Document Title:	U.S. Hate Crime Investigation Rates and Characteristics: Findings from the National Hate Crime Investigations Study (NHCIS)
Author(s):	Lisa M. Jones, Ph.D., Kimberly J. Mitchell, Ph.D., Heather A. Turner, Ph.D.
Document Number:	304531
Date Received:	April 2022
Award Number:	2018-MU-MU-0029

U.S. Hate Crime Investigation Rates and Characteristics:
Findings from the National Hate Crime Investigations Study (NHCIS)

Summary Report

December 31, 2021
Grant Award #: 2018-MU-MU-0029

Principal Investigator: Lisa M. Jones, Ph.D.

Co-Investigators: Kimberly J. Mitchell, Ph.D. & Heather A. Turner, Ph.D.

University of New Hampshire
10 West Edge Drive, Suite 106
Durham, NH 03824

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

The National Hate Crime Investigation Study (NHCIS) is the first study to collect detailed data on hate crime investigations from a nationally representative sample of law enforcement agencies across the United States. A random sample of 2,488 local, county, and state law enforcement agencies, stratified by agency type and size, were surveyed about the number of hate crime incidents investigated by their agency between January 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018. Case-level surveys then captured extensive data about 1,230 hate crime incidents, suspects, investigative strategies, and outcomes. Weighted, cross-sectional data were used to conduct descriptive, bivariate, and multivariate (e.g., logistic regression) analyses. The most common categories of hate crime investigated by law enforcement involved targeted victims' race and ethnicity, and were most frequently anti-Black crimes. Anti-Hispanic/Latino incidents, anti-Jewish/anti-Semitic incidents, and anti-gay incidents were also common. Suspects were most typically White, adult males. In about half of the incidents, the suspect was not known by the victim. However, only 23% of agencies participating in the study reported any hate crime investigations. Even among the 792 large agencies included in the sample, only 45% reported one or more hate crime investigations in 2018. Study findings identified a number of agency-level policies and procedures that were significantly related to an increased number of reported hate crime investigations, even controlling for agency type and size. Findings provide important information for improving the identification, documentation, and reporting of hate crimes by U.S. law enforcement agencies. Study results also highlight a number of strategies that law enforcement agencies can use to improve hate crime investigations and their response to communities around these crimes.

INTRODUCTION

Hate crimes are egregious and often violent crimes in which victims are targeted because of their race, ethnicity, immigrant-status, religion, sexual orientation, disability, gender, or gender-orientation. Over 8,000 victims of hate crimes were reported by law enforcement agencies 2020, the most recent year of data, as a part of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program in the U.S (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2020). National data on hate crimes has improved since Congress passed the Hate Crime Statistics Act (28 U.S.C. § 534) in 1990. However, reporting problems with the UCR program remain an issue (Cronin, McDevitt, Farrell, & Nolan, 2007; McDevitt et al., 2005), and additional methodologies are needed to supplement knowledge on hate crimes known to police, including more detailed statistics on who commits hate crimes in the U.S., and information on how investigations and the justice response can be improved.

In 2020, over 7,000 incidents were reported by U.S. law enforcement agencies to the UCR Program (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2020). Data from the National Crime Victim Survey (NCVS), a victim-report survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, estimated that an average of almost 250,000 nonfatal violent and property hate crime victimizations occurred annually from 2005-2019 (Kena & Thompson, 2021). Of the hate crime victimizations recorded by the NCVS, only 57% of violent hate crime victimization, and 30% of property hate crimes, were reported to police.

Accurate, reliable, and detailed information on the scope and nature of national hate crimes is critical in order to understand which segments of the population are most affected and how this changes over time, and to inform prevention efforts and improve criminal investigations and prosecutions (Shively et al., 2014). Hate crimes are more likely to involve a serious violent crime or assault compared with non-bias crimes (Lantz & Kim, 2019; Messner, McHugh, & Felson, 2004; Pezzella, Fetzer, & Keller, 2019; Tessler, Langton, Rivara, Vavilala, & Rowhani-Rahbar, 2021), and are more likely to involve multiple offenders (Masucci & Langton, 2017). Research has also documented that negative emotional and psychological consequences are more significant for victims of bias-crime compared to parallel non-bias crimes (McDevitt, Balboni, Garcia, & Gu, 2001; Messner et al., 2004; Turner, Finkelhor, Shattuck, Hamby, & Mitchell, 2015). Finally, hate crimes have substantial negative impact on bystanders, the communities in which they occur, and the groups of people toward which the hate or bias was directed (Perry, 2014; Perry & Alvi, 2012).

A need for improved national data on hate crime offenses

The importance of improving national data on hate crimes has received notable policy attention over the past several decades. The 1990 Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA), signed by President George H.W. Bush, required the U.S. Attorney General to collect data on crimes with evidence of prejudice based on "race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity" (Nolan, Akiyama, & Berhanu, 2002). As a result, the UCR, under the direction of the FBI, created a hate crimes data

collection program that sought to improve national data on hate crime incidents known to police. This data system has been modified several times as a national understanding of hate crimes has evolved. In 1994, the 1990 Act was amended to include bias against persons with disabilities, and in 2009, the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crime Prevention Act made gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation protected categories under federal hate crime statutes.

The FBI has been publishing annual reports on hate crime statistics submitted by law enforcement agencies since 1996. However, information is provided to the system by local agencies on a voluntary basis, and many state, city and local police agencies do not collect or disclose hate crime data (McDevitt et al., 2005; Pezzella et al., 2019). In 2020, 15,138 agencies participated in the UCR Hate Crime Statistics program. A roughly similar number of agencies has contributed data since 2010, with many agencies, including some large agencies, still not submitting data. Additionally, a large percentage of agencies that submit data cite an absence of hate crimes, or very low rates, even in urban districts that have high rates of crime. Research on data reporting discrepancies find that errors can occur at many levels, including patrol officers' designation of the incident as a hate crime, internal agency review and citation protocol problems, and failures to submit correct data to the FBI (Cronin et al., 2007).

Policy-makers are seeking ways to improve the reliability of hate crime statistics. In early 2021, the U.S. House passed the COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act (Public Law 117-13). This law acknowledges that an understanding of hate crimes in the U.S. is "hindered by incomplete data from Federal, State, and local jurisdictions." It authorizes the Attorney General to provide grants to assist law enforcement agencies in establishing a number of activities or programs aimed at reducing the number of hate crimes, including training around identifying and classifying hate crimes, adoption of policies to improve hate crime identification and investigation, and community engagement programs to improve hate crime prevention and education.

Challenges for police in defining and investigating hate crimes

Even for law enforcement agencies that regularly report cases to the UCR hate crime program, varying state laws and agency policies result in definitional and procedural inconsistencies that make it hard to summarize information across states and jurisdictions. The FBI currently defines a hate crime as "a criminal offense committed against a person or property which is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias against race, religion, disability, ethnic/nation origin group, or sexual orientation group" (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2021). Evolving definitions are reflected in national statutory policies (Garland, 2012; Haas, Nolan, Turley, & Stump, 2011; Shively & Mulford, 2007). Yet, state hate crime statutes still vary substantially in terms of how the crimes are defined, who is protected, and which types of victimizations are included (Pezzella & Fetzer, 2021; Shively, 2005; Shively & Mulford, 2007). Police officers, often with minimal training, are tasked with determining that bias motivation is present at a crime scene and applying state hate crime legal definitions to cases (Cronin et al.,

2007). Only some agencies have defined departmental policies specific to addressing hate crimes (Jenness & Grattet, 2005).

Agency-level procedural differences also complicate the accounting of hate crime statistics (Pezzella & Fetzer, 2021). One study of eight local police agencies found, for example, wide variations in review procedures used to classify hate crimes and the amount of training officers received (McDevitt et al., 2005). Even with good training, law enforcement professionals can have a difficult time classifying bias-motivated crimes. Hass and colleagues (2011) identified that response/retaliation events (incidents that are triggered by something other than bias but with bias as an exacerbating feature) and target-selection events (incidents in which victim characteristics are part of the reason they were targeted for the crime, but not clearly due to bias hate or prejudice) were particularly difficult for law enforcement to classify. Agency culture and procedures also affect the degree to which bias crimes are identified and reported (Cronin et al., 2007). Finally, classification and recording errors and omissions have been documented across several studies (Haas et al., 2011; McDevitt et al., 2005; Nolan et al., 2002). Strategies are needed to improve the quality of knowledge about hate crime investigations, and supplement data sources like the UCR, while improvements are made.

At this time, no research project has systematically collected, organized, and characterized which law enforcement policies are in use nationally regarding hate crime investigations and documentation. There are indications from prior research that police decisions to designate a crime as bias motivated are affected by a number of incident features such as: whether another motivation can be established, whether there were clear gains for the offender (e.g., money), the relationship between the victim and offender, and claims of retaliation by the offender (McDevitt, Levin, & Bennett, 2002). However, rigorous and updated research is needed to determine empirically which incident attributes affect police determination to charge and prosecute a hate crime.

Hate crimes typologies and offender pathways

A seminal study by McDevitt and colleagues (2002) drew data from 169 Boston hate crime incidents to construct a typology of hate crime offender motivations. This research identified four categories of offender motivation: *thrill,* in which the crimes were committed for excitement and power (the most common category); *defensive,* a reaction by offenders to a perception that outsiders were encroaching on their community or way of life; *mission,* in which offenders believe a group of people need to be hurt or destroyed; and *retaliatory*, where offenders are motivated in reaction to a previous real or perceived bias-based incident. This typology has been helpful in orienting police to the kinds of hate crimes that they may encounter and has been used frequently in training (Shively & Mulford, 2007). However, more recent research conducted in New Jersey suggests that the typology fails to capture a large portion of hate crime scenarios (Phillips, 2009). For example, hate crimes in which bias appeared to be involved in escalating the crime, but was not necessarily an original motivator were not easily classifiable under this typology.

Research-based typologies of crimes and offender motivations are critical in helping orient police officers to the range of different scenarios they may come across, and to assist them in considering not just stereotypical hate crime situations, but also crime scenes that may present more ambiguous characteristics. Typologies also help in developing better police response strategies, as well as prevention programs and policies.

Hate crimes involving youth

Extensive research has documented that victimization impacts youth in highly negative ways emotionally, psychologically, physically, and educationally, and that these negative effects follow them into adulthood (Finkelhor, 1995, 2008). An analysis of data from the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) from 1995-2000 found that 47 percent of all hate crime victims were 24 years old and younger (Nolan, Mencken, & McDevitt, 2003). A nationally representative survey of youth in the U.S. conducted by our research team found that 5% of youth aged 14-17 reported experiencing at least one bias-motivated physical assault in their lifetimes (Finkelhor, Turner, Shattuck, & Hamby, 2013).

Youth and young adults are also involved in a large percentage of hate crimes as offenders. Fifteen percent of the hate victimizations reported to the NCVS involved youth offenders who were 17 years old or younger (Masucci & Langton, 2017). Similarly, for hate crime data reported to the UCR by law enforcement agencies, 16% involved offenders younger than 18 years old (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2020). In McDevitt and colleagues'(2002) typology, the most common "thrill" category often involves youth and young adults, and researchers note that these offenders may be particularly amenable to change. One of the aims of the current study was to provide updated and representative information on hate crimes involving youth and young adults as both victims and offenders in order to help law enforcement better identify and assist with hate crimes affecting youth.

Current study

To provide the field with nationally representative data on hate crime incidents, the current study employed a successful, well-tested law enforcement agency survey methodology developed by our research center. Data were gathered with a multi-stage methodology: a mail survey querying a large, national sample of law enforcement agencies, followed by in-depth telephone interviews with investigators and case report data abstraction on a nationally representative sample of cases. A total of 2,488 law enforcement agencies responded to the survey, with detailed follow-up information collected on 1,230 hate crimes cases from 2018.

The research questions addressed by the current study were as follows:
1. What are the rates of hate crimes coming to criminal justice attention in the U.S., and what percentage of hate crimes reported to law enforcement end in arrest? How do rates using this methodology compare to data on hate crimes currently being compiled and reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation? How do rates vary by agency type and size?

2. Which agency-level policies are in place across the country that affect how decisions are made by law enforcement officers to identify and document bias crimes, and how do those policies vary by region and agency size?
3. Using a representative sample of hate crime incidents known to police collected from across the U.S., what can we learn about the nature of hate crimes being investigated by police? What offender typologies can be identified, and how do they vary by offender and incident characteristics and case outcomes? Who are the victims in these cases? What features mark youth-involved hate crime investigations?
4. What types of investigative practices are used to document bias in hate crime investigations, and which are associated with higher arrest and prosecution rates?

Detailed reports and papers are being drafted to address some of the research questions outlined above. In this summary report, we offer information about the NHCIS methodology, and provide summary findings and study implications.

METHODOLOGY

SAMPLE SELECTION

Agencies

The NHCIS sample of law enforcement agencies was designed to yield a nationally representative sample of cases. We used a five-frame stratified sample of agencies (randomly selected by size and agency type) because hate crime investigations do not occur with equal probability among the more than 15,000 U.S. law enforcement agencies. The sample was drawn using a database available through the National Directory of Criminal Justice Data (Public Safety Information Bureau, 2019). This data set includes an annually updated census of local, county, and state law enforcement agencies. It is designed to provide geographic and other identifying information for each record included in the Bureau of Justice Statistic's Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies. We divided law enforcement agencies into five sampling frames based on agency size and type. (See Table 1 with details described below.)

The first frame consisted of 1,162 municipal law enforcement agencies and sheriff's offices with 100 or more officers. All agencies in this frame were included with certainty. From these agencies, 7% (n=76) were ineligible to participate because they lacked jurisdiction to investigate hate crimes or the agency was a duplicate of another agency within that same or a different sampling frame[1]. Seventy-three percent of eligible agencies (n=792) returned completed surveys or provided the information by phone, and 45% of responding agencies from this frame (n=359) reported one or more hate crime investigations in 2018. (See Table 1 for the dispositions, by frame, of the NHCIS mail survey sample.)

The second frame consisted of all 50 U.S. state police agencies, which were included with

[1] Ineligible agencies in this frame consisted primarily of substations in large sheriff offices that were duplicative with the primary sheriff's office.

certainty in the study. Of these agencies, 100% completed and returned mail surveys, but 26% (n=13) were ineligible to participate because they lacked jurisdiction to investigate hate crimes. From responding agencies, 49% (n=18) reported one or more hate crime investigations in 2018.

The third frame consisted of 1,187 municipal law enforcement agencies and sheriff's offices that had between 50-99 officers. Of these agencies, 50% (n=593) were randomly selected to participate in the study. Of the 593 third frame agencies that received mail surveys, 2% (n=14) were ineligible to participate because they lacked jurisdiction to investigate hate crimes or the agency was a duplicate of another agency within that same or a different frame. Of the 579 eligible agencies, 73% (n=425) completed and returned mail surveys, and 27% of responding agencies (n=113) reported one or more 2018 hate crime investigations.

The fourth frame consisted of 12,837 municipal law enforcement agencies and sheriff's offices with less than 50 officers. Of these agencies, 12% (n=1,540) were randomly selected to participate in the study. Of the fourth frame agencies that received mail surveys, 3% (n=38) were ineligible to participate because they lacked jurisdiction to investigate hate crimes, the agency no longer existed, or the agency was a duplicate of another agency within that same or another frame. Of the 1,502 eligible agencies, 69% (n=1,035) completed and returned mail surveys, and 5% (n=55) of responding agencies reported one or more 2018 hate crime investigations.

The final, fifth frame consisted of 2,110 university and college police agencies of which 17% (n=357) were randomly selected for inclusion. Overall, 11% (n=41) were ineligible to participate because they lacked jurisdiction to investigate hate crimes. Of the 316 eligible agencies, 63% (n=199) completed and returned mail surveys, and 15% (n= 0) reported one or more 2018 hate crime investigations.

Table 1. Description and details of the NHCIS stratified national sample and dispositions of the mail survey

Sampling Frames	Population N	Agencies in Sample n (% pop.)	Eligible Agencies n (% agencies in sample)	Responding Agencies n (% eligible agencies)	Agencies reporting 2018 hate crime investigations n (% responding agencies)
First Frame 100+ officers	1,162	1,162 (100%)	1,086 (93%)	792 (73%)	359 (45%)
Second Frame State police	50	50 (100%)	37 (74%)	37 (100%)	18 (49%)
Third Frame 50-99 officers	1,187	593 (50%)	579 (98%)	425 (73%)	113 (27%)
Fourth Frame 1-49 officers	12,837	1,540 (12%)	1,502 (97%)	1,035 (69%)	55 (5%)

Sampling Frames	Population N	Agencies in Sample n (% pop.)	Eligible Agencies n (% agencies in sample)	Responding Agencies n (% eligible agencies)	Agencies reporting 2018 hate crime investigations n (% responding agencies)
Fifth Frame					
College police	2,110	357 (17%)	316 (89%)	199 (63%)	30 (15%)
Total	17,347	3,702 (21%)	3,520 (95%)	2,488 (71%)	575 (23%)

Cases

Of the 2,488 agencies that responded to the mail survey, 575 (23%) reported a hate crime investigation in 2018. These 575 agencies reported a total of 3,530 hate crime investigations, with 359 first frame agencies reporting 2,888 cases, 18 second frame agencies reporting 181 cases, 113 third frame agencies reporting 288 cases, 55 fourth frame agencies reporting 96 cases, and 30 fifth frame agencies reporting 77 cases. (See Table 2 for more details.)

From the 3,530 cases reported by responding law enforcement agencies, 5% (n=173) were ineligible for the study (either because they were not investigated in 2018 or were determined to have no indicators of possible hate or bias motivation). Among eligible cases, a little over half were randomly sampled to be included in the study.[2] From the 1,935 cases included in our sample, researchers sought detailed case information, either from telephone interviews with investigators or from case reports provided by law enforcement agencies. Information was successfully gathered on 1,230 cases (64% of cases selected into the sample), with telephone interviews conducted in 51.6% (n=622) of these cases and data abstracted from case reports in 49.4% (n=608).

Table 2. Dispositions of NHCIS telephone interviews

	1st frame agencies	2nd frame agencies	3rd frame agencies	4th frame agencies	5th frame agencies	Total
Cases reported in mail surveys	2,888	181	288	96	77	3,530
Not selected for sample	1298 (45%)	99 (55%)	16 (6%)	0 (0%)	9 (12%)	1,422 (40%)
Ineligible cases*	112 (4%)	26 (14%)	22 (8%)	6 (6%)	7 (9%)	173 (5%)
Number of cases in sample	1,478 (51%)	56 (31%)	250 (87%)	90 (94%)	61 (79%)	1,935 (55%)
Non-responders	227 (15%)	1 (2%)	57 (23%)	23 (25%)	2 (3%)	310 (16%)
Refusals	160 (11%)	34 (61%)	39 (16%)	7 (8%)	8 (13%)	248 (13%)
Duplicates	25 (2%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	5 (8%)	33 (2%)
Other non-completes	101 (7%)	3 (5%)	4 (2%)	5 (6%)	1 (2%)	114 (6%)

---

[2]Cases were randomly selected from agencies with large number of cases to reduce agency and investigator burden.

Completed interviews	965 (65%)	18 (32%)	148 (59%)	54 (60%)	45 (74%)	1,230 (64%)

*Case did not meet eligibility requirements of study (in most cases, report did not come into agency in 2018)

CONFIDENTIALITY

The National Hate Crimes Investigation Study (NHCIS) was conducted with the approval of the University of New Hampshire's Institutional Review Board and complied with confidentiality regulations mandated for research funded by the U.S. Department of Justice.

INSTRUMENT DESIGN

Agency-level survey

The NHCIS mail survey was a multi-page booklet, formatted so respondents could follow it easily. It included a "Frequently Asked Questions" section and a glossary of study terms, along with a toll-free telephone number so that respondents could contact the researchers if they had questions. The survey was modeled after one developed by Westat Corporation for use in the Second National Incidence Study of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART 2) Law Enforcement Study, which surveyed law enforcement agencies about the incidence and characteristics of stereotypical child abduction cases (Sedlak, Finkelhor, Hammer, & Schultz, 2002).

The mail survey included the following question to determine if agencies had relevant hate crimes cases:

"Between January 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018, was your agency involved in any investigations where there was an indicator or suspicion of possible hate or bias motivation by an offender against an individual's or a group's race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity/national origin, gender, or gender identity?"

If respondents answered "Yes," we asked them to list the case number, or other reference, and the name of the key investigating officer or most knowledgeable person for each case they reported. We emphasized that agencies should return surveys, even if they had no cases to report.

Hate crime policy section: The mail surveys had an additional section with eight questions that asked respondents about agency-level policies and procedures when handling hate crime investigations (e.g., "Does your agency have a dedicated officer or unit responsible for investigating or processing hate crimes?").

Case-level survey

Case-level survey data were collected through telephone interviews using a computer-assisted telephone interviewing system for 622 cases, and by abstracting data from case records provided by law enforcement agencies in 608 cases. The case-level survey consisted of the

following sections.

- **Eligibility**. The Eligibility section served as a screening device to establish whether a case was eligible for the study. It was used in all interviews. It queried respondents about whether the case "involved an incident where hate or bias motivation was suspected" and whether it was reported to their agency or opened as an investigation in 2018. Respondents were then asked to give a brief narrative description of the case.

- **Report and Crime Scene Details**. The Report and Crime Scene Details section collected information about how the incident report came into the agency and other incident information including: the day and time of the incident; the type of offenses that were reported; whether there was weapon use or injury; the location of the incident; and the involvement of other agencies in the investigation, including the FBI.

- **Suspects**. The Suspects section collected detailed information about the suspects in each case. For cases with multiple suspects, some demographic information (sex, age, race/ethnicity) was collected across all suspects, and then a primary offender was chosen for more detailed questions. In addition to demographic information, survey questions collected information on the suspects' criminal background (investigation for a prior criminal offense or arrest), behavior at the time of the incident (influence of alcohol or drugs, verbal or physical aggression toward police), and history such as mental illness diagnosis or gang involvement.

- **Victims**. The Victim section was used if the case involved an identified victim of hate or bias crime. Parallel to the Suspect section, in cases with multiple victims, some demographic information (sex, age, race/ethnicity) was collected across all victims, and then a primary victim was chosen for more detailed questions. Given its potential relevance to hate and bias motivated crimes, information about the victim's religious background, disability status, immigrant status, and sexual identity was collected when available. The Victim section also collected information about the victim's relationship to the suspect.

- **Evidence of Hate or Bias Motivation**. The Hate or Bias Motivation Section collected information about the type of bias motivation considered in the investigation including: race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender-identity, disability, or gender. This section also collected information on the indicators of hate or bias motivation present in the incident (e.g., hate-related verbal comments made by the suspects).

- **Other Evidence Collected**. The Other Evidence Collected section captured the types of evidence collected at the crime scene or as part of the investigation (e.g., photos or videos, computers or cell phones, etc.) and the number and types of witness interviews conducted. Information was also collected on the use of internet or online communication used by suspects in affiliation with the incident.

- **Case Outcomes**. The final section of the survey collected information about arrests, charges, and outcomes of criminal cases, including juvenile court outcomes.

- **Interview Conclusion**. The Interview Conclusion was used in all cases and served to finalize the interview, collect information about respondents' training, and capture any other important information about the case that was not covered in the survey.

DATA COLLECTION

Agency-level survey procedures

To maximize response rates to the Phase 1 mail survey, we followed an adapted version of the "total design" mail survey methodology (Dillman, 2011).

1. We used first class mail to send surveys, personalized cover letters, and business reply envelopes to the heads of the local, county, and state law enforcement agencies in the sample.

2. Approximately three weeks after the initial mailing, we sent reminder postcards to all agency heads, asking them to complete and return the survey if they had not done so, and thanking them if they had.

3. Approximately six weeks after the initial mailing, we sent additional copies of the survey, personalized cover letters, and business reply envelopes to the heads of agencies who had not responded to date.

4. Due to COVID restrictions on bulk mailings that occurred during this time, instead of a third mailing, we followed up by telephone to collect agency-level survey data from non-responding agencies.

The overall response rate for the mail survey was 71% of eligible agencies (N=2,488). Data collection for the mail survey took place between September 2019 and July 2021. Forty-three percent of agencies (n=1,070) who provided the number of 2018 hate crime investigations also completed the policy section of the survey.

Case-level survey procedures

Four trained interviewers conducted the telephone interviews or abstracted data from case record files. For telephone interviewers, a research assistant programmed the telephone survey instrument for computer assisted telephone interview (CATI) administration. The CATI program involved: 1) question and response series; 2) skip patterns; 3) interviewer probes and instructions; 4) range checks; and 5) special edit procedures.

The interviewers attended a two-day training session that provided extensive details about the background, purpose, and instrumentation of the study, and then participated in a series of practice and pilot interviews. Prior to beginning the telephone interview, the interviewers introduced themselves and the study using the following script: "Your agency was chosen randomly from a list of U.S. law enforcement agencies and is part of a national sample of approximately 4,000 agencies who received a mail survey asking about hate crime investigations that were initiated in 2018. _____ in your agency completed the mail survey and indicated that you were an investigating officer for one such case. We are interested in talking with you by phone to gather de-identified details on this case (no names or identifying information for anyone involved in the case are collected). This data will help inform investigation policy and practice recommendations for these kinds of cases. All data will be aggregated; no information on agencies or officer will be shared. The phone interview takes about 30 minutes."

The case-level data for the study was collected between October 2019 and September 2021.

WEIGHTING AND VARIANCE ESTIMATES

Agency-level and case-level weights and additional sampling variables were constructed to enable unbiased estimation and to reflect complex sample design information pertinent to variance estimation. First, each case was given a sampling weight to account for the probability of selection to both the mail survey and telephone interview samples. The sampling weights were adjusted for agency non-response, case level non-response, duplication of cases among agencies. Second, a primary sampling unit (PSU) and a secondary sampling unit (SSU) variable were created to account for clustering of cases (i.e., the SSUs) within agencies (the PSUs.) Third, a stratification variable was created based on the different sampling strategies for each frame. Finally, finite population correction factors account for the sample being selected without replacement, which can be used in variance estimation.

STUDY FINDINGS

Rates of 2018 Hate Crime Investigations Reported by Law Enforcement Agencies

The weights constructed with the NHCIS survey data allow us to estimate of the number of hate crime investigations reported by law enforcement agencies in the U.S. in 2018. From our data, we estimate that agencies recorded **6,486** hate crime investigations in 2018 with a 95% confidence interval of between **5,623** and **7,348** cases. For comparison, the 16,039 law enforcement agencies submitting data to the FBIs UCR program in 2018 reported a total of 7,120 hate crime incidents in 2018 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2018), within our estimated confidence interval.[3]

The number of cases reported by the agencies varied by agency size. Overall an estimated 3,979 cases (CI: 3,138-4,820)[4] were investigated by agencies with 100 or more officers in 2018; while 780 cases (CI: 686-873) were investigated by agencies with 50-99 officers; and 1,067 cases (CI: 986-1,148) were investigated by agencies with 1-49 officers. State police in our sample contributed an estimated 181 cases (CI: 49-313) and college/university police contributed 479 cases (CI: 415-543). The mean cases reported per agency in each of these frames are provided in Table 3.

---

[3] The law enforcement agencies reporting data to the FBI's UCR system and the database of agencies used to draw the sample for the NHCIS are similar but not identical. For the NHCIS, we sampled from U.S. state police, municipal police, sheriff's offices, and university/college police agencies; however, we did not include FBI offices or other agencies included in data reported in UCR summaries (e.g., airport police agencies, transportation bureaus).
[4] CI=confidence interval

Table 3. Estimated 2018 hate crime investigations

Frames	Mean # of cases per agency (wtd.) (SE)	Min.	Max.	% agencies reporting **any** 2018 hate crime cases (wtd.)
Agencies with 100+ officers	3.66 (.39)	0	125	45%
State police agencies	4.89 (1.82)	0	59	49%
Agencies with 50-99 officers	0.67 (.04)	0	14	27%
Agencies with 1-49 officers	0.85 (.003)	0	6	5%
College/university agencies	0.25 (.02)	0	10	13%

The number of hate crime investigations reported by even very large agencies on average is relatively small (mean=3.66), with 55% of very large agencies reporting zero hate crimes from 2018. The discrepancies in cases reported by agencies of similar sizes suggests significant influence from state and agency policy and culture on the numbers of hate or bias incidents reported by law enforcement agencies.

Agency Hate Crime Policies and Practices

From the sample of 2,488 responding agencies, 1,070 agencies (43%) responded to questions in the survey about agency policies and procedures for investigating hate and bias incidents. A summary of responses to key policy responses to policy questions are provided below in Table 4.

Table 4. Mean number of reported hate crime cases by agency policies (N=1,070)

Hate crime policy/procedure	% (n)	Mean reported hate crime cases by agency (weighted) (SE)	b (SE)[a]
Identified officer or unit for investigating hate crimes			
Yes	19% (188)	1.55 (.30)	0.86 (.25)**
No	81% (823)	0.29 (.03)	
Additional review process in place when patrol officers note possible bias motivation			
Yes	57% (587)	0.67 (.08)	0.29 (.07)***
No	43% (447)	0.22 (.03)	
Agency-level written policy guidelines for investigating hate crimes			
Yes	52% (535)	0.80 (.09)	0.50 (.08)***
No	48% (492)	0.16 (.02)	
Officers have received training specific to hate crime investigations in last 2 years			
Yes	50% (515)	0.53 (.07)	.09 (.09)
No	50% (512)	0.37 (.06)	

Hate crime policy/procedure	% (n)	Mean reported hate crime cases by agency (weighted) (SE)	b (SE)[a]
Agency has conducted outreach to local advocacy groups on hate crimes			
Yes	29% (293)	1.78 (.24)	1.15 (.18)***
No	71% (724)	0.15 (.01)	

[a]Linear regression models examined relationship between policy and number of reported hate crime cases, controlling for agency sampling frame
**p≤.01; ***p≤.001

Approximately 57% of agencies in the sample reported that they had an additional process in place to review notes of possible hate or bias motivation by patrol officers. Fifty-two percent of agencies reported having written policy guidelines for investigating hate crimes. Half of the agencies reported that their officers had received training specific to hate crime investigations in the previous 2 years. Smaller percentages of agencies report having a dedicated officer or unit for investigating hate crimes (19%) or conducting outreach to local advocacy groups on hate crimes (29%).

Respondents answered questions about agency policy and procedures in reference to the time they were completing the survey, so it is possible that changes in policies had occurred since the study period of 2018 hate crime investigations. Even with this caveat, rates of reported hate crime cases varied significantly across most of the policies and procedures listed in Table 4.

Controlling for agency sampling frame, reported hate crimes were higher for: **agencies that had a dedicated hate crimes officer or unit, additional review procedures in place for hate crimes, written policy guidelines for hate crimes, and had conducted outreach efforts to communities.** No significant differences in reported rates were found between agencies who had or had not provided officers with training on hate crime investigations in the previous 2 years.

Hate Crime Cases Investigated by Police

Detailed information was provided by participating agencies on 1,230 hate crimes investigated in 2018. Weighted distributions of characteristics of hate crime cases investigated by law enforcement across the U.S. are provided in the tables below.

Type of Hate and Bias Motivation

The most common category of bias or hate incident reported by police targeted victims because of race or ethnicity crimes (66%) (see Table 5). Crimes targeting religion or sexual orientation were also relatively common (21% and 15% respectively). Smaller proportions of incidents investigated by law enforcement were recorded as targeting gender identity (2%), disability (2%), or gender (1%). Looking more closely at subgroups within these categories, in cases targeting race or ethnicity, anti-Black (62%) and anti-Latino incidents (14%) were most

common. For religious-based hate crimes, the majority of cases were anti-Jewish/anti-Semitic (68%), with a small but notable proportion involving anti-Islamic or Muslim bias content (14%). Finally, within crimes targeting sexual orientation, the most common category of cases involved anti-gay bias (78%).

Table 5. Bias Motivation in Hate Crime Investigations (N=1,230)

Bias Type	Weighted % (unweighted n)
Race/Ethnicity	**65.58% (799)**
Anti-Black or African-American	61.65% (483)
Anti-Hispanic or Latino	13.81% (118)
Anti-White	7.72% (63)
Anti-multiple racial or ethnic groups	6.67% (41)
Anti-Arab or Middle-Eastern	4.94% (38)
Anti-Asian	3.32% (37)
Anti-American Indian or Alaska Native	1.19% (6)
Other	4.56% (42)
Unknown or missing	1.76% (23)
Religion	**20.93% (236)**
Anti-Jewish/Anti-Semitic	68.40% (145)
Anti-Islamic or Muslim	14.75% (42)
Anti-Christian, general	6.95% (17)
Anti-Catholic	2.96% (7)
Anti-Protestant	2.03% (6)
Anti-multiple religions or groups	0.95% (8)
Other	2.28% (8)
Unknown or missing	4.41% (13)
Sexual-orientation	**15.15% (205)**
Anti-gay	78.05% (154)
Anti-lesbian	10.90% (24)
Anti-non-heterosexual general	9.77% (26)
Other	5.36% (5)
Unknown or missing	4.59% (8)
Gender-identity	**2.09% (36)**
Anti-transgender	76.92% (26)
Other	11.45% (4)
Unknown or missing	12.16% (6)
Disability	**2.19% (22)**
Anti-cognitive or intellectual disability	66.92% (11)
Anti-physical disability	34.99% (7)
Unknown or missing	5.62% (4)
Gender	**1.43% (17)**
Anti-female	88.53% (13)

Bias Type	Weighted % (unweighted n)
Unknown or missing	11.47% (4)
Other	**2.86% (36)**
Unknown or missing	**4.49% (64)**

Note: Multiple categories can apply per case, therefore column n's do not sum to 100%

Across all hate crime bias types, anti-Black (41% of cases), anti-Jewish (14% of all cases), anti-gay (12% of all cases), and anti-Latino (9% of all cases) crimes made up a total of over 75% of all law enforcement hate crime investigations.

Hate Crime Suspects

Thirty-seven percent of cases (n=446) had no identified suspects. These included cases, for example, where there were no identified victims, witnesses (e.g., graffiti), or camera footage to provide information about offenders. In 63% of cases (n=783), there was some information available about the suspects, although this included cases in which the suspects were apprehended as well as others in which no suspects were fully identified, but witnesses or camera footage provided some minimal information on suspect characteristics. The results below provide information on the 783 cases with information available about suspects.

Eighty percent of the 783 cases with identified suspects (n=615) had just one suspect. The remaining cases involved multiple suspects. Across the cases with identified suspects, 14% involved juveniles (n=107).

The detailed remaining suspect information presented below refer to primary suspects in each case. Primary suspects were either the sole suspect, or in cases with multiple suspects, the oldest or the one who committed the most serious offense.

Primary suspects in 2018 hate crime investigations were primarily male (86%) and White (74%), with a fairly equal distribution across age categories (see Table 6). A minority of suspects were documented as: 1) having been investigated previously for prior criminal offenses (20%); 2) having prior histories of arrest (17%); 3) using drugs and alcohol at the time of the incident (15%); and 4) acting aggressively towards police during the investigation (12%).

Table 6. Characteristics of Primary Suspects in Hate Crime Investigations (n=783)

Suspect Characteristics	Weighted % (unweighted n)
Gender	
Male	86.15% (599)
Female	13.76% (124)
Transgender/Other	0.08% (1)
Race/ethnicity	
Asian	1.54% (9)
Black/Afr. American	18% (125)
Latino/Hispanic	5.32% (47)

18

Suspect Characteristics	Weighted % (unweighted n)
White	73.69% (450)
Other race/ethnicity	1.45% (7)
Age	
12 or younger	1.94% (11)
13-17	11.21% (68)
18-25	17.58% (92)
26-30	12.20% (55)
31-40	17.51% (103)
41-50	16.30% (99)
51-60	15.39% (98)
Older than 60	7.83% (36)
Other characteristics	
Investigated for a prior criminal offense	
Yes	19.66% (175)
No or unknown	80.34% (608)
Prior history of arrest	
Yes	16.63% (146)
No or unknown	83.37% (637)
Using alcohol or drugs at time of the incident	
Yes	15.09% (113)
No or unknown	84.91% (670)
Aggressive towards police during investigation	
Yes	11.81% (94)
No or unknown	88.19% (689)

Note: Percentages for primary suspect gender, race/ethnicity, and age presented for cases in which information was known. Unknown/missing data: gender=59, 7.27% (wtd.); race/ethnicity=145, 18.41% (wtd.); age=221, 29.9% (wtd.)

Hate Crime Victims

Seventy-seven percent of cases (n=981) had identified victims, while 20% of cases (n=198) had no individuals identified as victims. Cases without identified victims often listed a building or business as the victim (e.g., in cases of graffiti), or society. The results below provide information on the 981 cases with information available about victims.

Seventy-seven percent of the 981 cases with identified victims (n=787) had just one victim. The remaining cases involved multiple victims. The detailed information in Table 7 is presented on primary victims: either the sole victim, or in cases with multiple victims, the youngest or the one who committed the most serious offense.

Victims were primarily male (64%) (see Table 7). Victim race and ethnicity were primarily Black/African American (43%), White (38%), or Hispanic/Latino (13%). Victims were primarily between 18 to 30 years old (30%) or 31 to 40 years old (24%). Ten percent of cases involved juvenile victims. The most typical cases involved victims who did not know the suspect (58%), but 19% of cases involved suspects who were the victims' neighbor, and in 18% of cases the victim and suspect were friends or acquaintances.

Table 7. Characteristics of Primary Victims in Hate Crime Investigations (n=981)

Victim Characteristics	Weighted % (unweighted n)
Gender	
Male	63.72% (558)
Female	34.17% (306)
Transgender/Other	2.11% (25)
Race/ethnicity	
Asian	2.78% (27)
Black/Afr. American	42.73% (339)
Latino/Hispanic	12.48% (121)
White	38.67% (287)
Other	3.34% (34)
Age	
17 or under	10.19% (80)
18-30	30.11% (229)
31-40	23.96% (180)
41-50	17.16% (144)
Older than 50	18.57% (148)
Relationship of victim to primary suspect[a]	
Family member/ex-partner	5.80% (26)
Friend/Acquaintance	17.80% (87)
Neighbor	18.89% (89)
Stranger	57.52% (272)

Note: Percentages for primary suspect gender, race/ethnicity, and age presented for cases in which information was known. Unknown or missing data: gender=92, 10.54% (wtd.); race/ethnicity=173, 18.69% (wtd.); age=200, 22.13% (wtd.)

[a]Percentages calculated from cases with an identified victim and identified suspect (n=708); unknown/missing information=234, 32.23% (wtd.)

Case Details

Information about report and investigation details were collected on all cases. Cases were reported to law enforcement through a combination of victim report (48%) or reports by other individuals (52%) (see Table 8). In a small percentage of cases (8%), more than one law enforcement agency was involved, including 2% of cases that involved the FBI.

The hate and bias incidents occurred at a variety of locations, including victim residences or neighborhoods (27%) and on the street or road (22%). Incidents occurred fairly equally during the day (48%) or at night (47%), with a small percentage of cases (5%) occurring over a period of time lasting longer than 24 hours. The nature of the bias victimization offense most often included intimidation or threats (41%), property offenses (37%), and simple assault (19%). In about 14% of cases, a weapon was used, and in about 13% of cases, a victim was injured. Police officers indicated that in about 6% of cases the suspect used the Internet or new technology as part of the crime.

Table 8. Hate Crime Investigation Details (N=1,230)

Investigation Characteristics	Weighted % (unweighted n)
Report source	
Victim	48.06% (504)
Other	51.94% (509)
Multi-agency investigation?	
Yes	8.05% (92)
No or unknown	91.95% (1,138)
FBI involvement	
Yes	2.18% (30)
No or unknown	97.82% (1,200)
Incident location[a]	
Residence/neighborhood	27.34% (373)
School/university campus	14.82% (140)
Street/parking area	22.43% (289)
Office or store/business	18.35% (257)
Online	3.73% (59)
Incident time	
Day (8am-7:59pm)	47.83% (441)
Night (8pm-7:59am)	46.97% (490)
Incident longer than 24 hrs.	5.20% (55)
Offense type[a]	
Simple assault	19.50% (262)
Aggravated assault	11.04% (167)
Intimidation/threat	40.96% (514)
Property offenses	33.66% (419)
Peace violation	8.29% (86)
Weapon use	
Yes	14.23% (216)
No or unknown	85.77% (1014)
Injury	
Yes	12.54% (201)
No or unknown	87.46% (1,029)
Internet used by suspects in crime	
Yes	5.66% (66)
No or unknown	94.34% (1,164)
Referrals offered to victims[b]	
Yes	19.32% (196)
No or unknown	80.68% (785)

Note: Percentages for report source, incident time and secondary review are presented for cases in which information was known. Unknown or missing data: report source=217, 17.09% (wtd.); incident time=144, 10.46% (wtd.); secondary review=514, 42.06 (wtd.).
[a]Top five most prevalent categories displayed for incident location and offense type
[b]Percentages calculated from total cases with identified victim (n=981)

Indicators of Bias Motivation

Information was collected on the presence of a range of possible indicators of hate or bias motivation in order to understand the relatively frequency of such indicators. In over half of the cases, verbal comments (e.g., slurs) were noted as one of the indicators of possible bias motivation (see Table 9). Written comments (25%), hate-related drawings or graffiti (24%), and the victims' belief they had been targeted because of hate or bias (29%) were also commonly documented as indicators. In another 12% of cases, the victim was a minority in the area in which they lived and in 10% of cases witnesses believed the incident was bias motivated.

Table 9. Documented Indicators of Bias Motivation (N=1,230)

Indicators	Weighted % (unweighted n)
Hate-related verbal comments	51.83% (656)
Hate-related written comments	24.75% (299)
Hate-related gestures	3.12% (35)
Hate-related drawings/graffiti	23.39% (284)
Objects representing hate	3.33% (35)
Victim belief targeted because of hate/bias[a]	28.96% (301)
Victim minority in area[a]	12.29% (117)
Victim participating in group related activity[a]	1.61% (16)
Victim belong to advocacy organization[a]	0.32% (6)
Suspect known to be member of hate group[b]	1.09% (9)
Witnesses believed incident was bias motivated	10.37% (126)
Other similar incidents in area	4.82% (53)

[a]Percentages calculated from total cases with identified victim (n=981)
[b]Percentages calculated from total cases with identified suspects (n=783)

Hate Crime Investigation Case Outcomes

Finally, the case-level survey collected information on case outcomes. Considering all 1,230 cases, outcomes were broken down into five possible categories (see Table 10). In 37% of cases, there was no information at all about a possible suspect; in 35% of cases, there was at least some information about the suspect, but there was no arrest; in 17% of cases a suspect was arrested, but no charges were filed; in 6% of cases charges were filed against the suspect, but they did not include hate crime charges or penalties; and in 4% of cases, the charges filed against the suspects included hate crime charges or penalty enhancements.

Table 10. Hate Crime Investigation Outcomes (N=1,230)

Investigation Outcomes	All incidents % (n)
No suspect identified	37.47% (449)
Information on suspect, but no arrest	35.04% (409)

Investigation Outcomes	All incidents % (n)
Suspect arrested, but not charged	17.16% (212)
Suspect charged, but no HC charge/penalty	6.02% (97)
Suspect charged with HC charge/penalty	4.31% (63)

IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY FINDINGS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

The National Hate Crime Investigation Study (NHCIS) is the first study to collect detailed data on hate crime investigations from a nationally representative sample of law enforcement agencies in the U.S. The findings shed light on some of the strengths of the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. The data from the NHCIS also highlight several issues that are currently limiting the ability of the UCR to inform the public about the nature of hate crimes that come to police attention. Finally, the study provides detailed data on the characteristics of a nationally representative sample of hate crimes cases investigated by U.S. law enforcement in 2018, including information on case characteristics, hate and bias indicators, suspects, victims, investigation procedures, and case outcomes.

Implications for hate crime incident reporting and data collection

- Some advocacy organizations have criticized the voluntary nature of data submission into the UCR system (e.g., Anti-Defamation League (ADL), 2021). In 2017, for example, only 16,149 out of over 18,000 agencies submitted data to the UCR (around 90%). Improving agency participation rates is an important and worthwhile goal, particularly for the value and representativeness of the UCR in the future. However, the national estimates generated by our study for 2018 are not far off from the total counts provided by the FBI for that year (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2018). **According to our estimates, law enforcement agencies recorded an estimated 6,486 hate crime investigations in 2018 with a 95% confidence interval of between 5,623 and 7,348 cases. In 2018, the FBI reported a total of 7,120 hate crime incidents.** Although approximately 2,000 agencies do not contribute data to the UCR hate crime statistics each year, these are mostly small agencies, or agencies in states without or with very recent hate crime laws that would likely have reported no cases, had they submitted. It is our conclusion that, given current agency practices, their inclusion would not have substantially contributed to the overall count.

- A much more critical problem is that the majority of agencies across the country are reporting zero cases, even in large districts. **Only 23% of agencies participating in our study reported any 2018 hate crime investigations, and across the 792 very large agencies in our sample (i.e., agencies with 100 or more officers), only 45% reported a**

hate crime investigation. On the other hand, there were several large agencies that reported 50 or more hate crime investigations for that year. A qualitative review of case summaries from the agencies reporting larger numbers of hate crimes suggests there was better documentation of a wide range of crimes with hate or bias indicators, such as graffiti with hate language or symbols. It is clear that differences in state laws, agency policies and procedures, and agency and community culture substantially affect how law enforcement agencies identify, document, and investigate crimes with hate and bias indicators.

- To understand the impact of agency policy and procedures on reporting, the NHCIS examined a range of different agency policies that have been suggested by experts as likely to improve the quantity and quality of hate crime investigation identification and reporting. Specifically, we surveyed agencies about whether they had the following polices or procedures in place: 1) a dedicated officer or unit for investigating hate crimes; 2) review procedures for cases with possible hate or bias motivation; 3) written policy guidelines for investigating hate crimes; 4) officer training on hate crimes provided in the previous two years; or 5) outreach to local advocacy groups on hate crimes. Many of these policies were highlighted in the recent COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act (Public Law 117-13). **Our study identified that almost all of these procedures were significantly related to an increased number of reported hate crime investigations, even controlling for agency type and size.** The only procedure not predictive of higher rates of hate crime reporting was training. It is possible that the training that agencies reported providing for officers was limited or generic, and not focused specifically on improving identification and reporting of these crimes. Additional research will be needed to understand what kinds of training, accompanied by which agency policy changes, result most expeditiously in improved investigation and reporting outcomes.

Implications for improving our understanding of hate crime incidents

- The data provided by our case level surveys echoes findings by both the UCR and NCVS data collection on hate crimes. Consistently and overwhelmingly, the most common type of hate crime investigated by police involved anti-Black crimes. **Across all hate crimes, anti-Black (41% of cases), anti-Jewish (14% of all cases), anti-gay (12% of all cases), and anti-Latino (9% of all cases) crimes made up over 75% of all law enforcement hate crime investigations.** Suspects were most typically White, adult males. In a little over half of the incidents, the victim did not know the suspect, but in almost, victims knew the suspect in some way (e.g., as an acquaintance, neighbor, co-worker, classmate or family member).

- In a minority of cases, the hate crimes involved weapon use (14%), or cause injury to victims (13%). **Almost half of the investigated hate crimes involved intimidation, threats, or peace violations and over 30% involved property crimes. Many of the property crime and peace violations did not have any identified suspects, and often did not identify specific victims. Instead, these "indeterminate-victim hate crimes" listed the building, the state or society as the victim.** It is important that policy-makers

and law enforcement agencies understand more about the impact that cases of property destruction and hate-based graffiti have on communities. These cases can have significant negative impact on community members who witness the crimes, creating fear and distress in targeted groups. **More information is needed about the impact of indeterminate-victim hate crimes, and law enforcement agencies should be encouraged to improve documentation, investigation, and community response in these cases.**

- Although the majority of suspects and victims in bias or hate crime investigations are adults, a sizeable minority of cases involved juvenile suspects (14% of cases) or juvenile victims (10% of cases) under 18 years old. **In cases involving police, at least one out of every ten cases involves a juvenile as a suspect or a victim.** Hate crimes involving juvenile suspects are import to understand to inform prevention initiatives. Our analyses indicated that a majority of cases involving juvenile suspects occurred at schools.

- **Only 4% of hate crime investigations lead to a suspect being charged with hate crimes.** In over a third of cases, no suspect is identified by police, and in another third, there is no arrest. Data from the current study suggest that even in cases where hate or bias motivation is documented and a suspect is apprehended, an extensive amount of information about the suspect remains unknown. Training programs might be improved by providing agencies with investigation protocols or checklists to use when hate or bias indicators are present in a case. Additional information about the suspect (e.g., social media posts indicating racist ideology) or the community (data about similar crimes or incidents occurring in the neighborhood), could provide evidence for a hate or bias-motivated crime that otherwise be missed.

Overall, the NHCIS documents the need for improved procedures for law enforcement agencies regarding identification, investigation, and reporting hate crimes. Data collected annually from agencies will only be useful if there is some kind of consistency across jurisdictions in how crimes with hate and bias indicators are documented. The findings offer preliminary support for a number of recommended procedures such as secondary review procedures for cases with possible hate or bias motivation. Law enforcement training may make a difference but more information and research is needed on the optimal type and focus of training. Given the problem of under-reporting hate crimes and the limits of police and justice system actions on hate and bias incidents, it is also important that community-based solutions to hate victimization be identified and supported.

Forthcoming NHCIS papers and reports will examine case-level and outcome differences across types of hate crimes in greater detail, and focus attention on better understanding specific categories of hate crimes, such as youth-suspect crimes and indeterminate-victim hate crimes.

REFERENCES

Anti-Defamation League (ADL). (2021). ADL Deeply Alarmed by 2020 FBI Hate Crimes Data; Reiterates Calls for Increased Reportnig. Retrieved from https://www.adl.org/news/press-releases/adl-deeply-alarmed-by-2020-fbi-hate-crimes-data-reiterates-calls-for-increased.

Cronin, S. W., McDevitt, J., Farrell, A., & Nolan, J. J. (2007). Bias-crime reporting: Organizational responses to ambiguity, uncertainty, and infrequency in eight police departments. *American Behavioral Scientist, 51*(2), 213-231.

Dillman, D. A. (2011). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method--2007 Update with new Internet, visual, and mixed-mode guide*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2018). 2018 Hate Crime Statistics. Retrieved from https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2018.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2020). FBI Releases 2020 Hate Crime Statistics. Retrieved from https://www.fbi.gov/news/pressrel/press-releases/fbi-releases-updated-2020-hate-crime-statistics.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2021). Overview of Hate Crime. Retrieved from https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/overview-hate-crime.

Finkelhor, D. (1995). The victimization of children: A developmental perspective. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 65*, 177-193.

Finkelhor, D. (2008). *Childhood victimization: Violence, crime, and abuse in the lives of young people*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Shattuck, A., & Hamby, S. (2013). Violence, crime and abuse exposure in a national sample of children and youth: An update. *Pediatrics, 167*(7), 614-621.

Garland, J. (2012). Difficulties in defining hate crime victimization. *International review of victimology, 18*(1), 25-37.

Haas, S. M., Nolan, J. J., Turley, E., & Stump, J. (2011). *Assessing the Validity of Hate Crime Reporting: An Analysis of NIBRS Data.* Charleston, West Virginia: West Virginia Division of Justice and Community Services, Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center. Retrieved from https://djcs.wv.gov/ORSP/SAC/Documents/ORSP_WV_Hate_Crime_Report.pdf.

Jenness, V., & Grattet, R. (2005). The law-in-between: The effects of organizational perviousness on the policing of hate crime. *Social Problems, 52*(3), 337-359.

Kena, G., & Thompson, A. (2021). *Hate crime victimization. 2005-2019. NCJ Report, 300954.* Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from https://bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/hcv0519_sum_3.pdf.

Lantz, B., & Kim, J. (2019). Hate crimes hurt more, but so do co-offenders: Separating the influence of co-offending and bias on hate-motivated physical injury. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 46*(3), 437-456.

Masucci, M., & Langton, L. (2017). *Hate Crime Victimization, 2004-2015.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retreived from: https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/hcv0415.pdf.

McDevitt, J., Balboni, J., Garcia, L., & Gu, J. (2001). Consequences for Victims A Comparison of Bias-and Non-Bias-Motivated Assaults. *American Behavioral Scientist, 45*(4), 697-713.

McDevitt, J., Cronin, S., Balboni, J., Farrell, A., Nolan, J., & Weiss, J. (2005). *Research in Brief: Bridging the information disconnect in bias crime reporting*: Boston, MA: Northeastern University, Institute on Race and Justice.

McDevitt, J., Levin, J., & Bennett, S. (2002). Hate crime offenders: An expanded typology. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(2), 303-317.

Messner, S. F., McHugh, S., & Felson, R. B. (2004). Distinctive characteristics of assaults motivated by bias. *Criminology, 42*(3), 585-618.

Nolan, J. J., Akiyama, Y., & Berhanu, S. (2002). The Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 Developing a Method for Measuring the Occurrence of Hate Violence. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46*(1), 136-153.

Nolan, J. J., Mencken, F. C., & McDevitt, J. (2003). NIBRS Hate Crimes 1995-2000: Juvenile Victims and Offenders. Retrieved from http://www.as.wvu.edu/~jnolan/nibrshatecrime.html.

Perry, B. (2014). Exploring the community impacts of hate crime. In *The Routledge international handbook on hate crime* (pp. 47-58), NY: Routledge.

Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2012). 'We are all vulnerable' The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. *International review of victimology, 18*(1), 57-71.

Pezzella, F. S., & Fetzer, M. D. (2021). *The Measurement of Hate Crimes in America*. New York, NY: Springer.

Pezzella, F. S., Fetzer, M. D., & Keller, T. (2019). The dark figure of hate crime underreporting. *American Behavioral Scientist*, doi: 10.1177/0002764218823844.

Phillips, N. D. (2009). The prosecution of hate crimes: The limitations of the hate crime typology. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(5), 883-905.

Public Safety Information Bureau. (2019). National Directory of Law Enforcement Administrators. http://www.safetysource.com/directories/index.cfm?fuseaction=displayReference&ReferenceID=1.

Sedlak, A. J., Finkelhor, D., Hammer, H., & Schultz, D. J. (2002). *National estimates of missing children: An overview (Juvenile Justice Bulletin No. NCJ196466)*. Washington DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Shively, M. (2005). *Study of literature and legislation on hate crime in America*. Final report submitted to the National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC (NCJ 210300). Retrieved from https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/210300.pdf.

Shively, M., & Mulford, C. F. (2007). Hate crime in America: The debate continues. *National Institute of Justice Journal, 257*(6).

Shively, M., Subramanian, R., Drucker, O., Edgerton, J., McDevitt, J., Farrell, A., & Iwama, J. (2014). *Understanding Trends in Hate Crimes Against immigrants and Hispanic-Americans: Final Report*. Retrieved from: https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/244755.pdf.

Tessler, R. A., Langton, L., Rivara, F. P., Vavilala, M. S., & Rowhani-Rahbar, A. (2021). Differences by victim race and ethnicity in race-and ethnicity-motivated violent bias crimes: A national study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(13-14), 6297-6318.

Turner, H. A., Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Hamby, S., & Mitchell, K. (2015). Beyond bullying: Aggravating elements of peer victimization episodes. *School Psychology Quarterly, 30*(3), 366.