

Perception and Misperception in Urban Criminal Justice Policy:

The Case of Hate Crime

Donald P. Haider-Markel

Department of Political Science

1541 Lilac Lane, 504 Blake Hall

University of Kansas

Lawrence, KS 66044

Email: prex@ku.edu

Phone: (785) 864-9034

Fax: (785) 864-5700

An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Political Science Association, March 2002. This research was funded by a 1998 Wayne F. Placek Award from the American Psychological Foundation.

Keywords: hate crime; perception; organizational context; law enforcement; public policy; interest groups

Perception and Misperception in Urban Criminal Justice Policy:

The Case of Hate Crime

Abstract: Perceptions of an issue, problem, or policy might differ depending on the organizational context in which one is located--the basic notion that "where one sits is where one stands." The importance of perception has been a concern for students of international relations, political institutions, organizational theory, and public policy, but less so for scholars of urban politics. My study contributes to our understanding of how organizational and community context influence perceptions by examining the perceptions of interest group leaders and police related to law enforcement activity on hate crime with survey data from each group in a sample of the 250 largest American cities. I present a basic theoretical framework for understanding how perceptions may differ depending on organizational and community context. I then test for differences in perceptions using both simple and more advanced statistical methods, controlling for community context. My results do indeed suggest organizational and community context influence perceptions of law enforcement activity. I conclude with a discussion of the implications of my findings for urban politics and democratic political systems more generally.

In the political arena human perceptions clearly shape how decisions are made, what decisions are made, and how those decisions come to be understood--even when perceptions are wrong (Jervis 1976; Jones 1994). Given the importance of perception, one can ask how perceptions of an issue, problem, or policy differ depending on the organizational context in which one is located--the notion that "where one sits is where one stands" (see Allison 1971, 169-171). The importance organizational and community context in influencing perceptions has been a concern for students of international relations, political institutions, organizational theory, and policy implementation (Allison 1971; Bell 2002; Brown 1981; Crank 1994; Gerstenfeld 1992; Jervis 1976; Jones 1994; Kelly 2003; Klein and Sorra 1996; Morgan 1986; Pressman and Wildavsky 1973).

Perceptions also have real consequences for government legitimacy, especially in a democracy. If citizens perceive that government is engaged in action x, and government officials are not, citizens may come to distrust the government. Such citizen distrust may be difficult to change and may lead to government officials being voted out of office, or at worst, face significant social unrest (Skolnick 1966; Skolnick and Fyfe 1993).¹

In this study I contribute to our understanding of the role of organizational and community context by exploring differences in perceptions of law enforcement activity on hate crime in American cities. Making use of original survey data, I examine the perceptions of interest group leaders and

¹ One can generate many examples of this problem. Most recently it has become clear that many African Americans perceive that law enforcement disproportionately targets them as a group for traffic stops and harassment. Meanwhile, some law enforcement agencies insist that they are not engaged in so-called "racial profiling," and empirical evidence has been inconclusive. Nevertheless, the perceptions of African Americans have real consequences, greatly inhibiting the community's relations with law enforcement (Bell 2002; Jacobs and Potter 1998).

police regarding law enforcement activity on hate crime in urban areas.² I present a framework for understanding how perceptions may differ depending on organizational and community context. I then test for differences in perceptions using both simple and more advanced statistical methods, controlling for broader community contextual influences on perception. My results do indeed suggest perceptions of law enforcement activity are influenced by organization context, even when community characteristics are accounted for. For example, although activists are far less likely than police officials to perceive that law enforcement is doing much to address hate crime, the perceptions of activists and police are also influenced by community context. I suggest these findings have significant implications for democratic government and may be especially relevant for democratic politics in urban areas.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The politics and process of policy adoption is often the focus of both academics and activists. However, a considerable body of research demonstrates that the success or failure of policy goals occurs during policy implementation. But it is during the implementation process that our attention tends to wane, as interest groups and elected officials often have little incentive to pursue victories outside of the legislative process (DiMaggio 1988; McCubbins and Schwartz 1984; Pressman and Wildavsky 1973). However, some might argue that this apparent lack of attention is simply due to differences in the perceptions of the actors involved. Although interest groups may believe that the bureaucracy is doing little in a given issue area, the bureaucracy itself may believe that it is doing a considerable amount, given limited resources and the like (Bell 2002; Franklin 2002; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Klein and Sorra 1996; Morgan 1986).

² By interest groups I mean formal organizations created for the purpose of influencing the activity of government (Johnson 1998).

In criminal justice policy specifically a wide array of scholars have uncovered the nuances of how organizational structure, cultures, and community context can and often does shape the perceptions and behavior of law enforcement officials, their political overseers, and citizens (for example see Brown 1981; Crank 1994; Crank and Langworthy 1992; DiMaggio 1988; Meyer and Rowan 1977; Nolan and Akiyama 1999). But much of this literature tends to focus on policing methods and traditional crime categories.

How well would these research findings fit with newer areas of criminal justice policy, especially those where law enforcement is called upon to address an issue, even when no specific law or ordinance may require them to do so? A network of scholars has suggested that one relevant area for examining the role of organizational and community context in criminal justice policy is hate crime (Balboni and McDevitt 2001; Bell 2002; Boyd et al. 1996; Franklin 2002; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Nolan and Akiyama 1999).³ Hate crime provides a fascinating view on the role of perceptions in criminal justice for several reasons. First, crimes motivated by bias do exist and can be addressed by law enforcement even if no state or local policies have been enacted relating to hate crimes. For example, the New York City police department aggressively tracks and pursues crimes motivated by bias even though no hate crime policy exists in the city or the state (Jacobs 1992; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Lawrence 1999). As such, law enforcement can take action on the issue even without guidance from criminal law (Haider-Markel and O'Brien 1999; Jacobs 1992; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Nolan and Akiyama 1999).

Second, where hate crime policies do exist, they are often considered to be symbolic efforts to appease interest group demands and often little effort is made in this area by government officials beyond the adoption of a policy

³ Hate crimes are often defined as crimes that are committed, wholly or in part, because of the victim's group identification. Group identification might include race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender, veteran's status, and disability, among others (Bell 2002).

(Balboni and McDevitt 2001; Haider-Markel 1998; Jacobs and Potter 1998; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Nolan and Akiyama 1999; Walker and Katz 1995). Thus, political forces, such as interest groups and citizen preferences, could play a relatively large role in this area, shaping the perceptions of all actors involved (Bell 2002; Jacobs and Potter 1998; Jenness and Broad 1997; Jenness and Grattet 2001). Third, hate crimes are difficult to track and identify--victims often fail to report the crimes and police may wish to avoid the controversy that often surrounds hate crime issues (Balboni and McDevitt 2001; Bell 2002; Jacobs and Potter 1998; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Levin and McDevitt 2002; Martin 1995, 1996; Nolan and Akiyama 1999). But occasionally hate crimes do occur that attract significant public attention, activating interest groups and prodding bureaucratic action (Boyd et al. 1996; Haider-Markel 1998; Jacobs 1992; Jacobs and Potter 1998; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Levin and McDevitt 2002; Nolan and Akiyama 1999). As such, both bureaucrats and interest groups may have a strong incentive to address these crimes, again depending on local political conditions (Bell 2002; Jacobs and Potter 1998; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Levin and McDevitt 2002).

The extent to which hate crime is perceived as a problem by law enforcement, citizens, and elected officials, may be shaped by a variety of forces. Likewise, subsequent perceptions of law enforcement activity on hate crime should also be shaped by the organizational context in which individuals reside and the broader community in which they live and work (Bell 2002; Balboni and McDevitt 2001; Bell 2002; Jacobs and Potter 1998; Jenness and Grattet 2001).

To start, citizens may believe that crimes motivated by racial or ethnic bias are more severe and significant to society than other types of crime. But community opinion on hate crime is likely to vary significantly across the country, especially when the crimes involve more controversial groups, such as homosexuals (Bell 2002; Haider-Markel and O'Brien 1999; Jacobs and Potter 1998). As such, the variability of citizen preferences should influence the

perceptions and behavior of political actors, including elected officials, interest group leaders, and law enforcement officials (Balboni and McDevitt 2001; Bell 2002; Franklin 2002; Jacobs and Potter 1998; Jenness and Grattet 2001).

If citizens in a community believe the problem is of significant concern, politicians may cater to these concerns (to ensure reelection), and pass laws that provide harsh penalties. But the adoption of such policies will be dependent on citizen demands (Haider-Markel 1998; Jacobs and Potter 1998). Even in communities where demand is high, elected officials may not pursue effective implementation because they are unable to take credit for effective policy implementation in the same way they can for policy adoption (Franklin 2002; Jenness and Grattet 2001; McCubbins and Schwartz 1984).

Meanwhile, law enforcement bureaucrats may be conflicted on aggressive pursuit of hate crime, perceiving few hate crimes relative to other types of crime, but in some cases, being pressured by local political conditions, including citizen preferences and interest groups, to take action on the issue, especially in highly publicized cases (Balboni and McDevitt 2001; Boyd et al. 1996; Jacobs 1992; Jenness and Grattet 2001; McDevitt and Levin 2002). Law enforcement could take aggressive action by collecting statistics or creating special task forces to demonstrate activity and mollify the demands of interest groups, but interest group demands might conflict with community preferences (Bell 2002; Walker and Katz 1995). Although, bureaucracies often welcome opportunities to expand their operations because such actions may increase the authority and resources of the bureaucracy (Meier 1993), bureaucratic leaders may believe that resources can be more effectively used in other areas and their organizational culture or structure may make adapting to new procedures difficult (Balboni and McDevitt 2001; Bell 2002; Finn 1988; Franklin 2002; Gerstenfeld 1992; Haider-Markel 2002; Jacobs and Potter 1998; Klein and Sorra 1996; Nolan and Akiyama 1999; Walker and Katz 1995).

And unlike other types of crime, interest groups play a larger role in hate crime (Haider-Markel 1998; Jenness and Grattet 2001). Various minority groups are concerned about hate crimes because they disproportionately impact their members (Bell 2002; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Martin 1995). For many racial, ethnic, and sexual minorities, interest groups that are concerned about broader issues, such as discrimination, have also focused on hate crime. Further, in some areas specific groups have formed to address hate crimes, establishing their own tracking systems, hotlines, and counseling services (Jenness 1995; Jenness and Grattet 2001). These groups view the problem as more serious than the general population, politicians, or bureaucrats, in part, because their incentive is to act on the concerns of their members (Johnson 1998). As such, they are more likely than any other actor to believe that law enforcement is only weakly pursuing hate crimes or are simply not doing as much as it could be doing (Bell 2002; Jenness and Grattet 2001).

This discussion leads us to two key propositions. First, based on the organizational context in which law enforcement officials and interest group leaders exist, each should have differing views of the extent of the problem as well as the extent to which law enforcement is pursuing the problem--with interest groups seeing a larger problem and weaker law enforcement efforts. Second, although the first point should be generally true, the perceptions of law enforcement and interest groups will vary by community context, with both organizational actors perceiving hate crime as a greater problem in communities where citizen preferences are sympathetic to this perspective. Below I systematically test these propositions.

DATA AND MEASUREMENT

Unless otherwise noted the data for this analysis was collected through a national survey of police departments and interest groups in 1999. Copies of the police survey were mailed to the office of the police chief in the 250 largest (by population) American cities. The police chief was asked to

complete the survey. If s/he was unavailable, the chief's staff was asked to complete the survey. Over 61 percent (152) of police departments agreed to participate in the survey and over 85 percent of persons completing the survey were either the police chief, or a staff member from the chief's office.

For police survey respondents, the mean annual departmental budget was \$60 million and the mean number of sworn officers was 607. Survey respondents were representative of the population of large cities. In the original sample cities in the West and South are over represented (because they have more large cities), but the distribution of participants in the survey is similar and does not reveal a bias in response rate. As with the original sample, cities in the Northeast were under represented, as were cities on the lower end of the population scale. Based on the median population, police departments in larger cities were only marginally more likely to complete the survey. However, these differences are small and did not create any systematic bias.

Additionally, local interest groups that might be concerned with the issue of hate crimes were located in the 250 largest cities. Groups in each city were identified through contacts with national gay, African-American, Latino, and Asian American groups. Furthermore, local chapters of state and national groups were identified through group mailing lists and websites. All potential groups were either known as anti-violence/hate crime groups or had shown an interest in the issue of hate crime through their website, flyers, connections with other local groups, or connections with national groups.⁴

⁴ Because the full universe of groups in each city was unknown, the sample of groups included in this study was not fully random. However, the technique used here is well established in social science research and has been used in previous research on local groups concerned with hate crime (see Jenness 1995; Jenness and Broad 1997). Because survey respondents were informed that their participation and responses would be kept confidential the groups cannot be identified.

Once a list was compiled for each city, one group was randomly selected from each of the 250 cities and a survey was mailed to the group leader at the last known address. If a group failed to respond to the survey after three mailings, a new group was randomly selected from the list for that city and mailed a copy of the survey.

In all 112 group leaders completed the survey, for a response rate of almost 45 percent. As with the police survey, original sample cities in the West and South are over represented, but the distribution of participants in the survey is similar and does not reveal a bias in response rate. Based on the median city population, there was no systematic bias in the response rate of interest groups in larger versus smaller cities.

RESULTS: A FIRST LOOK

Because the first proposition suggests there will be a difference in the perceptions of law enforcement versus interest groups, I matched police respondents with interest group respondents for each city where a survey was completed for each group (the relevant survey questions and measurement scales for each group are displayed in the Appendix). This process dropped the total number of cases to 49, but it allows me to directly compare responses over a series of questions asked in each survey using simple T-tests. Respondents were asked a series of questions related to hate crime and police/community relations. The results of the T-test analysis on responses to these questions are displayed in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 About Here]

Police departments and interest groups responded differently to nearly all the survey questions, including questions relating to departmental activities and obstacles to pursuing hate crimes. In most cases police departments were more positive about their efforts relating to hate crimes than were interest groups. This finding is consistent with the proposition

that bureaucrats have an incentive to suggest they are doing a good job, while interest groups have an incentive to suggest that more needs to be done.

There are several additional findings of note. First, when responding to the statement: "Hate motivated crimes are more serious than other, similar but non-bias motivated crimes," interest groups were slightly more likely to say that hate crimes are more serious than were police, but the difference was not statistically significant. Thus, even though interest groups generally rate police poorly in their efforts related to hate crime, they are not significantly more likely to suggest that police should take hate crimes more seriously than other types of crime. Second, when respondents were asked "How concerned have local politicians in your city been about the issue of hate crime in the past three years," police were slightly more likely to indicate higher levels of concern than interest groups, but the difference was not statistically significant. Thus, both groups perceived that local politicians have not been very concerned with hate crimes. For law enforcement officials this fact should offer less incentive to aggressively pursue hate crime, and for interest groups this fact suggests that the groups need to engage in activities that raise the salience of the issue for the public and elected officials.

Third, when asked about interest group attempts to influence police activity on hate crime, police were more likely to indicate that interest groups were engaged in less activity than was suggested by the interest groups themselves. Although the police have no clear incentive to answer this question one way or the other, interest groups do have a vested interest in suggesting they are doing something.

Finally, respondents were asked about a series of obstacles to pursuing hate crime, including funding, training, and resistance from officers. In each case police were significantly more likely to suggest that these obstacles were not problems, while interest groups suggested that they were. For each of these questions the police do not necessarily have an incentive to

indicate these obstacles are not problems. Indeed, if a central focus of the bureaucracy is to expand its resources and authority (Meier 1993), one might think police respondents would have suggested these obstacles exist. However, if local political conditions signal that pursuing hate crimes is not valued, police may be less likely to indicate that obstacles exist.

ADDITIONAL ANALYSES

The above analysis, although interesting, clearly suggests the need for multivariate analysis of police and interest group responses. Each set of respondents clearly perceive the world in a different manner based on their organizational context, but some sets of responses also suggest their perceptions may vary by local political context. To explore this question I pooled the responses for police and interest groups so that the effect of organization context on response could be examined when controlling for characteristics of the community.

Each of the questions shown in Table 1 is therefore treated as a dependent variable. The key independent variable is a dummy variable coded one if the respondent was representing an interest group, and zero if the respondent was representing a police department. To capture variations in community context I included a number of additional variables.

The city's crime per capita rate was included with the expectation that in cities with higher crime rates, respondents would be more likely to suggest the police are doing less in the area of hate crimes simply because all actors would perceive a general crime problem.⁵ Dummy variables are included for the presence of a state or local policies addressing hate crimes, and are simply coded one if the city is covered by a policy, and zero otherwise.⁶ Here the

⁵ Data on crime rates are 1997 statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

⁶ Data on state policies are from the Anti-Defamation League (1999) and data on local policies are from Haider-Markel and O'Brien (1999). All policies are

expectation is that all actors will perceive greater police efforts if public policies have specified hate crime as an issue to take action on (Bell 2002; Haider-Markel 2002).

To capture citizen preferences on hate crimes two surrogate measures were used. First, because hate crime policies are often opposed by religious conservatives, cities that have more religiously orthodox populations should shape perceptions of law enforcement activity on hate crime, especially crimes of bias toward sexual orientation (Haider-Markel and O'Brien 1999; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Levin and McDevitt 2002). Religious values are measured as the percent of the county population that is affiliated with a Protestant Fundamentalist denomination.⁷ Second, Button, Rienzo, and Wald (1997) suggest that non-family households are associated with greater tolerance, especially towards gays and lesbians, and may subsequently influence perceptions of law enforcement activity on hate crime. As such, I included the percent of a city's population that are living in non-family households.⁸

In preliminary analysis I also included controls for a city's minority population, police officers per capita, overall population, median income, college education of the population, type of government (i.e. council/mayor), region of country, percentage Democratic presidential vote, and measures of the youth population. None of these measures was statistically significant nor did they significantly improve the models. Further, most of these

included here as dichotomous variables coded 1 if the state or city has any type of policy for collecting statistics on hate crime, creating penalties for hate crime, or enhancing penalties for hate crime. Cities in Texas are counted as being covered by a hate crime law even though the Texas law did not specifically mention particular groups or classes of persons in the year of the surveys (1999).

⁷ The data are from Bradley et al. (1992) and the classification of Protestant Fundamentalist denominations follows Haider-Markel and Meier (1996).

⁸ Data are from the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1990).

measures were highly collinear with the other community characteristics measures. Thus, none of the models reported here include this additional set of community characteristics.⁹

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of each analysis treating each question in Table 1 as a dependent variable are displayed in Tables 2a through 2c. Even controlling for community characteristics, the results of multivariate analysis are consistent with the T-tests. In all cases where there was a significant difference between police and interest group perceptions, those differences were confirmed in the multivariate analysis. Conversely, on those questions where the perceptions of police and interest groups were not found to be significantly different in the T-tests, the multivariate analysis found no significant difference. There were no significant differences between interest group and police perceptions of whether or not hate crime laws have an influence on hate crimes, whether hate crimes are more serious than other types of crime, and whether local politicians have been concerned with the issue of hate crimes. For each of these questions we expected that differences between police and interest groups would be small, largely because all respondents have an incentive to provide the most politically correct response.

[Insert Table 2a, 2b, and 2c About Here]

But overall interest groups were more likely to perceive that police were taking less action on hate crimes, less likely to believe that police and prosecutors would follow through on hate crime cases, and more likely than the police respondents to perceive problems with police funding, training, and

⁹ I also computed interaction variables from the interest group/police variable and each of the independent variables. None of the interactions was statistically significant and, thus, are not reported in the results here.

resistance from officers on the issue of hate crimes. Interestingly, police departments were more likely to say that hate crime victims do report the crime and less likely to perceive that interest groups in the community try to influence their activity related to hate crime. As such, the central proposition that respondents' perceptions will vary according to their organizational context is confirmed.

Additionally, community characteristics play a role in shaping respondent perceptions, but the influence of community characteristics is less consistent and they have less influence on perceptions than organizational context. In several cases, higher levels of crime led to a perception that police efforts on hate crime were not strong, and the presence of formal state and local policies increased perceptions that police were engaged in a fair amount of activity on hate crime. However, in only a few models did community preferences, measured by conservative religious affiliations and non-family households, appear to significantly influence respondents' perceptions.

Thus, the results reaffirm the importance of organizational context in shaping perceptions, but do not consistently demonstrate that community characteristics play a strong role in shaping perceptions. In fact, only the overall crime rate and the presence of a local or state policy on hate crime tend to shape perceptions. In cities with higher crime rates respondents were more likely to suggest police efforts on hate crime were weak, regardless of the institutional context of the respondent. Meanwhile, in cities covered by hate crime policies, respondents were more likely to perceive hate crime as a serious problem and perceive greater law enforcement efforts on hate crime, regardless of the institutional context of the respondent.

CONCLUSIONS

Across multiple sub-fields in social science researchers have argued that human perceptions shape decisionmaking and behavior, even when those perceptions are wrong. Theory and research suggest that perceptions are

shaped by the organizational and community context in which an individual is located.

In this study I contribute to our understanding of organizational and community context by making use of original survey data to explore the perceptions of interest group leaders and police regarding law enforcement activity on hate crime. I present a framework for understanding how perceptions may differ depending on organizational context and community characteristics. I then tested for differences in perceptions using both simple and more advanced statistical methods, controlling for community characteristics that may influence perception. My results suggest several important conclusions.

First, the simple and advanced statistical tests demonstrate that organizational context influences the perceptions of individuals. Perceptions of law enforcement activity on hate crime vary depending on whether a respondent was representing an interest group or a police department, and these variations persisted even when community characteristics were controlled for. Generally, interest group leaders are far less likely than police officials to perceive that law enforcement is doing much to address hate crime. Further, interest groups are more likely to perceive there are problems with funding, training, and officer resistance when it comes to hate crime. These findings are consistent with other studies of hate crime in urban areas (Balboni and McDevitt 2001; Boyd et al. 1996; Jenness and Grattet 2001; Levin and McDevitt 2002; Martin 1995, 1996).

Second, the perceptions of interest groups and police are also influenced by community context, but the influence of community context on perceptions is less consistent. If state or local policies related to hate crime cover the jurisdiction in question, respondents from law enforcement and interest groups are more likely to perceive greater law enforcement action on hate crime. Further, higher overall crime rates in a city led respondents to perceive that police are doing less about hate crime, regardless of whether

the respondent was representing law enforcement or an interest group. This result may occur because interest groups, seeing high crime rates, perceive that police are generally doing a poor job regardless of the type of crime. Meanwhile, police in higher crime cities may feel constrained from making statements that suggest they are doing a good job.

Third, although the above political conditions influenced respondent perceptions, community preferences, here measured by surrogates for community tolerance, only influenced perceptions of interest groups and police on a few questions. For example, higher levels of community tolerance were associated with respondent perceptions that law enforcement is making a strong effort on hate crimes.

Finally, although my results clearly establish that perceptions are influenced by organizational context and community characteristics, organizational context appears to play the greatest role in shaping perceptions of law enforcement and interest groups. And it seems intuitive that differences in the perceptions of political actors are of key importance for citizens in a democracy. If citizens and other political actors, such as interest groups, perceive that government action is weak and government officials perceive that government action is strong, citizens and interest groups may come to distrust the government, and even question its legitimacy. Such citizen distrust may be difficult to change and may lead to government officials being ousted from office, or at worst, lead to high levels of social unrest. Thus, government officials must be conscious of public perceptions exist, even when those perceptions might be wrong.

These conclusions seem especially important for criminal justice issues in urban settings. Differing perceptions between police, the public, and elected officials have frequently contributed to distrust, and provided motivation for urban unrest (Skolnick 1966; Brown 1981; Skolnick and Fyfe 1993). Scholars of urban politics and policies should therefore be encouraged

to engage in more systematic investigations of the role perceptions play in the urban governmental process.

Appendix: Survey Questions for Police Chiefs and Interest Group Leaders

8. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being poor and 10 being excellent, please rate your department's relations with the following communities:

--Lesbians and gays Please circle
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 meaning poor and 10 being excellent, please rate your perception of your department's efforts at enforcing laws for the following categories of crime:

Hate or bias crimes Please circle
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10a. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 meaning poor and 10 being excellent, please rate your perception of the District Attorney's efforts at enforcing laws for the following categories of crime:

Hate or bias crimes Please circle
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

12. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 meaning not serious at all and 10 meaning very serious, please rate your perception of how seriously regular uniformed officers take hate crimes and the enforcement of hate crime laws

Please circle
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15. **Please read the following hypothetical scenario and respond below.**

A white male is beaten and robbed near a gay bar in your city. Officers arrive on the scene along with medical personnel. The injured man tells the officers he believes he was attacked and robbed because he is a homosexual. In fact, he heard both of his two assailants call him a "fag" as he was beaten. Although evidence suggests the man was clearly robbed, the initial evidence related to the potential that the crime was motivated by bias towards homosexuals is limited to the statement of the victim. The victim is able to give a description of both assailants.

Now based on your department's policies and the attitudes of your officers, please rate the following on a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 indicating very unlikely and 10 indicating very likely.

15a. How likely is it that the police officers on the scene will classify the crime as a hate crime?

Please circle
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15b. How likely is it that a hate crime arrest will be made in the case?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15c. How likely is it that the district attorney will pursue the case as a hate crime?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15d. How likely is it that a hate crime conviction will be made in the case?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

19. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 meaning poor and 10 being excellent, please rate your perception of your department's effort to track, classify, and report hate crime incidents

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

21. Based on your knowledge of the behavior of hate crime victims would you say that hate crime victims (please circle):

- 0 never report hate crimes
- 1 often do not report hate crimes
- 2 sometimes do not sometimes do report hate crimes
- 3 often do report hate crimes
- 4 always report hate crimes

21a. Please rate the degree to which local groups concerned about hate crimes attempt to influence your department's activities related to hate crimes:

- 0 Never try to influence our activities related to hate crimes
- 1 Almost never try to influence our activities
- 2 Sometimes do not sometimes do try to influence our activities
- 3 Often try to influence our activities
- 4 Always try to influence our activities

21b. Based on your experience, how much impact do you think hate crime laws have on reducing the number of hate crimes in your city?

- 0 No impact
- 1 Very little impact
- 2 Some impact
- 3 Quite a bit of impact

4 A very large impact

21c. How strongly do you agree with the following statement "Hate motivated crimes are more serious than other, similar but non-bias motivated crimes."

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2 Disagree
- 3 Neither disagree or agree
- 4 Agree
- 5 Strongly agree

22. How much of a problem is lack of funding in your department's efforts to enforce hate crime laws and collect statistics on hate crime (please circle)?

- 1 Not a problem
- 2 Slight problem
- 3 Problem
- 4 Severe problem
- 5 Severe and continuing problem

23. How much of a problem is lack of training in your department's efforts to enforce hate crime laws and collect statistics on hate crime?

- 1 Not a problem
- 2 Slight problem
- 3 Problem
- 4 Severe problem
- 5 Severe and continuing problem

24. How much of a problem is resistance from regular officers in your department's efforts to enforce hate crime laws and collect statistics on hate crime?

- 1 Not a problem
- 2 Slight problem
- 3 Problem
- 4 Severe problem
- 5 Severe and continuing problem

27. How concerned have local politicians in your city been about the issue of hate crime in the past three years?

- 1 Not at all concerned
- 2 Somewhat concerned
- 3 Concerned
- 4 Very concerned

References

- Allison, Graham T. 1971. *The essence of decision*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. 1999. *1999 hate crime laws*.
New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
- Balboni, Jennifer M., and Jack McDevitt. 2001. Hate crime reporting: Understanding police officer perceptions, departmental protocol, and the role of the victim. *Justice Research and Policy* 3 (1):1-28.
- Bell, Jeannie. 2002. *Policing hatred: Law enforcement, civil rights, and hate crime*. New York: New York University Press.
- Boyd, Elizabeth A., Richard A. Berk, and Karl M. Hamner. 1996. Motivated by hatred or prejudice: Categorization of hate-motivated crimes in two police divisions. *Law & Society Review* 30 (4):819-850.
- Bradley, Martin B., Norman M. Green, Dale E. Johnson, Mac Lynn, and Lou McNeil. 1992. *Churches and church membership in the united states, 1990*. Atlanta: Glenmary Research Center.
- Brown, Michael. 1981. *Working the street: Police discretion and the dilemmas of reform*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Button, James W., Barbara A. Rienzo, and Kenneth D. Wald. 1997. *Private lives, public conflicts: Battles over gay rights in american communities*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Crank, John P. 1994. Watchman and community: Myth and Institutionalization in policing. *Law and Society Review* 28 (2):325-351.
- Crank, John P., and Robert H. Langworthy. 1992. An institutional perspective on policing. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 83 (2):338-363
- DiMaggio, Paul J. 1988. Interest and agency in institutional theory. In *Institutional Patterns and Organizations*, edited by Lynne G.

- Zucker, 3-21. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Finn, Peter. 1988. Bias crime: Difficult to define, difficult to prosecute. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 17 (Summer):54-68.
- Franklin, Karen. 2002. Good intentions: The enforcement of hate crime penalty-enhancement statutes. *American Behavioral Scientist* 46 (1):154-173.
- Gerstenfeld, Phyllis B. 1992. Smile when you call me that! The problems with punishing hate motivated behavior. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 10(2):259-285.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P. 2002. Regulating hate: State and local influences on law enforcement actions related to hate crime. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 2 (2):126-160.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P. 1998. The politics of social regulatory policy: State and federal hate crime policy and implementation effort. *Political Research Quarterly* 51 (1):69-88.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P., and Kenneth J. Meier. 1996. The politics of gay and lesbian rights: Expanding the scope of the conflict. *Journal of Politics* 58 (2):332-49.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P., and Sean P. O'Brien. 1999. Values in conflict: Local government response to hate crime. In *Culture wars and local politics*, edited by Elaine B. Sharp, 137-157. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Jacobs, James B. 1992. Rethinking the war against hate crimes: A new york city perspective. *Criminal Justice Ethics* 11 (2):55-61.
- Jacobs, James B., and Kimberly Potter. 1998. *Hate crimes: Criminal law & identity politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jenness, Valerie, and Kendal Broad. 1997. *Hate crimes: New social movements and the politics of violence*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Jenness, Valerie, and Ryken Grattet. 2001. *Making hate a crime:*

- From social movement concept to law enforcement practice.*
New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Jenness, Valerie. 1995. Social movement growth, domain expansion, and framing processes: The gay/lesbian movement and violence against gays and lesbians as a social problem. *Social Problems* 42 (1):145-70.
- Jervis, Robert. 1976. *Perceptions and misperception in international politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Johnson, Paul E. 1998. Interest group recruiting: Finding members and keeping them. In *Interest group politics*, 5th ed. Edited by Allan J. Cigler and Burdett A. Loomis, 35-62. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Jones, Bryan D. 1994. *Reconceiving decision-making in democratic politics: Attention, choice, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kelly, Janet M. 2003. Citizen satisfaction and administrative performance measures: Is there really a link? *Urban Affairs Review* 38 (6):855-866.
- Klein, K. J., and J. S. Sorra. 1996. The challenge of innovation implementation. *Academy of Management Review* 21 (4):1055-1080.
- Levin, Jack, and Jack McDevitt. 2002. *Hate crimes revisited: America's war on those who are different*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Martin, Susan E. 1996. Investigating hate crimes: Case characteristics and law enforcement responses. *Justice Quarterly* 13 (3):455-480.
- Martin, Susan E. 1995. 'A cross-burning is not just an arson': Police social construction of hate crimes in baltimore county. *Criminology* 33 (2):303-26.
- McCubbins, Mathew D., and Thomas Schwartz. 1984. Congressional oversight overlooked: Police patrols versus fire alarms.

- American Journal of Political Science* 28 (1):165-179.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 1993. *Politics and the bureaucracy*. 3rd ed. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology* 83 (2):340-363.
- Morgan, Gareth. 1986. *Images of organization*. Newbury Park, NJ: Sage Publications.
- Nolan, James J. III, and Yoshio Akiyama 1999. An analysis of factors that affect law enforcement participation in hate crime reporting. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 15 (1):111-127.
- Pressman, Jeffrey L., and Aaron B. Wildavsky. 1973. *Implementation: How great expectations in washington are dashed in oakland; or why it's amazing that federal programs work at all*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Skolnick, Jerome H. 1966. *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Skolnick, Jerome H., and James J. Fyfe. 1993. *Above the law: Police and the excessive use of force*. New York: The Free Press.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1990. *1990 census of population social and economic characteristics: United states*. Vol. 1. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Walker, Samuel, and Charles M. Katz. 1995. Less than meets the eye: Police department bias crime units. *American Journal of Police* 14 (1):29-41.

Table 1: T-Tests Comparing Survey Responses of Police Chiefs and Interest Group Leaders

Question (police listed first, activists second)	Mean	SD	T	Significance (2-tailed)
8. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being poor and 10 being excellent, please rate your department's relations with the following communities: Lesbians and gays	7.60 4.81	1.853 3.088	4.937	.000
10. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 meaning poor and 10 being excellent, please rate your perception of your department's efforts at enforcing laws for the following categories of crime: Hate or bias crimes	8.70 4.80	2.127 2.954	6.919	.000
12. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 meaning not serious at all and 10 meaning very serious, please rate your perception of how seriously regular uniformed officers take hate crimes and the enforcement of hate crime laws	7.84 4.36	1.940 2.534	8.264	.000
Hypothetical scenario responses				
15a. How likely is it that the police officers on the scene will classify the crime as a hate crime? (0-10 scale)	7.25 4.65	3.019 2.983	4.699	.000
15b. How likely is it that a hate crime arrest will be made in the case? (0-10 scale)	4.97 3.61	3.247 2.969	2.045	.048
15c. How likely is it that the district attorney will pursue the case as a hate crime? (0-10 scale)	5.57 3.91	3.567 2.944	2.311	.027
15d. How likely is it that a hate crime conviction will be made in the case? (0-10 scale)	4.94 3.54	3.395 3.003	2.155	.038
19. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 meaning poor and 10 being excellent, please rate your perception of your department's effort to track, classify, and report hate crime incidents	7.51 4.08	2.910 3.081	5.781	.000
21. Based on your knowledge of the behavior of hate crime victims would you say that hate crime victims: 0 never report hate crimes, to, 4 always report hate crimes	2.09 1.42	.733 .657	4.690	.000
21a. Please rate the degree to which local groups concerned about hate crimes attempt to influence your department's activities related to hate crimes: 0 Never try to influence our activities related to hate crimes, to 4 Always try to influence our activities	1.79 2.26	.833 .978	-2.385	.022
21b. Based on your experience, how much impact do you think hate crime laws have on reducing the number of hate crimes in your city? 0 No impact, to, 4 A very large impact	1.31 1.77	.867 .942	-2.215	.034
21c. How strongly do you agree with the following statement "Hate motivated crimes are more serious than other, similar but non-bias motivated crimes."	3.93 4.12	1.149 .900	-.850	.400

1 Strongly disagree, to, 5 Strongly agree

22. How much of a problem is lack of funding in your department's efforts to enforce hate crime laws and collect statistics on hate crime? 1 Not a problem, to, 5 Severe and continuing problem	1.58 2.52	.792 1.176	-3.761	.001
23. How much of a problem is lack of training in your department's efforts to enforce hate crime laws and collect statistics on hate crime? 1 Not a problem, to, 5 Severe and continuing problem	1.72 3.14	.849 1.246	-5.596	.000
24. How much of a problem is resistance from regular officers in your department's efforts to enforce hate crime laws and collect statistics on hate crime? 1 Not a problem, to, 5 Severe and continuing problem	1.47 2.85	.825 1.306	-5.176	.000
27. How concerned have local politicians in your city been about the issue of hate crime in the past three years? 1 Not at all concerned, to, 4 Very concerned	2.30 2.23	.939 .832	.393	.696

Notes: Results from 49 cities, one police chief respondent and one interest group respondent. Original sample was 250 largest American cities.

Table 2a: Determinants of Perceptions of Law Enforcement Activity on Hate Crimes

<i>Independent Variables</i>	Relations with gays	Dept. HC Effort	Officers Serious About HC	Scenario: Classify as HC	Scenario: Arrest	Scenario: DA pursuit
Interest group	-2.796** (.522)	-4.240** (.533)	-3.776** (.464)	-2.937** (.585)	-1.846** (.588)	-1.896** (.617)
State policy	.729 (.574)	1.281** (.594)	.933* (.517)	1.689** (.659)	2.773** (.651)	3.039** (.681)
Local policy	.253 (.951)	.214 (.963)	.567 (.862)	1.915* (1.072)	2.100* (1.065)	1.661 (1.172)
Non-Family Households	.121 (.081)	.081 (.080)	.046 (.069)	.012 (.086)	.023 (.085)	.009 (.090)
Protestant Fundamentalist	-.006 (.028)	.032 (.028)	.0006 (.025)	-.019 (.032)	-.030 (.031)	-.037 (.034)
Crime per capita	-.016 (.012)	-.021* (.012)	-.027** (.011)	-.029** (.014)	-.024* (.013)	-.026* (.014)
Constant	-6.702** (1.469)	8.100** (1.522)	8.642** (1.339)	8.524** (1.650)	5.122** (1.638)	5.945** (1.751)
R Square	.29	.47	.48	.35	.34	.36
Adjusted R	.24	.43	.45	.30	.29	.31
Standard Error	2.480	2.511	2.233	2.749	2.665	2.782
F	5.757**	12.076**	13.301**	7.205**	6.722**	7.107**
Number of cases	90	88	92	88	83	82

Notes: Coefficients are OLS regression coefficients. Standard errors are in parentheses. Significance levels in two-tailed test: ** < .05; * < .10. Full questions for dependent variables and coding are in the Appendix.

Table 2b: Determinants of Perceptions of Law Enforcement Activity on Hate Crimes

<i>Independent Variables</i>	Scenario: Conviction	Dept. Overall HC Effort	Victim HC Reporting	Interest Group Attempts at Influence	Impact of HC laws	Agree HC are More Serious
Interest group	-1.830** (.617)	-3.707** (.581)	-.699** (.143)	.507** (.185)	.313 (.197)	.260 (.218)
State policy	2.955** (.678)	1.363** (.639)	.168 (.160)	.098 (.206)	.435** (.218)	.069 (.244)
Local policy	1.284 (1.171)	2.369** (1.079)	.361 (.265)	.159 (.355)	-.005 (.363)	.049 (.414)
Non-Family Households	.031 (.090)	.166* (.086)	.023 (.022)	.060** (.029)	.018 (.030)	.017 (.034)
Protestant Fundamentalist	-.025 (.034)	-.003 (.031)	-.009 (.008)	-.008 (.010)	-.000 (.011)	-.010 (.012)
Crime per capita	-.017 (.014)	-.036** (.014)	-.004 (.003)	.002 (.004)	-.002 (.005)	-.012** (.005)
Constant	4.278** (1.729)	6.969** (1.639)	2.473** (.409)	.792 (.526)	1.003* (.559)	4.820** (.630)
R Square	.32	.42	.24	.16	.11	.09
Adjusted R	.27	.38	.19	.10	.04	.02
Standard Error	2.782	2.706	.694	.887	.894	1.032
F	5.977**	9.936**	4.673**	2.728**	1.545	1.354
Number of cases	82	87	93	91	83	89

Notes: Coefficients are OLS regression coefficients. Standard errors are in parentheses. Significance levels in two-tailed test: ** < .05; * < .10. Full questions for dependent variables and coding are in the Appendix.

Table 2c: Determinants of Perceptions of Law Enforcement Activity on Hate Crimes

<i>Independent Variables</i>	Problem: Lack of Funding	Problem: Lack of Training	Problem: Resistance From Officers	Level of Concern of Local Politicians
Interest group	.925** (.225)	1.456** (.219)	1.343** (.227)	-.062 (.180)
State policy	-.087 (.250)	-.159 (.240)	-.086 (.247)	.390* (.198)
Local policy	.471 (.424)	.274 (.423)	-.099 (.432)	-.092 (.352)
Non-Family Households	-.051 (.035)	-.039 (.034)	-.047 (.035)	.046 (.029)
Protestant Fundamentalist	-.002 (.012)	.036** (.012)	.014 (.012)	-.009 (.010)
Crime per capita	.004 (.005)	-.005 (.005)	.012** (.005)	-.003 (.004)
Constant	2.095** (.660)	2.247** (.621)	1.129* (.644)	1.727** (.513)
R Square	.23	.43	.39	.13
Adjusted R	.17	.38	.34	.07
Standard Error	1.002	1.002	1.022	.842
F	3.730**	9.627**	8.001**	2.106*
Number of cases	81	84	82	88

Notes: Coefficients are OLS regression coefficients. Standard errors are in parentheses. Significance levels in two-tailed test: ** < .05; * < .10. Full questions for dependent variables and coding are in the Appendix.