -0.06     | -0.61            | -                           | -           |
| 16       | 0.01                          | 0.01                    | 0.28               | -0.28           | -0.05              | 0.08            | -0.03         | -0.31          | 0.01           | -0.14          | 0.01         | 0.30       | 0.02     | 0.03             | -0.27           | -           |