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**Abstract**

Hate crimes are a pervasive issue in America today. Unlike typical crimes, hate crimes are enacted by those with bias against another’s race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, religion, etc. Since 1991, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has been collecting data on hate crimes and the biases that the perpetrators possess which motivated them to committing crimes against the victims. The research conducted in this paper will delve into hate crimes and how the numbers have changed over the years. This research is intended to determine statistical trends within the hate crimes data. To do so, a few different methods will be utilized including descriptive analytics and regression analysis. These tools will help to describe the current trends being seen by the data and potentially help predict the trends for the future. The results of this research could be used to aid federal and state programs to help minimize the number of hate crimes through various means of reform. This potential reform could both help potential perpetrators become more compassionate towards their potential victims as well as protect those potential victims from being targeted.
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**Capstone Project Final Report: U.S. Organization**

On July 26th, 1908, Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte ordered a special agent force to report to the Chief Examiner Stanley W. Finch. This organization was later named the Bureau of Investigation (BOI) (“Timeline”, 2016). This organization was later renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in 1935 (“Timeline”, 2016). The original conception of the FBI came about in the early 1900s when the United States had grown both in size and economically (“A brief history”, 2016). This growth would also lead to an increase in crime. Violence was not the only type of crime that began to grow. Corruption within politics, awful working conditions in factories, illegal monopolies, as well as theft became commonplace (“A brief history”, 2016). When Bonaparte was appointed as Attorney General by Theodore Roosevelt in 1906, he soon came to realize that he needed to create a force of special agents to help investigate and combat this rise of crime, thus the FBI was born (“A brief history”, 2016). What started out as a group of 34 men specifically hired by Bonaparte, the FBI first investigated white-collar crime and civil rights cases (“A brief history”, 2016). Through its first 15 years, the FBI struggled to get its footing. Agents had very little training, were poorly managed, turnover was a strong effect, and were often undisciplined (“A brief history”, 2016). In the 1910’s the organization had grown ten-fold to about 360 special agents. These agents investigated other crimes like treason and smuggling (“A brief history”, 2016). With the coming of the first world war, the FBI was tasked with counterespionage and rounding up army deserters (“A brief history”, 2016). Today, the FBI houses over 30,000 employees globally that work to protect the U.S. from terrorism, espionage, cyber-attacks, and major criminal threats as well as provide its many partners with services, support, training, and leadership (“About”, 2010).

Since the FBI’s early days, they have helped protect the civil rights of American citizens. The bureau began battling the KKK as early as 1918 and had handled many cases the involve violations of civil rights over the years (“Civil Rights”, 2016). The main civil rights issues that the FBI focuses on today are hate crimes, color of law violations, and Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act violations (“Civil Rights”, 2016). Color of Law violations are basically when an authority figure, such as law enforcement officers, judges, and prosecutors, abuses their power instead of using it to maintain justice and enforce laws (“Civil Rights”, 2016). Some of the violations include excessive force, sexual assault, false arrest, deprivation of medical care, and failure to keep from harm (“Civil Rights”, 2016). The Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act was enacted in 1994 and was enacted due to an increase in the number of acts of violence against reproductive health care providers and clinics (“Civil Rights”, 2016). A hate crime is a traditional offense – murder, arson, vandalism – with the added element of bias (“Hate Crimes”, 2016). These biases include race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender, and gender identity (“Hate Crimes”, 2016). According to the FBI, hate crimes are the highest priority of their civil rights program because of the devastating impact in has on families and communities (“Hate Crimes”, 2016). Originally these hate crimes were attributed to race, color, religion, or national origin but were expanded to include actual or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, and gender following the murders of Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. (“Hate Crimes”, 2016).

The data I have selected to work with involves hate crime data between 1991 and 2020. This data includes the variables incident ID, data year, the public agency name, the agency type, the state, division, region, population group, incident date, the number of victims and offenders – both adult and juvenile, race/ethnicity of the offender, the offense, the location of the offense, the bias, the victim type, and if there were multiple offenses or biases. I did not choose the FBI first, I chose the data first. I chose to look at hate crime data because I wanted to not only look at data interesting to me, but I also wanted to look at data that related to something I was passionate about. Firstly, I find data that related to psychological behavior fascinating. I think it is really interesting to figure out why people act the way they do. Hate crime data relates to this topic heavily. A hate crime is the bridge between human bias and committing criminal offenses against a person or organization. It is interesting to see that a person’s prejudices affect their judgement so much that they commit crimes against other people or organizations due to some sort of bias. I am a resident of Laramie, Wyoming. In 1998, Matthew Shepard, a gay student at the University of Wyoming, was beaten, tortured, and left for dead due to his sexual orientation (“Our Story”, 2020). Many residents in Laramie still deny the connection of Matthew’s sexual orientation to his murder, but that is the cause of his murder. As a newer member of the LGBTQ+ community and lifelong ally, I was incredibly heartbroken to hear about Matthew Shepard. Wyoming is not famous for many things, but Matthew’s death is widely known. I am very passionate about justice for minority groups, even if I am not a part of them. I have never witnessed, been the victim of, or known a victim of a hate crime, but I have been discriminated against. That discrimination alone saddens me as that is a common experience. Escalating that discrimination to crimes against that person or organization makes me sadder.

This data from the FBI is incredibly valuable in terms of hate crime data because it is not localized to a specific area, but it encompasses hate crime across the country. Not only does including crime across the country help me, but so does the historical data. Having both data from 1991-2020 and have it include the whole nation helps me understand the bigger picture of hate crimes in this country. Having data include only my state or region would be useful but looking at the whole United States paints a better picture of this violation of civil rights.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation swears to protect the citizens of the United States from terrorism, crime, cyber-attacks, and espionage. This encompasses hate crimes as well. Because hate crimes are offenses against the civil rights of United States citizens, collecting data on it is incredibly useful. There are many ways that the FBI could use this data to protect its citizens. The first way this data could be used would be to investigating the most common types of hate crimes. They could even determine the most common hate crime types by state. Using this data would help the FBI determine how resources should be allocated to combat these hate crimes. This could also be used as backing for legislation against hate crimes. If the frequency of hate crimes is analyzed along with the type of hate crime and even the area, then the FBI would know how often a hate crime occurs. They, then, could predict when and probably where the next hate crime will occur. This could be useful as information to law enforcement in the area, to increase awareness of these issues for citizens, and as ways to further learn about the patterns of hate crimes. Using the information regarding multiple offenses and biases would indicate if the perpetrator were more likely to commit more than one hate crime or not and if they have more than one bias or not. This information gives a better criminal profile. These better criminal profiles would hopefully help the FBI develop some sort of training or resource to not only increase awareness of hate crimes, their frequency, and their severity, but also to potentially help educate the populous about inclusion, tolerance, and acceptance of others. My hope would be that the FBI would use the data to better educate themselves and use that information to decrease or eliminate hate crimes altogether.

Studies show that hate crime victims experience more harm than someone of an equal crime (Iganski, 2001). This harm is psychological and causes harm to not just the victim. Because hate crimes single out a person for who they are, the ramifications of that hate crime can deeply affect the victim’s community (Iganski, 2001). It has a much greater effect on the victim and their community because these biases are often against things they cannot change about themselves (Iganski, 2001). The FBI has measures in place to combat hate crimes. These measures include working with various partners across the country to play a part in the investigative process of these hate crimes, supporting local authorities, help with prosecutive decisions, engage in public outreach, and offer trainings and workshops (“Hate Crimes”, 2016). These measures aim to help protect marginalized groups of people and to help the victims and their families get the justice they deserve.

While these are great strides towards minimizing hate crimes, it would be useful to know how effective those measures are at preventing and minimizing hate crimes in the U.S. If all of these measures are not affecting the hate crimes numbers, then they are not effective tools. To protect the members of marginalized groups, measures taken by their governing bodies need to be effective and useful. This research aims to determine statistical trends found in hate crime data collected by the FBI between 1991 and 2020. These statistical trends can be used to partially determine the effectiveness of the current measures taken by the FBI. Then using the historical data, a predictive model can be created to determine if the current measures in place will produce trends in the future.

**Objectives**

The objectives for this research project are to determine the past trends of the hate crime data and then use that data to predict potential trends for the future. The results from this could then be leveraged to determine how hate crime statistics will change. Another potential objective could be determining what potential factors lead to a decrease in hate crimes and if current measures are effective.

**Overview of Study**

This study uses data from the FBI. The dataset includes data about the location of the crime, the victims, the perpetrator(s), the biases present, and demographics about the perpetrator(s). This study will be two-fold. First, it will look at the historical data and determine past trends found in the data. Second, it will attempt to predict hate crime statistics for the future.

**Research Hypothesis**

This research project aims to answer the question: “How has the number of hate crimes changed over the last 30 years, and will those trends continue in the future?”.

**Literature Review**

The FBI has been collecting hate crime data since 1991. Because motivation can be subjective and the definition of certain terminology changes, it can sometimes be difficult to determine a hate crime (‘Hate Crime Methodology”, 2020). An example of terminology changing was the very definition of hate crimes. Hate crimes only included biases based upon race, color, religion, and/or national origin until 2009 (“Hate Crimes”, 2016). In 2009, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act was passed and then the FBI could then also include biases of sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, or disability in hate crimes (“Hate Crimes”, 2016). While there are many demographic groups that can be targets for hate crimes, the most common hate crime is racially motivated (Masucci & Langton, 2017). Other changes to note about the data collected is that the FBI made revisions to their data collection process over the last few years. These changes include revising the definition of rape, adding religious bias motivations, adding animal cruelty, fraud offenses, and cyberspace locations to the data collection, and added additional federal data. These changes could potentially change the outcomes of the research being done. If the historical data was not changed along with the changes listed above, then data could be accidentally skewed.

Another point of interest would be the FBI’s efforts to minimize hate crimes. The FBI states that they have many measures in place to combat the problem of hate crimes. These measures include playing active roles in hate crime investigations, supporting local authorities, helping seek federal offenses if appropriate, and offering training to various different law enforcement agencies (“Hate Crimes”, 2016). The problem with these measures is that their effectiveness may not be monitored. While many companies, organizations, and colleges/universities offer diversity education/training, studies have not been able to support the effectiveness of such programs (King et al., 2010). It could be possible that the FBI is offering many different resources to help minimize hate crimes, but in reality, those resources may not be effective. While that is not being fully fleshed out in this research, it is part of the discussion around why the potential trends exist in the data and can even potentially be a reason for the trends to exist at all.

All the sources agree that hate crimes are bad, but many do not delve into the potential backlash at further criminalizing hate crime activity. While hate crimes are illegal due to the nature of the crime itself, there is a lot that law enforcement needs to consider before enacting further measures. One measure that is brought up in Paul Iganski’s study on hate crimes is the idea of hate crime laws. The main issue with hate crime laws is that they potentially threaten civil liberties of citizens and may promote “extra punishment for values, thoughts, and opinions which the government deems abhorrent” (Iganski, 2001, para. 4). This is an important idea to keep in mind. The idea of biased motived crimes is horrible, but simply speaking using those biases should not directly be punished as that falls under freedom of speech (Iganski, 2001).

Looking at how information and data collection has changed is important to this study because it can potentially bias the outcomes of this research. If certain data was not collected up to a certain point, the conclusions drawn may not be fully accurate. Acknowledging that the FBI has measures in place to prevent/minimize hate crimes is important for two reasons. First, because those measures could be a contributing factor to a decrease in hate crimes that would not be accounted for in the data. Second, if the programs have not been deemed effective or ineffective, then the effect those measures have on the data cannot be fully determined. Because those determinations cannot be made, that can also have an effect on the outcomes. If the trends show that the number of hate crimes started to dip starting in a specific year, we cannot fully determine why that dip took place. Finally, acknowledging the other side of the conversation on hate crimes has an added effect to the potential use for this data by the FBI and other law enforcement agencies. If it can be shown that hate crime numbers have stayed constant over the past 30 years, then would enacting further measures infringe on citizen rights? It is important to keep that in mind for ethics.

**Research Design**

There are two sets of null/alternative hypotheses that are present for this study. The first looks at the trends of the past and the second looks at the potential trends of the future. The null hypothesis for the first piece is that the number of hate crimes has stayed the same or increased over the last 30 years. The alternative hypothesis is that there is evidence to show that the number of hate crimes has decreased over the past 30 years. The null hypothesis for the second piece is that the number of hate crimes will stay the same or increase in the future. The alternative hypothesis is that there is evidence to show that hate crimes will decrease in the future. This study focuses on the number of hate crimes, because the hope is that all the efforts the law enforcement agencies are putting forth are helping to decrease the number of hate crimes over the years.

The method that will be used for this study will be using SAS OnDemand as the tool. The methodologies that will be utilized in this research will be descriptive statistics – such as counts, means, medians, modes, and standard deviations, visual statistics – such as histograms and line graphs, and regression analysis as the predictive model. These tools should be able to answer the questions of what the historical data shows for trends on hate crimes and what can be predicted for the future.

There are a few limitations to note for this research. The first is the dataset as a whole may not be complete. First, due to changes in data collection by the FBI, there may be some data that was not included previously but is now (“Hate Crime Methodologies”, 2020). Second, many hate crimes go un-reported. The number of unreported hate crimes has only recently dipped below the number of reported hate crimes (Masucci & Langton, 2017). This could lead to bias in the results. If more hate crimes are being reported now than before, the trends based on the data alone could be skewed and inaccurate.

There are also ethical concerns to this data as well. The first and most important ethical concern would be potentially endangering marginalized groups. Because this data focuses on marginalized groups, there could be the chance of not only being able to identify victims but also being able to determine which areas have the highest number of marginalized groups. Inability to keep user data anonymous means that data could potentially be used unethically to change society, and analysis can cause bias (Herschel & Miori, 2017; Richterich, 2018). Being able to determine the identity of a victim could put that person at risk and violate their privacy. By drawing conclusions about how well the U.S. is doing with protecting marginalized groups, the outcomes could potentially put targets on those groups of people. The other ethical concerns as mentioned by Iganski is the potential infringement of civil rights (Iganski, 2001). If the government starts targeting certain populations to mitigate hate crimes, then the freedom of speech might be infringed upon.

**Discussion of Results**

The first portion of analysis of this dataset focused on descriptive analytics. Descriptive statistics are numerical and graphical techniques used to organize, present, and analyze data (Fisher & Marshall, 2009). Some of the most common descriptive statistics are mode, mean, median, frequency, counts, range, and standard deviation (Fisher & Marshall, 2009). The purpose of this portion was to determine potential trends that can be seen in the historical data. Many different variables were looked at for this portion. The variables that were looked at were the state, population group code, offender race/ethnicity, offense name, location name, victim types, multiple offenses, multiple biases, and bias descriptions based upon the year. The results of these descriptive analyses included counts, standard errors, variances, skewness, and histograms. Not every piece was relevant, but some information could be gleaned from these statistics. For multiple biases, it appears that single bias hate crimes have a very consistent distribution over time while multiple bias hate crimes have increased over the past few years. There are also significantly more single bias hate crimes than multiple bias hate crimes. About 99.5% of hate crimes are single bias. The most common biases seen in the data set are Anti-Black or African American, Anti-Jewish, Anti-White, Anti-Gay (Male), Anti-Hispanic/Latino, and Anti-Other Race/Ethnicity/Ancestry. Out of the top 6 biases with over 10,000 hate crimes throughout the 30 years this data was collected, 4 out of the 6 are racially motivated biases. This shows that while gay men might be the second most targeted group, race is the biggest motivation for hate crimes out of all the biases. Looking at hate crime location, the top locations where hate crimes occur are residence/home, highway/road/alley/street/sidewalk, Other/Unknown, School/College, and Parking/Drop Lot/ Garage. According to the data, about 29.6% of hate crimes occur in a home or residence. While it is not specified if this means the victim’s house, the perpetrator’s residence, or a third party. However, a large amount of hate crimes occurs in places where both parties were probably invited in. Most of the other top locations are in public spaces. This means that if marginalized groups are out in public, they are likely to be victimized if they are going to be. According to the data, perpetrators are more likely to be first time hate crime offenders. This means that most people that commit a hate crime have never done it prior. This means that if something is to be done about hate crimes, it would involve targeting past offenders as much as potential first time offenders. The most common crimes committed are destruction/damage, intimidation, simple assault, and aggravated assault. Because 91.7% of hate crimes are non-lethal, this could mean that members of marginalized groups are more likely to get hurt than to die. However, this still does not eliminate the threat of the hate crime being lethal. The number of hate-fueled murder is about 0.1% for the past 30 years. This means that at least 272 victims were killed because of some bias.

**Screenshot 1**

*Code for Categorical Variables Descriptive Statistics*

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

*Note*. This code was used for the variables: bias\_desc, location, multiple\_bias, multiple\_offense, offense\_name, population group code, offender\_race, offender\_ethnicity, state, and victim\_types.

**Figure 1**

*Bar graph of the Number of Hate Crimes per Year*
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**Figure 2**

*Distribution of Bias numbers by Data year, Anti-American Indian and Anti-Arab*
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**Figure 3**

*Distribution of Bias numbers by Data year, Anti-Transgender and Anti-White*
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**Figure 4**

*Pie Chart of Number of Hate Crimes per State in 1991*
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**Figure 5**

*Pie Chart of Number of Hate Crimes per State in 2020*
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These trends are all very important to understand the potential context of this data. However, the real question lies in the number of hate crimes per year, how they have changed, and why. There is a lot of information that can be inferred or interpreted from the figures above. Figure 1 shows a bar graph indicating the number of hate crimes per data year. It shows that the number of hate crimes fluctuates from year to year. This would indicate that the overall trend in terms of the number of hate crimes did not overall decrease. This would lead towards rejecting the null hypothesis because there is not significant evidence indicating that the number of hate crimes has decreased over the past 30 years. However, it would still be helpful to figure out why.

An interesting potential explanation for the large fluctuations in hate crime numbers could be seen in figures 2 and 3. Figure 2 shows the distribution of hate crimes numbers by year for hate crimes relating to a person being American Indian or being Arab. Looking at the distribution of hate crimes for those who are Arab, there is a massive increase between 2000 and 2003. The most probable reason for this massive increase is due to 9-11. The aftermath of 9-11 left many Americans scared and broken due to a terrorist attack by Arabs. It could be assumed that this fear ingrained more American citizens with a hatred and fear of Arab people and thus were more likely to lash out at Arab citizens. In figure 3, you can see the distribution of hate crimes over the years for those who identify as Transgender and those who are White. This is an interesting comparison, because racial hate crimes have been recorded since the beginning of this data collection and show a consistent number of hate crimes. However, the concept of a person being transgender is newer to most people’s vocabulary. While trans people have always existed, it was not common knowledge of what it meant to be trans until about the last decade or so. Because transgender was not a mainstream term before about 2010, the crimes committed against trans people would not have been counted towards this specific category of hate crime or even be considered a hate crime at all. When the word transgender became mainstream, it could be possible that people who normally would have gone unnoticed and been able to be their authentic selves without garnering hate, would now become targets because people who felt that being transgender is wrong became aware of its existence and thus transgender people could become a new target. Because of large-scale events like 9-11, the number of hate crimes could fluctuate. The number of hate crimes could also fluctuate because of the acknowledgement of more terms related to people being more diverse making those who identify using those newer labels becoming active targets.

Another thing that is interesting is the spread of hate crimes by state. Figure 4 shows the states that had the highest number of hate crimes in 1991. Figure 5 shows the states that had the highest number of hate crimes in 2020. What is interesting is the fact that in 1991, New York and New Jersey make up about 40% of the hate crimes for that year but those numbers change drastically in 2020. Hate crimes were more concentrated in specific areas in 1991 but spread out more across the country throughout the years. There are many potential ideas about why this happened, but one idea could be the introduction of social media and the internet. One of the first social media sites was called Myspace which was founded in 2003 (LLC Myspace, 2011). Since then, the number of social media sites has only increased. A study published in 2020 suggests that social media plays a part in the spread of hate speech that inspires hate crimes (Müller & Schwarz, 2020). It can be seen that local cultural attitudes towards a specific racial group have an effect on how people in that area regard those of that race (Müller & Schwarz, 2020). On top of the already persistent issue that many hate crimes go unreported, the introduction of social media could be another reason why the number of hate crimes has not decreased over the past 30 years.

The second portion of this analysis is determining the trends of hate crime numbers in the future. The null hypothesis for this is that the number of hate crimes will increase or stay the same in the future. The alternate hypothesis for this piece is that the number of hate crimes will decrease in the future. To determine this, a regression model was used. Regression analysis is a statistical method that looks at predicting a response (dependent variable) based on one or more factor (independent variables) (Freund et al., 2006). This simple linear regression model only used two variables: the victim counts for the dependent variable and the year for the independent variable. I chose to use the victim count because while there can be more than one victim associated with a hate crime, the overall goal would be to decrease the number of victims overall. Most hate crimes are also single victim crimes. It is also relevant because 84.7% of all hate crimes have a single victim. The final model can be seen below. The biggest issue here is that when using a p-value of 0.05 to determine if the year can determine the victim count, it is not shown to be a significant value. The p-value for year is 0.22. This means that year would not be a good predictor of the number of victims. For this piece of the research, it could be seen that the null hypothesis should also not be rejected. There could be many other factors that could account for the number of hate crimes changing in the future, but it is not simply just time.

**Screenshot 4**

*Linear Regression Model, Year vs Victim Count*
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Since the year will not change the number of hate crimes, a second linear regression model was used to determine what factors would change the number of hate crimes. The variables were, again, tested against the victim count to keep the dependent variables the same. The potential independent variables for this model included state, region, population groups, offender race, offender ethnicity, location name, offense name, bias, victim types, multiple biases, and multiple offenses. Using a forward selection method and a significance level of 0.05, the variables that were determined to be significant were multiple offenses, region, location, offense name, total offender count, bias, and victim types. Table 1 shows the final estimate effects that being in a specific category has on the likelihood of the number of victims. Hate crime locations that have the highest likelihood of increasing the chance of a hate crime are locations of religious worship, the internet, and the parking areas near government buildings. The biases that have the most impact on the likelihood of a hate crime include anti-Asian and anti-Hispanic/Latino, anti-Catholic and anti-Protestant, and anti-Gay (Male) and anti-White. Independent businesses and individuals are the two victim types that increase the likelihood of a hate crime the most. A multiple offender increases the likelihood of a hate crime by almost 1.5. These factors are all important because these groups are the most likely to be targeted. While efforts should be made to help every group feel safe and protected, these categories show where the bias tends to be the worst. Those would be good places to start.
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**Table 1**

*Forward Selection Effects, Second Linear Regression Model*

| **Parameter Estimates** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **DF** | **Estimate** | **Standard Error** | **t Value** | **Pr > |t|** |
| **Intercept** | 1 | 0.693756 | 0.563940 | 1.23 | 0.2186 |
| **TOTAL\_OFFENDER\_COUNT** | 1 | 0.061305 | 0.008109 | 7.56 | <.0001 |
| **LOCATION\_NAME Church/Synagogue/Temple/Mosque** | 1 | 0.278854 | 0.547169 | 0.51 | 0.6103 |
| **LOCATION\_NAME Church/Synagogue/Temple/Mosque;Jai** | 1 | 1.737124 | 1.579722 | 1.10 | 0.2715 |
| **LOCATION\_NAME Church/Synagogue/Temple/Mosque;Oth** | 1 | 2.556460 | 1.523898 | 1.68 | 0.0934 |
| **LOCATION\_NAME Cyberspace** | 1 | 2.229854 | 0.553584 | 4.03 | <.0001 |
| **LOCATION\_NAME Government/Public Building;Park/Pl** | 1 | 2.153905 | 1.600908 | 1.35 | 0.1785 |
| **LOCATION\_NAME Government/Public Building;Parking** | 1 | 2.642965 | 1.520723 | 1.74 | 0.0822 |
| **BIAS\_DESC Anti-Asian;Anti-Hispanic or Latino** | 1 | 3.271659 | 1.441285 | 2.27 | 0.0232 |
| **BIAS\_DESC Anti-Catholic;Anti-Protestant** | 1 | 4.103646 | 1.033883 | 3.97 | <.0001 |
| **BIAS\_DESC Anti-Gay (Male);Anti-White** | 1 | 4.173242 | 0.479099 | 8.71 | <.0001 |
| **VICTIM\_TYPES Business;I** | 1 | 0.182957 | 0.179559 | 1.02 | 0.3082 |
| **VICTIM\_TYPES Individual** | 1 | 0.136159 | 0.145678 | 0.93 | 0.3500 |
| **MULTIPLE\_BIAS M** | 1 | 0.072674 | 0.246910 | 0.29 | 0.7685 |
| **MULTIPLE\_BIAS S** | 0 | 0 | . | . | . |
| **MULTIPLE\_OFFENSE M** | 1 | 1.467150 | 0.040533 | 36.20 | <.0001 |
| **MULTIPLE\_OFFENSE S** | 0 | 0 | . | . | . |

*Note*. Table has been compacted to include only relevant variables for space and ease.

Since it is more likely that hate crimes are not going to go away by themselves, it would be best to focus on increasing resources and measures to make people more empathetic towards those in other demographic groups. It cannot be fully determined if the current measures in place are effective or not due to the large number of other factors that could increase or decrease the likelihood of hate crimes. Since the research both shows that hate crimes have increased due to the introduction of social media and that more hate crimes are reported than not, the measures in place could be positively affecting hate crime statistics, but it there are other things that could affect it as well. Overall, putting measures in place to address hate crimes is important. The United States is a diverse place. To protect all people from being attacked based on things they can’t or should not have to change should be a priority. This study aimed to show how hate crime statistics have changed over time and then to potentially explain why. The hope is that further research be done into how to best combat hate crimes.
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