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ABSTRACT

A literature review on recent hate crime issues was conducted. This review included the legal definition of a hate crime, judicial cases, national and local responses to the issue, and approaches to prevent such incidents.

An analysis of hate crime knowledge was conducted among a sample group of students at Youngstown State University (YSU). A questionnaire was distributed to 1,000 students enrolled in introductory level classes at YSU. The questionnaire was designed to collect data on the basic demographics of the sample and their experiences with hate crimes in reference to victimization, commission, and witnessing of hate crimes. The instrument questioned the students on their knowledge of what a hate crime is and the consequences of such crimes. The study focused on the five major motivations behind hate crimes: gender, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and physical disability. These five characteristics are contained in the legal definition of a hate crime. Data was analyzed and tested for statistical significance by race and gender.

It appears that hate crimes and the motivations for such acts exist among the participants of the study. The sample group provided their perceptions of discrimination, as well as experiences with hate crimes, on and off the campus of YSU. Approximately 66 percent of the sample perceived discrimination, of some sort, as a problem on campus. Over half of the sample (54.6%) indicated they were victims to a hate crime, while 30.4 percent indicated they had committed a hate crime. Based on the findings of this study, recommendations for further research and education were made to help prevent discrimination and hate crimes from occurring.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In a world where diversity rests at the core of a population, it is inevitable that tension will result among people of different backgrounds. It is this tension, when released through mental and physical harm that can result in the destruction of a society. America, the land of freedom and equality, is one of the leading breeding grounds for hatred between people of different races, ethnicity, religion, and sex (Gilmour, 1995). Bias motivated incidents must be viewed as not only the criminal acts they are but also the destructive force behind a quickly deteriorating nation.

Bias motivated crimes cannot be ignored with hopes that the problem will cure itself. Prejudicial stereotypes and hatred are two characteristics that have been ingrained within cultures across the nation. Without education and tolerance, people can never expect the problem to disappear. The only result of ignorance is that the problem will grow more severe. The crimes will grow more hideous, while the number of victims will increase.

Problem Statement

The issues of hatred and discrimination are and probably will continue to be prominent issues within society. Wishful thinking can provide a society where people of diverse backgrounds unite to form one community. However, this is not a realistic picture. People cannot be expected to completely eliminate hatred and discrimination. An attempt to minimize these characteristics is essential. Politicians, educators, legislatures, community leaders, and the media, can work together to educate the general
public on tolerating and respecting diversity. People do not have to appreciate and accept people of all backgrounds. They must, however, be prevented from committing hate crimes and bias motivated incidents. People, regardless of their race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or disability, have the right to live and feel safe. Prevention of crimes resulting from this hatred can and must be controlled.

Hate crimes have detrimental affects on all those involved; the offender, the victim, the victim’s associated group, and the community at large. It is critical that people understand that a nation cannot be built with a foundation based on intolerance and inequality. A community, or better yet, a nation, must be built through unity and respect. For this reason it is essential that research be conducted addressing all issues involved with bias motivated incidents. Research must address characteristics of offenders as well as victims; the beliefs and values motivating the crimes; the affects such crimes have on the individual and the community; and ways to educate individuals and prevent the incidents from occurring. Prevention, through education and experience with different groups needs to be incorporated into all aspects of life. As the old concept goes, familiarity breeds similarity, which in turn can breed respect. This can ultimately result in less discrimination and fewer bias motivated incidents.

The task at hand is grand. For this reason, all sectors of the community must combine forces to come out victorious in the battle against hatred.

This chapter provided a brief introduction of hate crime and its prevalence in communities. The following chapter provides a framework of recent literature on the issue of hate crime and bias motivated incidents. Included in chapter two is the legal
definition of a hate crime, legal cases pertaining to this issue, and suggestions for preventing such crimes on a local and federal level.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

* In Harper Woods, Michigan, a black couple was threatened by a white man who said he would kill and dismember them if they moved into his neighborhood (Aronson & Height, 1997).

* A 19 year old Vietnamese American pre-med student in Coral Springs, Florida, was beaten to death in August 1992, by a mob of white youth who called him “chink” and “Vietcong” (Aronson & Height, 1997).

* Melissa McLauchlin, a young white woman was raped and murdered by five black men who wanted to “get a white girl” in revenge for “four hundred years of oppression” (“Hidden Hate Crime,” 1996, 18).

In a world where diversity rests at the core of a population, it is inevitable that tension will result among people of different backgrounds. It is this tension, when released through mental and physical harm, that can result in the destruction of a society. America, the land of freedom and equality, is one of the leading breeding grounds for hatred between people of different races, ethnicity, religion, and gender (Gilmour, 1995). Incidents such as the three mentioned above are everyday realities for all people living in the nation today. Bias motivated incidents must be viewed as not only the criminal acts they are, but also the destructive force behind what could be, a
quickly deteriorating nation.

According to the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 (HCSA, codified as 28 U.S.C. 534) a hate crime constitutes any “crime that manifests evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity, including where appropriate the crimes of homicide, non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape; aggravated assault; simple assault; intimidation; arson; destruction, damage, or vandalism of property” (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997, p.2).

The Hate Crime Enhancement Act of 1994 added women and persons with disabilities to the list. In this statute, hate crimes are defined as crimes where “the defendant intentionally selects a victim, or in the case of property crime, the property that is the object of the crime, because of the actual perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation of any person” (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997, p.2).

When the Hate Crime Statistics Act was introduced to Congress in April 1990, the majority favored the new legislation by a Senate vote of 92 to 4. There was no hesitation on the part of President George Bush to sign the bill into law (Seligman, 1997). Many experts viewed this attempt to combat hate crimes as a fast, cost-effective way for politicians to establish an image where racism and bigotry would not be tolerated (Seligman, 1997). Regardless of whether this was the latent function behind such an enactment; it cannot be ignored that this law brought about significant changes within political and social spheres.

The HCSA (1990) requires the United States Attorney General to collect and publish an annual report about crimes that “manifest evidence of prejudice based upon
race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity” (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997, p.IX). The data was to be collected from local and state agencies on a voluntary basis. General guidelines were established for the collection of this data by the Attorney General. The legislation also stipulated that there be an established set of criteria present that would indicate a bias motivated crime occurred. It is stipulated in the Act that such data must only be used for research and should not contain any information that reveals the identity of the victim.

In its first year, 1991, the report included data generated from 2,771 agencies in 32 states. This accounted for less than one in every five law enforcement agencies in the nation. There has been an increase in the number of participating agencies in the subsequent years. In 1996, there was an increase of over 60 percent in the number agencies that reported data (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). Law enforcement agencies have begun to realize the importance of data collection.

The results of the initial report were alarming. In 1991, among the 32 reporting states, there were 4,755 reported hate crimes committed in the United States. This figure included 12 murders. In 1992, there were 7,466 incidents; in 1993 - 7,587; 1994 - 5,852; and in 1995 - 7,947 incidents. The figure for 1995 included 20 murders. In 1996, there were five states that did not participate in the collection of hate crime data (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). Some jurisdictions report not having the resources, expertise, or the motivation to collect such data. It is argued that some jurisdictions do not collect data because the political, economic, and cultural consequences far outweigh the need to submit negative information about the community (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). The data collected by the Attorney General can, and for the most part
is, highly subjective due to law enforcement agencies' decision on what data to collect and what to submit.

The Uniform Crime Report of 1995 was a compilation of incidents reported by over 9,500 law enforcement agencies in 45 states and the District of Columbia. This figure indicates that over 75 percent of the United States population was represented in the 1995 report (U.S. Bureau of Justice, 1995). Included in this report is a breakdown of what the motivation was for the majority of hate crime incidents. The results concluded that: 61 percent were motivated by racial bias; 16 percent were based on religious bias; 13 percent involved sexual orientation bias; and 10 percent were motivated by either ethnic or national origin. The total number of incidents involved 9,895 offenses; 10,469 victims; and, 8,433 known offenders (U.S. Bureau of Justice, 1995). Crimes against persons accounted for 72 percent of the reported incidents, with intimidation and simple assault being the most frequently reported offense (U.S. Bureau of Justice, 1995). Seventeen percent (17%) of the victims involved businesses, religious institutions, and other non-human objects.

These statistics reveal that bias motivated incidents are a real and growing concern in the United States. What this nation must be concerned with is the underlying message behind the incidents. The concern must center on significantly reducing the hatred that has lingered among people for centuries. According to Hansen (1996), children are not born hating others due to differences in backgrounds. Bigotry and prejudices are traits instilled in children through the socialization process. For years, Hansen has attempted to isolate the characteristics, which motivate offenders to commit hate crimes. One recurring theme leads back to intolerance towards people of different
backgrounds, having been taught to individuals during childhood (Hansen, 1996). For this reason, it is crucial that the socialization process within schools and home environments are evaluated to ensure tolerance and equality. The symptoms of intolerance must be treated before the actual crimes can be prevented.

Typical of any crime, hate crime incidents can occur at any time, place, and to any individual. There is no one cause that can be singled out to explain this phenomenon. However, certain mitigating factors have been identified, ranging from social to personal experiences. Hate crime incidents tend to increase during poor and uncertain economic conditions (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). The reason behind this is the belief that members of minority groups are occupying economic and political positions that members of the majority group should occupy. Another factor centers on the issue of deteriorating values of property and neighborhoods when minority residents move in (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). It is common practice for some individuals to keep neighborhoods free of minorities to maintain property values. Verbal and physical threats have been used to keep minorities from establishing residency in certain communities.

Another factor, which motivates offenders to commit hate crimes, is the belief in and importance placed on racial stereotypes (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). Stereotypical images are evident in every facet of life: within the home, schools, in the media, and within political arenas. Subtle messages that promote hostility between individuals occur constantly in everyday life. It is inevitable that those who are ignorant of the lives of others will believe the negative images portrayed. For example, within a three-day period following the Oklahoma bombing, at least 227 incidents of harassment
were reported against Arab-Americans and Muslims (Aronson & Height, 1997). Before responsibility for the bombing was established, the media played on societies’ image of the typical Arab terrorist. People within the United States, outraged at the incident, were prepared to punish the offenders. The fact that the offenders were still unknown had no impact on the perceptions of the society. The typical terrorist, in the public’s eyes, was a Muslim, Arab.

The media is an influential force in transmitting negative images and stereotypes. Some of the images presented are subtle, as is the case with the portrayal of the “welfare mother”. Through advertisements, both political and social, this phrase has become synonymous with the single, African-American woman supporting her numerous children through welfare. If this image is portrayed repeatedly, it is inevitable that this reflection becomes a reality to those with no first hand knowledge to the contrary. Another reoccurring theme presented in the media is the image of the young African-American as “a nigger”. The people viewing the movies may understand that the picture is just that – a movie. However, the viewers are absorbing this information and with repetition, an image becomes reality. The media is a major influence in everyday life. It is critical that advertisements, movies, and television shows be screened in an effort to stop spreading false and negative images. Organizations, which rate television shows and movies must discourage such stereotypical messages from appearing in the media, regardless of how subtle a message may be.

Personal experiences are also an influential factor in hate crime occurrences (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). It is all too often human nature to take specific incidents and generalize to an entire population or situation. This also holds true for
generalizing a bad incident with a member of some group, and holding the entire population of that group responsible for the individual’s actions. What people must realize is that the beliefs and values an individual holds is not necessarily governed by the particular group they are associated with.

Passing on the message of hatred occurs both intentionally and unintentionally. Many tactics are used which are pre-mediated and successful. Brainwashing children and vulnerable persons is one tactic used by many hate group organizations (Aronson & Height, 1997). Although organized hate groups account for a minority of hate crime victimization, they are responsible for some of the most violent incidents reported (Garofalo, 1997). These groups often coerce individuals to join by playing on personal experiences and vulnerabilities. Take for example the white male who is mugged by a group of black teenagers. At this point, the victim is more concerned with the actual incident then with the race of the offenders. The technique used by organized hate groups is to focus on the victim’s emotional insecurities by maximizing the race difference between victim and offender. The idea that all African-Americans are criminals is then instilled into the victim’s mind. As a result, the victim joins the group. Hatred towards the “black” offenders is encouraged. The hatred that started out towards the youth that committed the crime has now widened to include all blacks.

The Center for Democratic Renewal, a national hate crime research organization in Atlanta, conducted a yearlong investigation on the church burning epidemic which occurred in 1995 (Wirpsa, 1997). The organization concluded that there was a conspiracy to burn multiracial churches in the hopes of starting a race war. Center officials pointed at white male supremacists as being “the backbone of the
company…having a mission to teach the young their ideologies and methods” (Wirpsa, 1997, p.9).

**Characteristics of Hate Incidents**

When considering the individuals and circumstances involved, hate crime incidents are unique in comparison to traditional crimes. There has not been extensive research on this issue, however it is a growing area of inquiry, and there has been some general conclusions set forth on the issue. Some of the characteristics of bias motivated incidents include but are not limited to the following:

1. The majority of incidents are committed by groups of four or more people (Gilmour, 1998).

2. The greater the number of offenders, the more violent the crime (Gilmour, 1998).

3. The victim is usually a stranger to the offender (Garofalo, 1997).

4. The incidents are primarily crimes of youth; one-half of the offenses are committed by individuals younger than twenty (Gilmour, 1998).

5. Hate crimes are more hideous than traditional crimes, resulting in greater mental and physical harm. Hate crimes result in hospitalization four times more than other crimes (Gilmour, 1998).

6. There is a negative effect between economic conditions and the incidents of hate crimes – when one increases the other decreases (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997).
7. Bias motivated incidents are a reflection of "primal emotions aroused by the love of one's own group." Often times these crimes committed by persons who suffered emotionally as children (Gilmour, 1998).

8. Offenders, when involved in an attack as a group, often cannot believe they participated in the incident (Garofalo, 1997).

9. Hate crimes are less likely to be reported to the police (Garofalo, 1997).

10. Such offenses are more likely to be committed in public places instead of in private homes (Garofalo, 1997).

Reports concerning the characteristics of hate crime offenders have been limited. Results of the 1995 Federal Bureau of Investigations, Uniform Crime Report (1995) stated that of the 8,433 known offenders, 59 percent were white and 27 percent were black. As is true for the victims of hate crimes, the offenders tend to be predominately young males. Some studies indicated that offenders tend to be even younger than their victims (Garafolo, 1997). The majority of the perpetrators are youthful thrill seekers, rather than the organized, hard-core hate groups (Aronson & Height, 1997). A study conducted in 1993 at Northeastern University showed that 60 percent of offenders committed crimes for the thrills associated with the incident. The gaining of respect from friends or peers was another frequently cited motivating factor (Aronson & Height, 1997).

The acts committed by these youth cannot be classified as youthful rebellion. Those who carry out the incidents are usually acting out on feelings shared by family, friends, and communities at large (Gilmour, 1995). These thrill seekers, who act on spur of the moment impulses, constitute the largest group of offenders involved in bias
motivated offenses. This group also consists of the individuals who express and believe in ethnic and racial stereotypes (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). It has also been noted that alcohol and drug use are an influencing factor in the commission of crimes by these individuals.

The 1995 FBI report noted that the second largest category of perpetrators was the “reactive offender” (Aronson & Height, 1997). This individual believes that by committing the offense, they have answered some insult or attack committed by the victim, or the victim’s group. The incident is considered necessary retaliation for any incident, ranging from a perceived insult, interracial dating, or the integration of a community (Aronson & Height, 1997).

Contrary to public opinion, the smallest group of offenders is the hard-core fanatic (Aronson & Height, 1997). These individuals are members of the organized hate groups who represent the very essence of discrimination and bigotry. These groups have a major influence on spreading the ideologies of hatred. Many of the techniques used by these organizations include the Internet, distribution of literature, and broadcasting through public media services (Aronson & Height, 1997). Leaders of hate group organizations are responsible for spreading the message of hatred, while the “thrill seekers” more often commit and are punished for the incidents.

Another category, often associated with hate group organizations, are the individuals classified as “mission offenders” (Aronson & Height, 1997). These persons have a deep-rooted hatred for minorities and feel they are doing good by eliminating the world of evil. Although this group represents a small minority of offenders, the incidents
committed by mission offenders usually involve numerous victims. These incidents quickly gain national attention and strike fear in persons across the nation.

In reference to the characteristics of offenders, one study identified that on a per capita basis, in 1996, blacks were three times as likely to commit crimes driven by racial prejudice (Seligman, 1997). The information presented by Seligman (1997) contradicts data presented by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance (1997), which indicates the majority of hate crimes are committed against African-Americans. As is evident, there is confusion and contradiction among researchers.

To understand the extent of hate crimes, society must also understand that any individual can be a victim of bias motivated incidents. Regardless of one's race/ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability, everyone has the potential to be victimized. There are numerous reasons for the lack of data. Law enforcement agencies and political figures are cited for this, however, communities and the victims themselves, also contribute to the lack of data. In the U.S. Bureau Of Justice Assistance: A Policymaker's Guide to Hate Crimes (1997), several reasons were cited as to why victims may not report a hate crime. Those following are included:

1. Many victims fear reprisal from authorities. Victims may fear that law enforcement agencies will blame the victim for being in the wrong place at the wrong time. It is not unusual for victims to be blamed for provoking the incident.

2. For homosexual and bisexual victims, the fear of revealing sexual orientation becomes a major factor in reporting incidents to the authorities. "Coming out of the closet," can have detrimental consequences in all areas of life.
3. The fact that many hate crime victims belong to minority groups, language becomes a major concern in reporting crimes. Fears that an individual will not be able to effectively communicate the specifics of the crime, or will not be understood are valid concerns for the victim.

4. Many of the victims may not be legal residents of the country. The issue of deportation becomes the victims’ major concern.

5. Many individuals mistrust law enforcement officials and agencies. Victims often fear officials may hold the same beliefs and prejudices as the offenders.

6. There is a major concern that reporting the crime would stigmatize not only the individual victim, but also, the entire group the victim is associated with.

7. Some victims fear the humiliation that often accompanies victimization. However, for victims of hate crimes, the victim must also be concerned with the shame the family will encounter if the crime is reported. For example, in many cultures, a girl’s virginity is essential to marriage. If a girl is raped, and the incident is reported, the entire family would be scarred for generations to come.

The majority of hate crimes, as reported by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance (1997), are perpetrated against African-Americans. This research contradicts that which was conducted by Seligman, (1997), who reported the opposite. Regardless, it is obviously that such incidents are motivated by the race of the victim. When looking at the issue as a religious based crime, the overwhelming majority are committed against individuals and institutions of the Jewish faith (U.S Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). Of the religious motivated incidents reported in 1995, 82 percent were
committed against Jews (Aronson & Height, 1997). The incidents ranged from physical assaults to the painting of swastikas on homes. Although these two groups have been documented as the largest groups victimized through bias motivated crimes, other minorities have been significantly affected as well. Besides these two categories of motivation, race and religion, other individuals are victimized because of gender, sexual orientation, and disability.

One study conducted in Australia showed that people with developmental disabilities were more apt to be the victims of hate crimes (Equality Colorado, 1996). Motivated by contempt towards persons with disabilities, one convicted criminal commented, “This person’s life was so miserable, I couldn’t make it any worse anyway.” (Equality Colorado, 1996, p.2). Hatred is the primary factor behind bias motivated incidents; however, vulnerability opens up many avenues for the offender to commit the crime (Equality Colorado, 1996).

From its inception, societies have been struggling to deal with the hatred that has lingered among people. From the Roman’s prosecution of Christians; to the Nazis “final solution” for the Jews; to the genocide in Rwanda; hate crimes have haunted people of different backgrounds (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). It is time for individuals, communities, and legislatures to take responsibility for educating people and diminishing the hatred that stands behind such hideous acts.

**National and Local Responses**

Most states have combated the issue of hate crimes by enhancing the existing penalties for crimes that are hate motivated (Garfolo, 1997). There are two basic
approaches to penalty enhancement policies. The first avenue involves adding to the existing penalty when the crime was motivated by hate. Secondly, many states have opted to list hate motivated crimes as one class or grade higher in the penal code. Though such actions have brought the issue of bias motivated crimes to legislative levels, more action and energy is needed to actually pursue the battle against hatred.

Penalty enhancements are often viewed as "quick fixes" to a very in depth problem (Garofalo, 1997). Resources are required to enhance the detection, investigation, and prosecution of hate crimes. More importantly, resources must be used to end the hatred that stands behind such incidents. People must become aware of the fact that children are not born to hate – it is taught (Hansen, 1996). Children must learn to appreciate and respect difference before hatred can be diminished.

Numerous efforts on the part of the Federal Government, as well as state governments, have been established to combat hate crimes. The Federal Government's first attempt was the enactment of the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990 and its extension in 1996. The FBI has also conducted training programs for almost 3,700 employees in 1,200 state, local, and federal law enforcement agencies. Such training programs educate employees on preventing, prosecuting, and dealing with the consequences of hate crimes (Aronson & Height, 1997). With the help of the Justice Department's Community Relations Service, created by the 1964 Civil Rights Act, training sessions have been conducted across the nation. The Community Relations Service is the only federal agency whose primary purpose is to help communities cope with the disputes centered around hate motivated incidents (Aronson & Height, 1997).
In 1992, Congress addressed the issue of hate crimes committed by juveniles. Several new programs were approved by congress, under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Provisions within these new programs included the following: 1) each state’s juvenile delinquency plan must include a component designed to combat hate crimes; 2) the Justice Departments Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Programs has granted $100,000 to conduct a national assessment of youths who commit hate crimes, motives, victims, and the penalties granted; and, 3) OJJDP provided a $50,000 grant to develop a curriculum for preventing hate crimes by juveniles (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997).

Congress also passed the Violence Against Women Act in 1994. This legislation provides for 1.6 billion in funding over a six-year period for improvements in areas of law enforcement, prosecution, victim services, education, and research programs dealing with violence against women. This also allows women to sue in federal and state court for an act of gender-motivated violence, which raises the crime to the level of a felony. With the enactment of such a law, it has been made evident that violence against women, motivated by the sex of a victim, constitutes a hate crime (Aronson & Height, 1997).

Prosecuting hate crimes has also been supported on the state and local levels. The majority of states have passed some form of legislation concerning the issue. States have allowed for civil actions against perpetrators of hate crimes. Many states have enacted penalty enhancement policies as well. States have issued laws outlawing vandalism against religious institutions and the intimidation of individuals due to associations within a specific group. One very critical component established within numerous state
legislation is the provision requiring the compilation of hate crime data involving juveniles.

In reference to juveniles, the issue of parent liability is always a major concern. With hate crimes, there is no exception. Holding parents accountable for children’s actions is a major controversy. Supporters argue that children who commit hate crimes are usually acting out on beliefs held by family members or other peer groups (Gilmour, 1998). This provides another justification for the necessity of evaluating both, home and school environments.

It is essential that law enforcement agencies develop positive relationships with minority communities. This will not only benefit the community at large, but also the law enforcement agency itself. When the community respects and trusts the agency, the reporting of incidents can be expected to increase. The agency can expect to have higher levels of cooperation from the community, aiding in prevention, investigation, and the prosecution of crimes (Aronson & Height, 1997).

New York City has implemented a special bias unit in an attempt to establish positive relationships with minority communities (Garofalo, 1997). Officers in the units are trained to be sensitive to victims and communities. The officers are also better equipped to read and look for signs indicating that a bias motivated crime has occurred.

Community education programs have been implemented in communities to reduce prejudice and discourage hatred. In 1992, the Leadership Conference Education Fund (LCEF), conducted an informational campaign along with the Advertising Council, to promote interracial understanding. The underlying message behind this campaign was: “Life’s too short. Stop the hate!” (Aronson & Height, 1997, p 2). Developing programs
promoting cultural diversity, especially those targeted at youth are essential to any community attempting to rid itself of bias motivated incidents.

Experts have presented numerous policy options and suggestions to enhance awareness and decrease the number of hate crimes.

1. Insist on the creation of federal statutes requiring the permanent collection of hate crime data (Equality Colorado, 1996).

2. Support or sponsor legislation that requires law enforcement agencies to collect data (Equality Colorado, 1996).

3. Make hate crime training a required part of all law enforcement training (Herak, 1997).

4. Pass legislation that provides sufficient funding to continue and respond to hate crime incidents (Equality Colorado, 1996).

5. Support and sponsor legislation to provide funding for state and local hate crime response networks. Such networks would act as clearinghouses on rights and services (Herak, 1997).

6. Law enforcement agencies and private organizations must develop an agreed upon definition and reporting protocol for hate crimes (Equality Colorado, 1996).

7. Hate crime awareness and ethnic diversity curriculums should be provided for in elementary and secondary schools (Klanswatch, 1998).

8. Communities, legislatures and law enforcement agencies should encourage the immediate reporting of any crimes witnessed or experienced (Equality Colorado, 1996).
9. Encourage communities to stay away from hate group rallies. City officials should organize alternative events during times hate rallies are being conducted. Even peaceful protesters should be discouraged for this only brings more media attention to the hate group (Klanswatch, 1998).

10. Community anti-racism groups should be formed and supported (Klanswatch, 1998).

11. Communities should quickly respond to hate crimes with a show of unity (Klanswatch, 1998).

12. Victim assistance should be emphasized. These support systems should include not only the victim directly involved, but also the group the victim is associated with (Klanswatch, 1998).

13. Promote and support research in all areas involved in this issue, including the effects on the individual and the community (Equality Colorado, 1996).

The United States Supreme Court has also played an important part in influencing legislative and community attitudes concerning bias motivated crimes. Two major cases have been heard before the Supreme Court concerning the issue of hate crime prosecution; Wisconsin v. Mitchell, 113 S.Ct. 2194 (1993), and R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, Minnesota, 505 U.S. 377 (1992). Both cases have had a major impact on shaping legislative and community opinions about the issue of bias motivated crimes.

A Wisconsin State law was carefully written to punish the criminal intent and conduct associated with the crime. It was carefully stated to prevent the punishment of personal prejudicial opinions, as is illustrated in the following case (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997). The Mitchell case involved a group of black males who
severely attacked a young white boy, and left him in a coma for four days. The offenders committed the crime after witnessing the scene in “Mississippi Burning” where a black boy was beaten while praying. Todd Mitchell was the primary initiator of the incident.

Todd Mitchell was prosecuted and convicted of battery. This crime carries a sentence of two years imprisonment. However, because of the penalty enhancement statutes in Wisconsin, Mitchell received four years because the crime was racially motivated. This decision was appealed on grounds that the decision violated the first amendment by punishing offensive thought. The Wisconsin State court agreed with this argument and concluded that the law was unconstitutional because it penalized individual biased thought. Brought before the Supreme Court, this decision was rejected and the statute was upheld as being constitutional. Chief Justice William Rehnquist commented on the decision, “Although a sentencing judge may not take into account the defendants abstracts beliefs, the Constitution does not preclude the admission of evidence concerning one’s beliefs and associations at sentencing if they are related to the commission of the crime” (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997, p.29).

Evident from the decision reached by the Supreme Court in Mitchell, the enhanced punishment for bias motivated conduct is consistent with the United States Constitution. Numerous academic scholars and political groups have met this decision with controversy. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), a defender and protector of individual civil liberties, favors the concept of penalty enhancement. This union argues that because hate crimes threaten an “unprotected peaceable enjoyment of public places to members of the targeted group,” additional sanctions are constitutionally permissible (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997, p.32).
In opposition to this acceptance of penalty enhancement policies, many fear that since historically the Criminal Justice system has been biased in its dealings with minorities, such enhanced sanctions will be used against, rather than to protect minority groups. In defense of this argument, it is emphasized that the leading court case upholding the issue involves a black offender and a white victim (Garofalo, Stretesky, 1995, p. 144).

The second major case heard before the Supreme Court was R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, Minnesota (1992). In this case, R.A.V., who was a juvenile, was accused of burning a cross in the lawn of a black family. As a result, R.A.V. was charged under the St. Paul Bias Motivated Crime Ordinance. The trial court in this case dismissed the charges advising that the ordinance violated the First Amendment because it was “impermissibly broad and regulated the content of an offender’s speech.” (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997, p.29). In turn, the Minnesota Supreme Court reversed the decision stating that the regulation was tailored to serve the State’s interest in protecting the community against bias motivated threats to public safety and order. The United States Supreme Court disagreed with the reversal of the State Supreme Court and declared the ordinance unconstitutional since it restricted speech on the basis of its content.

As Supreme Court Justice Antonin B. Scalia wrote, “…because the ordinance restricted biases of a particular nature, it barred only those viewpoints that city council found distasteful. The majority held that a law prohibiting all fighting words communicated in a threatening manner would be constitutional. As a result, the
Minnesota ordinance went beyond permissible regulations and infringed upon the free speech rights of the defendant” (U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1997, p.30).

The argument that hate crime statutes violate the First Amendment has plagued the issue since its conception. Those who support this argument argue that personal prejudices are part of person’s freedom of speech and expression. The logic behind this concept centers on the idea that persons should not be punished for personal opinions and beliefs. Opponents of hate crime statutes also argue that all crimes are dehumanizing and are likely to generate unrest within the community, not just bias motivated crimes. What these opponents fail to recognize is that crimes committed against a person’s identity cause far greater social and psychological pain than do traditional crimes (Herek, 1997). Hate crimes enhance the racial tensions within a community, resulting in a fragmented society (Taylor, 1991). Because this harm is magnified, actions should be taken to maximize the penalties involved when an incident occurs.

Why Study Hate Crimes?

The study of hate crimes and the impacts these incidents have on individuals and communities is a topic that definitely needs researched. It is indicated that such crimes have greater psychological effects than traditional crimes. These effects differ in a sense from non-bias crimes in that the role of the victim is occupied by the individual; the minority group; the community; and the nation as a whole.

In a four-year study, conducted by Dr. Gregory Herek (1997), it was concluded that lesbian and gay survivors of hate crimes showed more signs of psychological distress, five years after the incident occurred then did homosexual victims of non-bias
crimes. Included in the category of psychological distress were depression, stress, and anger. Another study conducted by the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence showed that bias crime victims were two to three times more likely to suffer from symptoms of trauma than victims of non-bias crimes (Equality Colorado, 1996).

The study directed by Dr. Herek and colleagues, Dr. J. Roy Gillis and Dr. Jeanine Cogan, was conducted from 1993 – 1996, on 2,300 gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals from Sacramento, California and surrounding areas. The sample included 83 percent who were gay/lesbian and 17 percent who were bisexual. The median age of the respondents was 34 years old. The research included the completion of a survey questioning experiences with crime, health, and social activities. The majority of questions were established to measure psychological variables. One-fifth of the respondents also participated in lengthy interviews. The study was funded by the National Institute of Mental Health.

The results of the study documented that one-fifth of the women and more than one-fourth of the men had experienced a hate motivated incident due to sexual orientation. One of every eight women had been victimized in the previous five years where one in every six men had been (Herek, 1997). Crimes ranged from assaults, rapes, robberies, and theft to vandalism. The respondents also noted that other forms of harassment were experienced. More than one-half of the subjects had been targets of anti-gay verbal abuse within the prior year; one-fifth had been threatened with violence or chased; and, 16 percent reported employment discrimination (Herek, 1997).

In contrast to victims of non-bias crimes, the victims of hate crimes showed psychological problems five years after the victimization occurred. This contrasts
significantly from the two years victims of non-biased crimes experienced such psychological problems. It has been suggested that this heightened level of distress may result from the sense of personal danger and vulnerability associated with victimization (Herek, 1997). For homosexuals, this vulnerability stems from the individuals’ sexual orientation, a core factor in ones self-concept. This is one of the major reasons hate crime victims suffer more severe and prolonged levels of distress – the attack is penetrated against the personal identity of the victim.

Finn and McNeil (1988) reported that gay/lesbian victims were the least of all victims to report crimes to authorities (Garofalo, 1997). Herek and associates (1997) also reported on the number of homosexuals who report crimes. The study concluded that only one-third of the victims reported the incident to the police. This figure pales in comparison to the 57 percent of victims of random crimes who report the incidents. One reason for such a low report rate on behalf of homosexuals is the fear of “coming out of the closet.” Other issues center around the fear that the authorities, just as the majority of the general public, will not accept homosexuality. For this reason, the victims cannot expect positive responses from the individuals responsible for their protection and safety (Herek, 1997).

Studies such as the one conducted by Herek are critical to the issues centering on hate crimes. Although this study focused on the issues of gay/lesbian victims, the conclusions can be cautiously generalized to members of other groups. Just as the identity of a homosexual is effected, so too will that of an African-American or an individual of the Jewish faith. Hate crimes directly affect a person’s self-concept and feelings of self-worth. The psychological distress experienced by hate crime victims
tends to linger for years after the incident. The community affiliated with the victim would also undergo negative effects.

Bias motivated crimes cannot be ignored with hopes that the problem will cure itself. Prejudicial stereotypes and hatred are two characteristics that have been ingrained within cultures across the nation. Without education and tolerance, people can never expect the problem to disappear. The only result of ignorance is that the problem will grow more severe. The crimes will grow more hideous, while the number of victims will increase. The old philosophy of an eye for an eye can no longer be applied in today’s society. Jesse Jackson stated it best when he said “An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth leaves us all blind and disfigured” (Jackson, 1997, p.13).

Hate crimes have detrimental affects on all those involved; the offender, the victim, the victim’s associated group, and the community at large. It is critical that people understand that a nation cannot be built with a foundation based on intolerance and inequality. A community, or better yet, a nation, must be built through unity and respect. For this reason it is essential that research must be conducted addressing all issues involved with bias motivated incidents. Research must address characteristics of offenders as well as victims; the beliefs and values motivating the crimes; the affects such crimes have on the individual and the community; and ways to educate individuals and prevent the incidents from occurring. Prevention, through education and experience with different groups needs to be incorporated into all aspects of life. This can ultimately result in less discrimination and fewer bias motivated incidents. All sectors of the community must combine forces in order to come out victorious in the attempt to diminish hatred.
Hatred among people will be an issue for centuries to come. Whenever diversity exists within a population, it can be expected that intolerance for some aspect of a group will be generated. What society must be willing to enhance is the concept of respecting this diversity. Even if acceptance is never acquired, respect will diminish the motivation to commit bias motivated incidents. It is this respect many citizens lack today.

Before one can actually attempt to fight a battle, one must familiarize themselves with the enemy. For this reason, this study will focus on an issue that has and will continue to have a significant impact on the nation - hate crimes. Due to accessibility purposes, this research will be conducted utilizing the student body at Youngstown State University. This population represents a culturally diverse group. This characteristic is essential to any study researching the mentioned topic. A questionnaire, modeled after that which was designed by Gregory M. Herek, Ph.D. (1994 – 1997), will be distributed to the targeted population. The questionnaire will address demographics, past experiences, beliefs, and consequences of hate crime incidents and the targeted population.

Certain beliefs motivate offenders to commit hate crimes. It is critical to conduct research in the hopes of uncovering such beliefs. It is also important to concentrate on the consequences of the incidents – both, on the individual and communal levels.

The issue of bias motivated crimes, if not addressed, can lead to a larger segregation of our country. Although it is evident that federal and state governments, as well as communities have presented sincere attempts to diminish the incidents of hate crimes, it is clear that this nation has a long journey yet to travel. Hatred is instilled in the very fabric that holds this nation together. It is up to the nation, as a whole, to pull
apart the seams in order to rebuild a more understanding and tolerate world. Hatred, prejudicial stereotypes, and bigotry must be replaced with equality, tolerance, and respect if ever we can expect to live together in one nation...indivisibly...and with justice for all.

A literature review on hate crimes was presented in this chapter. The next chapter will focus on the methodology used in the study of hate crimes that was conducted on students at Youngstown State University.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This study consisted of questionnaires seeking information concerning students’ general demographics and past experiences with hate crime incidents. The targeted population included introductory level students within the disciplines at Youngstown State University (YSU). This population provided easy accessibility to a culturally diverse group. Diversity is essential to any research inquiring on the issues of hate motivated incidents.

Youngstown State University’s student body offers a population where majorities of people from different backgrounds are represented. According to the OBOR Undergraduate Admissions Report, in 1997, the YSU population consisted of 27.9 percent first time degree students from high school; 10.9 percent other first time students; 45.5 percent of returning students; and, 15.8 percent transfer ins (students from other institutions of higher learning). These statistics indicate that there are both traditional and non-traditional students enrolled at YSU.

The University Statistical Report showed that in 1997, 44.9 percent of the student body consisted of males while the remaining 55.1 percent were female. YSU also provides a diverse group when dealing in terms of minority and foreign groups. The University Statistical Report indicated that 7.6 percent of the 1997 enrollees were black (non-Hispanic); 0.2 percent were Indian; 0.6 percent were Asian; 1.2 percent were Hispanic; and 88.7 percent were white (non-Hispanic). As is evident, there is cultural, racial, and gender representation within the enrollment of Youngstown State University.
The questionnaires were distributed one week prior to the commencement of the 1998 Fall Quarter. These questionnaires were systematically distributed to each introductory class, which appeared first in the schedule of classes booklet for the Fall Quarter. The packets were sent to the faculty members to distribute the questionnaires to their students. Classes were chosen under each discipline, until a total of 1,000 questionnaires were distributed. The packets consisted of: 1) a letter of instruction to the faculty (see appendix A); 2) a copy of the Human Subjects Research Committee approval letter (see appendix C); 3) an informed consent to participants (see appendix B); and, 4) the questionnaire (see appendix D). The responses and all identities of the sample group were kept anonymous and confidential. There was no information collected, which would identify any individual participant.

The questionnaires were developed to determine the basic demographics of the sample group. These included such characteristics as gender, race, age, marital status, and sexual orientation. The student body was also asked to indicate any physical disabilities they posses. The students were asked to disclose basic, academic information. The respondents were asked to answer questions on their class level, their grade point average, and their major course of study at YSU.

The second section of the questionnaire was developed in order to understand what the sample group considered to be a hate crime. With this question, the participants were asked to indicate, in their own words, what the definition of a hate crime was. The vast majority of the respondents provided a definition of a hate crime. Please see appendix E for the responses to this question.
The majority of the questions were developed to gather information on the respondents' experiences with hate crimes. The sample group was given the opportunity to state what types of discrimination they felt were prevalent at Youngstown State University; no other locations were included. They were then asked to indicate whether they ever fell victim to, committed, or witnessed a hate crime. The questions were designed, so that the respondents were able to indicate where the crime occurred. In reference to whether or not the respondents had ever committed a hate crime, they were given the opportunity to indicate the motivation for doing so.

The final questions of the instrument focused on the consequences of hate crimes. The respondents were asked to disclose their beliefs on what punishment should be for those offenders who commit hate motivated incidents, as opposed to the traditional offenders. They were also asked to indicate who they felt suffered the most from such crimes. Once all the questionnaires were collected, the data was entered into the SPSS computer program and analyzed.

This study was conducted in order to obtain information on the targeted population's perceptions of what hate crimes are, its prevalence, and the perceived harm that occurs as a result of such incidents. All too often, the general public neglects to see the negative consequences such incidents present, not only to the victim, but to the entire community. It is past due that people are educated on the topic of hate crimes.

This chapter concentrated on the methodology of the study. In chapter four, the data collected from the questionnaires will be presented. Also included in chapter four, the results of the statistical tests that were conducted in reference to the differences in the responses of males and females, and whites and non-whites.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Sample Group Descriptives

In order to collect data on the experiences and knowledge of issues concerning hate crimes among students at Youngstown State University (YSU), 1,000 questionnaires were distributed. These questionnaires were distributed one week prior to the commencement of the 1998 Fall Quarter. These questionnaires were systematically distributed to each introductory class, which appeared first in the schedule of classes booklet of the Fall Quarter. The packets were sent to faculty members to distribute the questionnaires to their students. Classes were chosen under each discipline, until a total of 1,000 questionnaires were distributed. The packets consisted of: 1) a letter of instruction to the faculty (see appendix A); 2) a copy of the Human Subjects Research Committee approval letter (see appendix C); 3) an informed consent to participants (see appendix B); and, 4) the questionnaire (see appendix D).

These packets were originally distributed to 23 departments at YSU. By the second week of the quarter, all but seven departments had returned the completed questionnaires. An additional three departments were issued the packets, bringing the total number of departments to 26. Ultimately, eight departments did not respond, or returned the uncompleted information. Two faculty members emphasized the idea that students should not be expected to pay tuition to be participants in research projects. The attempt to collect data ceased during the fifth week of the mentioned quarter. Total participation included 18 departments and 576 students.
Race and Gender

The first section of the questionnaire was developed in order to establish the basic demographics of the sample group. The participants were asked general questions regarding personal and academic status. Of the 576 students who responded to the questionnaire, approximately one-half were male (49.8%, n = 287) and one-half were female (49.5%, n = 285). Four participants did not provide their gender. The majority of the respondents were Caucasian (83.2%, n = 479) and 62 were African American (10.8%). The remaining four percent of the sample group included Asians, Hispanics, Middle Easterners, Indians, Americans, Mixed, East Indian/Canadian, Black/White, White/Hispanic, and White/American Indian. Twelve participants did not disclose their race. This sample did not reflect the information presented by OBOR report, which indicated a more culturally diverse group among the population at YSU (OBOR, 1997).

Marital Status and Sexual Orientation

The majority of the participants indicated they were single and had never married (87.0%, n = 501). The remaining fell within the following categories: divorced (3.6%, n = 21); married (7.5%, n = 43); separated (0.9%, n = 5); and widowed (0.3%, n = 2). Four of the respondents did not answer the question regarding marital status. When asked to categorize their sexual orientation, the vast majority of the sample group indicated that heterosexuality was their preference (97.7%, n = 563). Only one percent of the sample group indicated they were homosexual. Three people indicated they were bisexual, while two people indicated they were homosexual. Of the two homosexuals, one was gay and the other a lesbian. Eight people refused to indicate any sexual orientation at all.
Physical Disability

Approximately three percent of the respondents indicated they had a physical disability (n = 18). The noted disabilities included the following: eyesight (0.7%, n = 4), overweight (0.2%, n= 1), knee injury (0.2%, n = 1), diabetic (0.2%, n = 1), speech impediment (0.2%, n = 1), sclerosis (0.3%, n = 2), asthma (0.3%, n = 2), arm deformity (0.5%, n = 3), lupus (0.2%, n = 1), fibromyalgia (0.2%, n = 1), and hearing aid (0.2%, n = 1).

Age, Class Rank, & Grade Point Average

The ages of the respondents ranged from under 18 years of age to over the age of 41. The following table represents the ages of the respondents in detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years old</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years old</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30 years old</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40 years old</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 years old and above</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sample group was questioned on what class level they were at. Most of the respondents were in their first year of study at YSU. They are classified as freshman (48.1%, \( n = 277 \)). The remaining participants were categorized within the following: 26.2% percent were sophomores \( (n = 151) \); 14.6 percent were juniors \( (n = 84) \); 9.5 percent were seniors \( (n = 55) \); and, three of the respondents were enrolled in graduate school (0.5%). Six of the respondents did not provide their class rank. The data illustrated a descent portrayal of the diversity among the students at YSU in reference to class level as was indicated by the OBOR report in 1997.

In reference to their academic status, the students were asked to indicate their grade point average, based upon their last report card. Approximately 43 percent of the respondents reported having a grade point average within the range of 3.00 and 3.97 \( (n = 243) \). Approximately 32 percent of the respondents indicated a grade point average between 2.0 and 2.98 \( (n = 182) \). Six percent of the sample group indicted having a grade point average between 1.12 and 1.97 \( (n = 10) \) or 4.00 and 4.27 \( (n = 23) \). One hundred and eighteen participants opted not to respond to the question. One of the respondents indicated that the grade point average was irrelevant to the purpose of the study.

Field of Study

The respondents were asked to indicate their major course of study at YSU. There were 36 different majors indicated among the responses. Only 20 participants did not indicate their major, while one student advised that it was “none of my concern.” The following 15 most frequently reported majors, listed in order of highest frequency, were represented among the sample group.
1. Criminal Justice (16.7%, n = 96)
2. Education (12.8%, n = 74)
3. Undecided (12.2%, n = 70)
4. Business (7.3%, n = 42)
5. Psychology (4.9%, n = 28)
6. Music (4.5%, n = 26)
7. Biology (4.0%, n = 23)
8. Environmental Studies (3.6%, n = 21)
9. Computer Science (3.5%, n = 20)
10. Physical Therapy (3.0%, n = 17)
11. Engineering (2.6%, n = 15)
12. Communications (2.1%, n = 12)
13. Combined Science (1.7%, n = 10)
14. Pre-Law (1.6%, n = 9)
15. Health Education (1.2%, n = 7)

Approximately six percent of the sample group indicated Advertising, Chemistry, Dental Hygiene, Nursing and Political Science as their major course of study at YSU. Three percent of respondents noted their major field of study either as Foreign Language, Physical Education, Philosophy, or Theater. Of the remaining respondents (2.6%), the following were noted as their majors: Anthropology, Archeology, Architecture, Art Education, Geology, Graphic Design, Mathematics, Photography, Religious Studies, and Sociology.
Perception of Discrimination at YSU

Before the respondents were asked questions regarding their experiences with hate crimes, they were questioned on their perceptions of discrimination and its prevalence at YSU. Five basic areas of discrimination were reviewed: gender, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and physical disability. It was these five types of hate crimes that were the main focus of the study because they are part of the legal definition of a hate crime. The following table represents the respondents' perceptions of discrimination at YSU.

Table 2
Perception of Discrimination at YSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DISCRIMINATION</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students at YSU perceive discrimination against race/ethnicity as the most prevalent form of discrimination on campus (22.2%, n = 128). As is illustrated in the above table, discrimination against gender and sexual orientation followed (11.5%, n = 66, and 12.5%, n = 72, respectively). Discrimination against religion and disability were
also perceived as problems among the respondents. Approximately, 16 percent of the sample indicated discrimination against religion and disability as a problem.

The sample group was asked to specify other forms of discrimination they perceived were issues at YSU. Approximately two percent of the participants indicated the following: discrimination against age, discrimination against students, discrimination against single parents, discrimination against the inexperienced, discrimination against the intelligent, discrimination against sports, reverse discrimination, and discrimination against the city of Youngstown. One person made the comment that from experiences on campus, it seems as if "people have been getting along." Others expressed the concern that they have not been on, or around the campus long enough to notice any forms of discrimination (n = 11). Twenty-two of the participants did not respond to the question.

Definitions of a Hate Crime

Before the respondents were questioned on their experiences with hate crimes; they were asked to define a hate crime. Approximately 95 percent of the sample group responded by providing their definition. The majority of the sample group had a general idea of what a hate crime was. One respondent, as did most others, defined a hate crime as "any verbal abuse, physical or other criminal act against a party exclusively motivated by prejudice in regard to ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, etc."

Approximately 79 percent of the other definitions centered on this basic concept. Although many of the respondents concentrated on race and gender, as the only motivating factors behind hate incidents, they had a basic understanding of what hate crimes are.
There were approximately seven participants who defined a hate crime as
"murder" or "rape." Among these participants, it seemed that they did not understand
that hate crimes are motivated by some sort of discrimination or stereotypical definition
of a particular group or how they should behave. There was one participant who had a
very distorted definition of a hate crime. He defined a hate crime as "When the KKK
kills niggers."

Overall, from the responses obtained, the majority of the respondents had a basic,
general understanding of what hate crime is. For detailed responses, please see appendix
E.

Experience with Hate Crime: Victimization

The second section of the questionnaire focused on the experiences the
respondents faced in regards to being victims of hate crimes or other hate incidents. The
respondents were asked whether or not they were ever harmed, either physically or
verbally, because of gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, or disability. Twenty-two
percent of the respondents (n = 127) advised that they were harmed because of their
gender. Fifty-one of the respondents opted not to answer the question. In regards to
victimization motivated by race/ethnicity, approximately 21 percent of the group
indicated they had been harmed (n = 118). Forty-nine of the respondents did not
complete the question. Victimization based on the gender and the race/ethnicity of the
victim were rated the two highest among the sample group. There were also those
respondents who indicated being victimized due to their religion (8.5%, n = 49), sexual
orientation (2.4%, n = 14), and disability (1.2%, n = 7).
The type of victimization, as well as where the victimization took place, was the next inquiry of the questionnaire. The respondents were given ten different forms of victimization, ranging from being called an inappropriate name to having a friend or family member murdered. The most frequent responses are noted below. Please see appendix F for detailed responses. The results were as follows:

- Approximately 34 percent of the group indicated they were called an inappropriate name (n = 193). The five most frequently reported places where this inappropriate name calling occurred was school (14.2%, n = 82), work (4.5%, n = 26), a public arena (2.8%, n = 16), YSU (2.3%, n = 13), and a social event (1.9%, n = 11).

- Approximately four percent of the sample group indicated they were asked to leave a particular function or were asked not to participate in an activity (n = 22). The most common response to where this type of harm occurred was at work (0.5%, n = 3), at YSU (0.3%, n = 2), in a public arena (0.3%, n = 2), and at a friend’s home (0.3%, n = 2).

- Four percent of the sample group indicated that they were encouraged not to reside in a particular community (n = 21). The five most frequent responses to where this victimization took place included; school (0.5%, n = 3), Boardman, OH (0.5%, n = 3), Canfield, OH (0.3%, n = 2), Youngstown, OH (0.3%, n = 2), and Alabama (0.3%, n = 2).

- Eight percent of the sample group indicated they were asked to engage in certain behaviors (n = 45). The five most frequent places where the respondents were asked to engage in certain behaviors were at school (2.6%, n
at work (1.0%, n = 6), at a friend's home (0.7%, n = 4), at a public arena (0.5%, n = 3), and YSU (0.3%, n = 3).

- Eight percent of the students indicated that they were physically attacked (n = 46). The physical attacks most frequently took place at school (2.1%, n = 12), home (1.2%, n = 7), a friend's home (1.2%, n = 7), a public arena (0.5%, n = 3), and at a sports event (0.5%, n = 3).

- Approximately six percent of the sample group indicated that they had been sexually assaulted or raped (n = 37). The most frequent places for such victimization, as indicated by the sample group, included home (1.9%, n = 11), at a friend's home (1.6%, n = 9), at school (0.5%, n = 3), and at work (0.5%, n = 3).

- Approximately six percent of the sample group indicated they had been robbed (n = 33). The most frequent places for this victimization included home (2.3%, n = 13), a friend's home (0.5%, n = 3), a public arena (0.3%, n = 2), and while on or parked on the streets (0.3%, n = 2).

- Eighteen percent of the sample indicated that their property was damaged, vandalized, or stolen (n = 102). The respondents indicated the following as the most frequent places the incidents took place; at home (5.7%, n = 33), at school (2.3%, n = 13), at YSU (1.9%, n = 11), while in a car (1.6%, n = 9), and while on the streets (0.9%, n = 5).

- Five percent of the sample group indicated that either a friend or family member was murdered. The most frequently mentioned places where the
murders took place included; home (1.4%, n = 8), Youngstown, OH (1.2%, n = 7), a public arena (0.3%, n = 2), and among the streets (0.3%, n = 2).

- Approximately ten percent of the respondents indicated that at some point in their life they were overlooked for a job or a promotion (n = 57). Fifteen of the respondents indicated that they were overlooked for a job or promotion at work. They did not indicate specifically where the incident occurred. Three of the respondents indicated the victimization took place at school, while five indicated it happened within a public arena. Three of the subjects noted that they did not feel comfortable in disclosing the actual place they were victimized.

Number of People Involved in the Hate Incident

The respondents were questioned about how many people were with them when the victimization occurred as well as how many people had committed the act. The following tables represent the compiled data. A large percentage of the respondents indicated they were alone when the victimization occurred (20.5%, n = 111). The respondents also indicated that they were most likely to be victimized by one offender (19.3%, n = 111). See tables three and four, respectively.
Table 3

Number of People with Respondent When Victimized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># OF PEOPLE WITH VICTIM</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A crowd (five or more people)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 people</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information provided regarding how many people actually committed the hate incident, parallels that of how many victims were involved.

Table 4

Number of Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># OF OFFENDERS</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group (3–5 people)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A crowd (5 + persons)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organized group</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience with Hate Crime: Commission of Crime

The next section of the questionnaire was formed to establish an understanding of how many of the respondents actually took part in committing a hate crime incident, both physical or verbal. The questions were set up in the same manner as the previous set of questions which inquired about being a victim of a hate crime. Twenty-five of the respondents admitted that they committed harm against a person(s) because of the victim’s gender (4.3%, n = 25). Twenty-nine of the subjects did not respond, while 522 answered no. When asked if harm was ever committed against someone based on the race of the victim, approximately ten percent of the respondents answered yes (n = 55). Four hundred and ninety of the respondents advised they had never committed a crime motivated by hatred towards any race; 31 people left the question unanswered.

In response to whether any harm was committed against someone based on religion, approximately five percent of the subjects admitted they had committed such an offense as opposed to 90 percent who never have. Thirty-three of the respondents did not reply. The highest number of respondents admitted to committing an offense against someone motivated by a hatred of the victim’s sexual orientation (10.2%, n = 59). Eleven of the subject indicated that they had harmed someone with a physical handicap (2.0%). The documented information is presented in the following table.
Table 5
Respondents' Commission of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATION FOR OFFENSE</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reference to what type of crime was committed, the respondents were given a number of offenses and asked to indicate those in which they committed. The incidents ranged from calling someone an inappropriate name to murder. The following represents those respondents who admitted committing the mentioned hate crimes or incidents.

- Called an individual(s) an inappropriate name (17.7%, n = 102).
- Asked an individual(s) to leave a particular function or not to participate in a particular activity (2.6%, n = 15).
- Asked in individual(s) to engage in certain inappropriate behaviors (2.4%, n = 14).
- Physically attacked an individual(s) (2.4%, n = 14).
- Damaged, vandalized, or stole property from an individual(s) (1.7%, n = 10).
- Encouraged an individual(s) not to reside in a particular community (1.6%, n = 9).
- Overlooked an individual(s) for a particular job or promotion (0.7%, n = 4).
- Robbed an individual(s) (0.5\%, n = 3).
- Sexually assaulted or raped an individual(s) (0.2\%, n = 1).
- Murdered an individual(s) (0.2\%, n = 1).

Approximately ten percent of the incidents indicated above were committed in either elementary or high school (n = 59) by a group of individuals (7.3\%, n = 42). The respondents were not given the opportunity to indicate the specific type of social event, however, six percent admitted to committing a crime at a social event (r = 33), followed by the commission of a hate crime within a public arena (5.0\%, n = 29). Other places where the respondents had committed the hate incident included: home (3.8\%, n = 8), at a religious institution (0.2\%, n = 1), at a place of employment (2.4\%, n = 14), and at YSU (1.4\%, n = 8).

**Number of People Involved in the Hate Incident**

As was mentioned briefly above, most of the respondents committed the hate incident with a group of individuals (7.3\%, n = 42). For purposes of the proposed study, a group was defined as three to five people. Four percent of the sample group admitted that they acted alone in committing the crime (n = 23). Only three people indicated they participated in committing a hate crime with an organized group (0.5\%). Two percent of the people acted alone or with one other person (n = 12), while 15 indicated they offended while involved in a crowd (five or more individuals).
Motivating Factors

Besides incidents that are motivated by either hatred towards one's race/ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, or disability, the respondents were questioned on what motivated the actual commission of the crime. The results were frightening. Among the sample group, the most frequently noted reasons for committing a hate incident was because the offender did not like members of the particular group (8.7%, n = 50). The second most common response for committing a hate crime was just for fun (7.0%, n = 41). Of all the mentioned motivating factors, only one reason represented retaliation of some form. Only six percent of the sample group indicated committing a hate crime against an individual because that particular group had harmed a friend or family member. In order of frequency, the following are the motivating factors behind the respondents' actions.
Table 6

Motivating Factors Behind the Crimes of the Sample Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATING FACTOR</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike members of the particular group</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just for fun</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the particular group harmed friend/family</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want members of that group in my community</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want members of that group in school</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was bored</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want members of that group at work</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach members of the particular group a lesson</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the particular group deserve to be treated as such</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the particular group are inferior</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience with Hate Crime: Witnessing the Crime

The final section of the questionnaire, which focused on the respondents' experiences with hate crime incidents, dealt with the issue of being a witness to a hate incident. Over one half of the sample group had witnessed a hate crime motivated by the hatred of a particular race (59.0%, n = 340). Forty eight percent of the respondents admitted being witnesses to an incident motivated by hatred felt towards the sexual orientation of an individual (n = 277). In regards to incidents committed against one's gender, 199 of the subjects admitted being a witness to such an incident (34.5%).
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Approximately 30 percent of the respondents had witnessed some form of hate crime motivated by hatred of one’s religion \( (n = 170) \), while 32.3 percent had witnessed a crime against an individual who possessed a physical disability \( (n = 186) \).

Witnessing an individual being called an inappropriate name was the most common form of hate incident among the sample group \( (64.2\%, n = 370) \). The following incidents were also noted:

- Witnessed an individual being physically attacked \( (22.9\%, n = 132) \)
- Witnessed property being damaged, vandalized, or stolen \( (19.1\%, n = 110) \)
- Witnessed an individual being forced to leave a function or not to participate in an activity \( (18.8\%, n = 108) \)
- Witnessed an individual being forced to engage in a particular behavior \( (15.5\%, n = 89) \)
- Witnessed an attempt to force particular groups not to reside within a community \( (13.9\%, n = 80) \)
- Witnessed an individual being overlooked for an employment position or promotion \( (11.6\%, n = 67) \)
- Witnessed an individual being robbed \( (3.3\%, n = 19) \)
- Witnessed a person being raped \( (2.3\%, n = 13) \)
- Witnessed an individual being murdered \( (1.4\%, n = 8) \).

Approximately 31 percent of the respondents had indicated that the majority of the crimes they witnessed were committed by a group of people \( (n = 181) \). This was followed by crimes being committed by a crowd of five or more people \( (10.9\%, n = 63) \). There were 27 and 29 respondents who indicated that either one or two people committed
the harm, respectively (4.7%, 5.0%). Only one percent of the sample group indicated that an organized group committed the witnessed harm (n = 5).

The following table represents the data collected on where the respondents witnessed the hate incidents and crimes. As is illustrated in the table, the most commonly reported locations were the incidents occurred were elementary school/high school (38.5%, n = 222), at a social event (32.5%, n = 187), and within a public arena (29.0%, n= 167).

Table 7

Where the Hate Incident was Witnessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHERE CRIME OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/High School</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a social event</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a public arena</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of employment</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institution</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences of Hate Crime

The final section of the questionnaire was organized in an attempt to grasp the respondents’ views of the severity of the consequences hate crimes have on individual victims as well as the society. Nearly 70 percent of the sample group agreed with the statement that hate crimes cause greater negative consequences, to both the individual
and the community, than do traditional crimes (n = 403). Of this amount, 162 advised that they strongly agreed with the above statement (28.1%). Only six percent of the respondents indicated that they either disagreed (n = 21) with or strongly disagreed (n = 11) with the mentioned statement. Approximately 21 percent of the subjects were undecided (n = 118).

In reference to what the punishment of hate crime offenders should be, the majority of the respondents indicted that punishment should be equal to that of traditional crime (55.7%, n = 321). One of the respondents noted that “a murder is a murder, regardless of what motivated the offender to kill the victim.” One hundred and forty seven of the respondents indicated that the severity of punishment should be increased when a hate crime is committed (25.5%). A small portion of the sample felt that the punishment of hate crime offenders should be less severe than that of traditional crimes (4.0%, n = 23). Forty-seven participants indicated that they were indifferent to the whole concept of punishment, as it pertains to hate crimes in reference to traditional crimes (8.2%). Although the number of respondents who indicated that hate crime offenders should not be punished at all for their crimes was small (2.4%, n = 14). The concept is frightening.

Victims of Hate Crimes

The last section of the questionnaire centered on the victims of hate crimes. The subjects were asked to rank from one to eight (one being the most affected) which group of people suffered the greatest harm resulting from hate incidents. The sample group indicated that the victim, the victim’s family, and the victim’s associated group were the
people who suffered the greatest harm. The respondents rated the negative consequences
to the community and the nation, as greater than the harm the offender and offender’s
associates experience. Overall, the respondents indicated the following:

Table 8

Victims of Hate Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK (1-8, 1 = Most affected)</th>
<th>THE VICTIM</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The victim</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The victim’s family</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The victim’s associated group</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The community in which the incident occurred</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The nation</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The offender’s associated group</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The offender’s family</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The offender</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments

The respondents were given an opportunity to express any additional comments
or concerns they had regarding the questionnaire or any issues regarding hate crimes.
Most of the respondents, who added comments, indicated that they were pleased to be a
part of this study. They commented on the fact that such studies are educational and can
be used to bring the topic of hate crimes to the surface. The respondents seemed very
positive and fortunate to express their views on such an important issue. The additional
comments are documented in appendix G.
Differences Between Genders

In order to develop a better understanding of the study group's experiences with hate crimes, differences between the genders were examined. The following section of this research project explains the differences found using crosstabulations and chi-square tests. The following statistically significant differences found among the sample group can be used to describe the population of students at Youngstown State University. Through the use of the mentioned testing, the data indicated a significant statistical difference in regards to gender and victimization. As is illustrated in Table 9, the female respondents (40.4%, n = 107) indicated they were harmed more frequently than their male counterparts (7.7%, n = 20) ($\chi^2 = 76.45$, $p \leq .05$, df = 1).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HARMED/NOT HARMED</th>
<th>WOMEN (N = 265)</th>
<th>MEN (N = 260)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 525)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not harmed</td>
<td>59.6% (n = 158)</td>
<td>92.3% (n = 240)</td>
<td>75.8% (n = 398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmed</td>
<td>40.4% (n = 107)</td>
<td>7.7% (n = 20)</td>
<td>24.2% (n = 127)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 76.45, \ p \leq .05, \ df = 1 \]

Once it was determined what number of the sample group was victimized, the respondents were asked to indicate what type of victimization occurred. The information collected indicated that females were more likely to be victims than were males. The following are just examples of the types of victimization that occurred and how the data
differed in regards to gender. For detailed information regarding where the actual harm took place, please refer to appendix F.

For example, when asked to indicate whether or not they were ever called an inappropriate name, 51.3 percent of the females (n = 120) reported they were called inappropriate names as opposed to 33.6 percent of the males (n = 73). Please refer to the following table for statistical notation.

Table 10

| CALLED AN | WOMEN (N = 234) | MEN (N = 217) | TOTAL (N = 451) |
| INAPPROPRIATE | | | |
| NAME | | | |
| No | 48.7% (n = 114) | 66.4% (n = 144) | 57.2% (n = 258) |
| Yes | 51.3% (n = 120) | 33.6% (n = 73) | 42.8% (n = 193) |

χ² = 14.31, p ≤ .05, df = 1

The questionnaire also inquired on how many people were ever robbed. When comparing the genders, there was a slight, yet significant difference between the responses indicated by the males and females. The results indicted that the women respondents (10.5%, n = 24) were more likely to be robbed than the males (4.2%, n = 9). This statistical significance (χ² = 6.25, p ≤ .05, df = 1) is illustrated in the following table. The respondents information concerning where the actual harm occurred are noted in appendix F.
Table 11

Men and Women’s Responses: Have You Ever Experienced a Robbery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WERE YOU EVER ROBBED</th>
<th>WOMEN (N = 229)</th>
<th>MEN (N = 213)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 442)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.5% (n = 205)</td>
<td>95.8% (n = 204)</td>
<td>92.5% (n = 409)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.5% (n = 24)</td>
<td>4.2% (n = 9)</td>
<td>7.5% (n = 33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 6.25, \ p \leq .05, \ df = 1 \]

The sample group was asked to indicate if they were ever asked to engage in any inappropriate behaviors. Concentrating on the differences between male and female respondents, the data illustrated that women were more likely to experience this type of victimization. Thirty-four of the female respondents (14.9%) as opposed to 5.2 percent of their male counterparts (n = 11) were asked to engage in some sort of inappropriate behavior. Regardless of the fact that most of the respondents indicted they were never victimized in this manner, of those who were, the victims were more likely to be females \( (\chi^2 = 11.42, \ p \leq .05, \ df = 1) \). See Table 12.
Table 12

Men and Women’s Responses: Were You Ever Asked To Engage in Certain Inappropriate Behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASKED TO ENGAGE IN INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>WOMEN (N = 228)</th>
<th>MEN (N = 213)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 441)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.1% (n = 194)</td>
<td>94.8% (N = 202)</td>
<td>89.8% (N = 396)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.9% (N = 34)</td>
<td>5.2% (N = 11)</td>
<td>10.2% (N = 45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 11.42, p ≤ .05, df = 1

There is a general assumption in society that women are more likely to either be sexually assaulted or raped. The data collected through the sample group supports this assumption. There was only one male in the sample group who indicated that he was either sexually assaulted or raped (0.5%). In reference to the female participants, this paled in comparison. There was 15.8 percent of the female respondents who had been raped (n = 34). The statistical significance is illustrated in table 13.

With each inquiry questioning whether or not the respondents had ever been victimized, the respondents were asked to indicate were the harm had taken place. In reference to the victimization of being sexually assaulted or raped, most of the respondents indicated that the incident occurred at home (39.5%) or at a friend’s home (29.0%). The detailed responses of the sample group are noted in appendix F.
Table 13

Men and Women’s Responses: Have You Ever Been Sexually Assaulted or Raped?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEXUALLY ASSAULED OR RAPED</th>
<th>WOMEN (N = 228)</th>
<th>MEN (N = 213)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 441)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.2% (n = 192)</td>
<td>99.5% (n = 212)</td>
<td>91.6% (n = 404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.8% (n = 36)</td>
<td>.5% (n = 1)</td>
<td>8.4% (n = 37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 33.63, p \leq .05, df = 1$

Differences Between Gender: Number of Offenders

The respondents were also asked to indicate how many people were involved in committing the harm when they were victimized. The respondents were given five options ranging from one person committing the crime to an organized group being involved. In respect to gender, there was a statistical difference noted in the data. The female respondents indicated that when they were victimized, the crime was more likely to be committed by either one person (55.6%, n = 75) or by two people (15.6%, n = 21). Of the male respondents who indicated they were harmed, they noted that the offense was committed by either a group of people (33.3%, n = 31) or by a crowd (83.6%, n = 8). There were a higher percentage of males (4.3%) who indicated they were harmed by an organized group than the females (3.0%). This difference in how many people were involved in offending the sample group is illustrated in the following table ($\chi^2 = 16.80, p \leq .05, df = 4$).
Table 14

Men and Women’s Response: How Many People Offended You?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW MANY PEOPLE HARMED YOU</th>
<th>WOMEN (N = 135)</th>
<th>MEN (N = 93)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 228)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>55.6% (n = 75)</td>
<td>38.7% (n = 36)</td>
<td>48.7% (n = 111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>15.6% (n = 21)</td>
<td>9.7% (n = 9)</td>
<td>13.2% (n = 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group</td>
<td>16.3% (n = 22)</td>
<td>33.3% (n = 31)</td>
<td>23.2% (n = 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A crowd</td>
<td>2.2% (n = 3)</td>
<td>8.6% (n = 8)</td>
<td>4.8% (n = 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organized group</td>
<td>3.0% (n = 4)</td>
<td>4.3% (n = 4)</td>
<td>3.5% (n = 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 16.80$, $p \leq 0.05$, df = 4

Differences Between Gender: Commission of Crime

The sample group was asked to indicate whether or not they ever harmed an individual(s) due to the persons gender, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or disability. The data indicated differences between the genders in two areas. The first was in reference to whether or not the respondents harmed someone due to the individual’s race. There were 40 male participants who indicated that they had committed harm for this reason (14.8%) as opposed to 15 of the female respondents (5.5%). This statistical significance ($\chi^2 = 12.95$, $p \leq 0.05$, df = 1) is illustrated in table 15.
Table 15
Men and Women’s Responses: Have You Ever Harmed Because of Race?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOU HARMED DUE TO RACE</th>
<th>WOMEN (N = 274)</th>
<th>MEN (N = 271)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 545)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94.5% (n = 259)</td>
<td>85.2% (n = 231)</td>
<td>89.9% (n = 490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.5% (n = 15)</td>
<td>14.8% (n = 40)</td>
<td>10.1% (n = 55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 12.95, \ p \leq .05, \ df = 1 \]

The second area in which there was a difference between males and females was in regards to whether they ever committed harm which was motivated by the victims' sexual orientation. Approximately 89 percent of the sample group indicated they had never committed a crime based on a prejudice towards one's sexual orientation (n = 489). However, of the 59 participants of the sample group who have, 15.8 percent were males (n = 43) as opposed to 5.8 percent who were female (n = 16). See table 16.

Table 16
Men and Women’s Responses: Have You Ever Harmed Because of Sexual Orientation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOU HARMED DUE TO SEXUAL ORIENTATION</th>
<th>WOMEN (N = 275)</th>
<th>MEN (N = 273)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 548)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94.2% (n = 259)</td>
<td>84.2% (n = 230)</td>
<td>89.2% (n = 489)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.8% (n = 16)</td>
<td>15.8% (n = 43)</td>
<td>10.8% (n = 59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 14.11, \ p \leq .05, \ df = 1 \]
Differences Between Genders: Witnessing a Crime

One section of the questionnaire concentrated on the concept of whether the sample group had ever witnessed a hate crime. There was only one area in which there was a statistical significant difference between the genders. This difference appeared in the respondent’s reply to if they ever witnessed a crime motivated by a prejudice towards a specific religion. There was approximately 39 percent of the male respondents (n = 100) who witnessed such an incident as opposed to 27.6 percent of the female respondents (n = 70). Please see table 17 for an illustration of this statistical significance ($\chi^2 = 7.60$, $p \leq 0.05$, df = 1).

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witnessed Crime Due to Religion</th>
<th>Women (N = 254)</th>
<th>Men (N = 256)</th>
<th>Total (N = 510)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.4% (n = 184)</td>
<td>60.9% (n = 156)</td>
<td>66.7% (n = 340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.6% (n = 70)</td>
<td>39.1% (n = 100)</td>
<td>33.3% (n = 170)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 7.60$, $p \leq 0.05$, df = 1

Differences Between Gender: Punishment of Offenders

The last area, in which a statistical difference was noted between the genders, was in reference to the severity of punishment for hate crime offenders. The data indicated that the female respondents were more likely to feel the severity of punishment, for hate
crime offenders, should be equal to that of traditional crimes. The male respondents were slightly more likely to indicate that offenders who commit hate crimes should be punished more severely than the offenders who commit traditional crimes. The following table represents this finding.

Table 18

Severity of Punishment for Hate Crime Offenders In Reference to Traditional Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUNISHMENT SHOULD BE...</th>
<th>WOMEN (N = 236)</th>
<th>MEN (N = 232)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 468)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Severe</td>
<td>20.7% (n = 57)</td>
<td>32.6% (n = 90)</td>
<td>26.6% (n = 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>64.9% (n = 179)</td>
<td>51.4% (n = 142)</td>
<td>58.2% (n = 321)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 13.78, p ≤ .05, df = 1
Differences Between Races

In order to analyze the collected data, differences between the races were examined. For statistical purposes, the race of the sample group was categorized into two categories, white and non-white. Included in the white category were all Caucasians. All minority group members were classified as non-whites. The following section of this research project explains the differences found using crosstabulations and chi-square tests. The statistical differences noted in this section could be used to generalize the experiences of the student population at Youngstown State University (YSU). The first area where there was a statistical significance between the responses of whites and non-whites was in reference to if the respondent ever harmed because of race. The data indicated that 15.7 percent of the non-whites harmed an individual(s) because of race (n = 14). In contrast, 9.0 percent of the white respondents indicated they committed a crime motivated by a prejudice towards a certain race (n = 41). The following table illustrates the statistical significant difference ($\chi^2 = 3.73, p \leq .05, df = 1$) between the two groups.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HARMED/NOT HARMED</th>
<th>WHITES (N = 456)</th>
<th>NON-WHITES (N = 89)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 545)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91.0% (n = 415)</td>
<td>84.3% (n = 75)</td>
<td>89.9% (n = 490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.0% (n = 41)</td>
<td>15.7% (n = 14)</td>
<td>10.1% (n = 55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 3.73, p \leq .05, df = 1$
There was also a statistical significance between the two categories of races in regards to whether or not they ever harmed an individual(s) due to the victim's religion. This data also indicated that the non-whites were more likely to harm someone due to religion (10.1%, n = 9), than were the whites (3.7%, n = 17). Although the majority of both groups had never committed a crime motivated by religion, of those who did, the offenders were more likely to be non-white ($\chi^2 = 6.62, p \leq .05, df = 1$). See Table 20.

Table 20

Whites and Non-Whites Responses: Have You Ever Harmed Because of Religion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HARMED/NOT HARMED</th>
<th>WHITES (N = 454)</th>
<th>NON-WHITES (N = 89)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 543)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96.3% (n = 437)</td>
<td>89.9% (n = 80)</td>
<td>95.2% (n = 517)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.7% (n = 17)</td>
<td>10.1% (n = 9)</td>
<td>4.8% (n = 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 6.62, p \leq .05, df = 1$

Differences Between Races: Victimization

There was an overwhelming difference between the data in regards to victimization and race. Non-whites were far more likely to be victimized, not only because of their race, but also for their religion. Approximately 57 percent of the non-white respondents indicated they were victimized due to their race, as opposed to 15.3 percent of the white respondents (see table 21). In reference to being victimized due to religion, 17.3 percent of the non-whites indicated being harmed (see Table 22). In contrast, only 8.3 percent of the white respondents were harmed.
Table 21

White and Non-Whites Responses: Have You Ever Been Harmed Due to Race?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HARMED/NOT HARMED</th>
<th>WHITES (N = 438)</th>
<th>NON-WHITES (N = 89)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 527)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmed</td>
<td>15.3% (n = 67)</td>
<td>57.3% (n = 51)</td>
<td>22.4% (n = 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Harmed</td>
<td>84.7% (n = 371)</td>
<td>42.7% (n = 38)</td>
<td>77.6% (n = 409)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 75.11, \ p \leq .05, \ df = 1$

Table 22

White and Non-Whites Responses: Have You Ever Been Harmed Due to Religion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HARMED/NOT HARMED</th>
<th>WHITES (N = 432)</th>
<th>NON-WHITES (N = 75)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N = 507)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmed</td>
<td>8.3% (n = 36)</td>
<td>17.3% (n = 13)</td>
<td>9.7% (n = 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Harmed</td>
<td>91.7% (n = 396)</td>
<td>82.7% (n = 62)</td>
<td>90.3% (n = 458)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 5.93, \ p \leq .05, \ df = 1$

Differences Between Races: Witnessing a Hate Crime

When analyzing the data concerning the number of respondents, who have witnessed a hate incident, it is evident that the non-whites have witnessed more crime. Approximately 72 percent of the non-white respondents had witnessed a hate crime which was motivated by race (n = 62). In comparison, 60.7 percent of the white
respondents indicated they had witnessed a race motivated crime \((n = 278)\). Refer to table 23 for an illustration of this difference.

Since the data indicated that the non-white group was more likely to be victimized, as well as witness a hate crime, it can be safe to say that this group would feel hate crimes cause more negative consequences for the victim then do traditional crimes. The data supported this. Approximately 44 percent of the non-white group indicated that they strongly agree with the statement. Only 27 percent of the white group indicated that they strongly agreed with the statement that hate crimes cause more negative consequences than do traditional crimes \(\chi^2 = 14.50, p \leq .05, df = 1\).

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WITNESSED HARM</th>
<th>WHITES ((N = 458))</th>
<th>NON-WHITES ((N = 86))</th>
<th>TOTAL ((N = 544))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39.3% ((n = 180))</td>
<td>27.9% ((n = 24))</td>
<td>37.5% ((n = 204))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.7% ((n = 278))</td>
<td>72.1% ((n = 62))</td>
<td>62.5% ((n = 340))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 4.11, p \leq .05, df = 1\)

In this chapter, the responses of the students of Youngstown State University, to the hate crime questionnaire was presented. A discussion of their responses as well as an illustration of the statistical differences was noted. Differences between males and females as well as whites and non-whites was illustrated. The next chapter will contain conclusions and a discussion of the material.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

Prejudicial stereotypes, discrimination, and hatred: Are these characteristics of our nation’s past? According to today’s recent literature and this study, hate crimes and bias motivated incidents are and will be an issue society must learn to recognize and deal with. We cannot no longer close our eyes, or turn the other cheek when such incidents occur. It is essential that all members of society understand and work together to defeat the perpetrators of hate. This was the main motivation behind this study.

As with any research, there were limitations to this study. Whenever questionnaires are distributed, especially to students, there is always the risk that the instrument will not completely capture the participants’ knowledge and experience on the issue. There is always the chance that a respondent will not take the study seriously, resulting in dishonest answers. As for this study, it appears that the students completed the questionnaire honestly. The provided information seemed both honest and sincere.

There was an overwhelming, positive response from both, students and faculty, in completing the requested information. The response time for returning the completed questionnaires was reasonable. There were, however, a number of questionnaires returned uncompleted. The reasons behind this could be numerous. It is impossible to assume that the questionnaires were returned due to non-participation. It may have been that too many questionnaires were sent to one faculty member. Overall, the information collected was sufficient and positive.
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There were two faculty members who returned the information along with a letter indicating that it is not appropriate for students to be used as research participants. The argument one professor made was that students pay tuition so they can be taught, not participate in research. The majority of the faculty cooperated with my requests. Gratitude is extended to each.

The major limitation of this study centered on the diversity of the participants. An overwhelming majority of the respondents were of Caucasian descent (83.2%, n = 479). This limited the information regarding minorities’ experiences with hate crimes. Unfortunately, minority groups are more often the victims of bias motivated incidents. It would have definitely benefited this research had there been more representation of minority groups. In using the term minority, this is not exclusively referring to race. Included in this group are persons with physical disabilities and homosexuals. These two groups were also underrepresented in this research project. There were only one percent of the respondents who indicated they were homosexuals, and only three percent of the respondents who had physical disabilities.

The students at Youngstown State University expressed a positive attitude in participating in the research. The respondents indicated, through their additional comments, that such research is essential if ever bias motivated issues are to be resolved. They felt that such research could help in educating the general public on accepting people and their differences. It was refreshing to see the students thanking the researchers on bringing this important issue to the forefront. For the respondents’ additional comments, please refer to appendix G.
The majority of students had a general understanding of what hate crimes were. As was evident in their definitions, the majority of the students indicated hate crimes were unjustified, ignorant acts of violence that cause negative consequences to all those involved, ranging from the direct victim to the nation as a whole. There was, however, little mention of hate crimes resulting from a prejudice against religion, disability, or sexual orientation. The majority of the respondents indicated that hate crimes were a result of hatred towards a specific race or gender. See appendix E for respondents’ definitions of a hate crime.

Most of the respondents agreed that the issue of hate is, and probably will be, a prominent issue within communities and the nation. It was expressed that the judicial system should definitely try to control the amount of illegal acts committed, which are motivated by hate. Whether or not the severity of punishment should be more severe than that which pertains to traditional crimes was not clear. Overall, the majority of the respondents indicated that punishment of hate crime offenders should be equal to the punishment of traditional crime offenders (55.7%). The male respondents were more inclined to indicate that punishment of hate crime offenders should be more severe than that of the traditional crime offenders (32.6%). The women respondents indicated that the punishment should be equal (64.9%). The result, a group unsure of exactly how to handle the issue of punishing hate crime offenders, but still understanding that something needs to be accomplished.

The sample group indicated that they perceived discrimination of gender, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and disability as problems at YSU. Approximately 62 percent of the sample group perceived discrimination, of at least one
of the mentioned characteristics, on campus. For this percentage of the sample group to indicate a problem, there must be some evidence to support the perception. The students provided this evidence by indicating that incidents of hate crime occurred on campus. See appendix F for detailed incidents. YSU administration must focus on ways of lessening this perception. The administration, as well as faculty and students must concentrate on preventing discrimination, in any form, from appearing at YSU or any other location.

Approximately 31 percent of the sample group reported that they committed a hate crime or bias motivated incident. This number, in itself, is enough to indicate hate crimes are still a prominent part of society. These are young, educated, adults who have grown up in a society of diversity. Why then, is the number of offenders so high? There are numerous explanations for this; however, it is not easy to specify exactly why. For the sample group, just not liking members of that particular group, or just to have fun, were among the most frequently noted motivations behind the offense. Tolerance, education, and respect must be incorporated within people when they are young. These characteristics must be instilled in people through family, school, community-based programs, and through the media.

It was not surprising to find that the women respondents were more likely to be victims of hate crimes. In all areas that proved to be statistically significant, women were more likely to be the victims. In turn, the data illustrated that the male participants were more likely to commit a hate crime. Such results support the general assumption that males are more prone to commit crimes. Accordingly, females are more susceptible to become victims.
In reference to victimization, it was not surprising that the data indicated the non-white respondents were more likely to be victimized. It was however, interesting to note that this same non-white group was more prone to commit a bias motivated incident. The research on this issue is unclear. Some researchers indicate whites commit more hate crimes, while others state non-whites offend more, as was illustrated in the literature review. Ironically, from the data reported in this study, non-white respondents were more likely to offend, as well as be victimized.

Our children, our students, our campuses, our communities, and our nation are infested with concepts of hate. We have been absorbed by prejudicial stereotypes, and have become accustomed to discrimination. We cannot allow such negativism to continue. It can and will only result in our destruction. Even though this study did not illustrate an overwhelming amount of hate crime occurrence, it should be used as a warning. Let it be used to illustrate that hate crimes are still prevalent in our society and will be if all sectors of the community do not work at eliminating it. Legislatures, educators, politicians, community leaders, and parents must support and educate children in their quest to discover diversity. Tolerance, as well as appreciation for diversity should be encouraged not discouraged.

Conducting this study has been an interesting and educational quest. It must be stated that it has also been disappointing. Growing up in a family where appreciation and respect for diversity were taught, it is disturbing to think that hate crimes continue to exist at such an extraordinary rate. Let this study be one to encourage further research and education on the prevention of hate crime incidents. It is essential to encourage an
understanding and respect among people of different genders, races, religions, sexual orientation, and disabilities, if ever this nation is to truly unite.

Equality Colorado. Fact Sheet: Hate Crimes Against Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals.

Publications.

And Statistics Section, Department of Justice Canada. http://canada.justice.gc.ca/
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Appendix A

Letter of Instruction to Faculty
October 7, 1998

Dear Faculty Members:

In an attempt to obtain data on hate crime issues for my Thesis in Criminal Justice, I will be conducting a research study. I am requesting your help and cooperation in collecting this data. I am asking that the enclosed questionnaires be distributed to all students enrolled in your introductory classes here at Youngstown State University and that they be completed during the first or second week of classes. The estimated time for completing the questionnaire is about 10 to 15 minutes.

The only responsibility you will be accountable for is distributing and then collecting the completed questionnaires. Please advise students that:

1. All participation is strictly voluntary and all responses will be kept anonymous and confidential;
2. There are absolutely no risks to any of the participants. Their grade in the class will not be affected by their decision to participate in this study;
3. They should sign the consent form and detach it from their questionnaires;
4. They should not participate in the study if they have already answered the questionnaire in another class.

Again, emphasize that participation is strictly voluntary.

Please collect questionnaires and consent forms separately, place both in the return inter-office envelope that is provided, and return to the Criminal Justice Department to the attention of Dr. Tammy King. If you decide not to participate, please return uncompleted forms to the Criminal Justice Department.

A copy of the approval form from the Human Subjects Research Committee is included for your review. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact Dr. Tammy King, Criminal Justice faculty member and head advisor, at (330) 742-7206. Dr. King will contact me with your concerns.

Sincerely,

Sonia I. Rafeedie
Appendix B

Informed Consent
Dear Students:

In my attempt to obtain data on hate crime issues for my Thesis in Criminal Justice, I will be conducting a research study. I am requesting your help and cooperation in collecting this data. You, as students at Youngstown State University, will be asked to complete a survey questioning your knowledge and experience with hate crimes. Approximate participation time will be 15 minutes.

There are no risks to any of the participants. All responses will be kept anonymous and confidential. Your participation in this study will not affect your grade in the course. Participation is strictly voluntary. The data will be handled in a professional manner, as so participants cannot be identified when the results are reported.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact Dr. Tammy King, Criminal Justice faculty member and head advisor, at (330) 742-7206. Dr. King will contact me with your concerns.

Sincerely,

Sonia I. Rafeedie

I understand the study described above and have been given a copy of the description as outlined above. I am 18 years of age or older and I agree to participate.

__________________________________________  ______________
Signature of Participant                                  Date
Appendix C

Human Subjects Committee Approval
September 11, 1998

Dr. Tammy King, Assistant Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
UNIVERSITY

RE: HSRC Protocol #09-99

Dear Dr. King:

The Human Subjects Research Committee has reviewed your protocol, "Hate Crimes: The Unidentified Evil," (HSRC# 09-99), and determined that it is exempt from review based on a DHHS Category 2 exemption.

Any changes in your research activity should be promptly reported to the Human Subjects Research Committee and may not be initiated without HSRC approval except where necessary to eliminate hazard to human subjects. Any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects should also be promptly reported to the Human Subjects Research Committee.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Robert Rando
Administrative Co-chair
Human Subjects Research Committee

cc

c: Dr. James Conser, Chair
Department of Criminal Justice
File
Appendix D

Data Collection Instrument:

Student Questionnaire
HATE CRIMES

*** All information obtained from the following questionnaire will be kept confidential and anonymous. Please answer the survey with all honesty and to the best of your knowledge. If you have already completed this questionnaire, please return the uncompleted survey to your professor. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Dr. Tammy King in the Criminal Justice department at 330-742-7206. My sincere thanks is extended to all participants.

1. What is your gender?  
   A. Female  
   B. Male

2. What is your race/ethnicity?  
   A. Caucasian (white)  
   B. African-American (black)  
   C. Asian American  
   D. Hispanic-American  
   E. Middle Eastern  
   F. American-Indian  
   G. Other (please specify)

3. What is your age?  
   A. Under 18  
   B. 18  
   C. 19  
   D. 20  
   E. 21-30  
   F. 31-40  
   G. 41 +

4. What is your current marital status?  
   A. Single  
   B. Divorced  
   C. Married  
   D. Separated  
   E. Widowed

5. What is your sexual orientation?  
   A. Heterosexual  
   B. Bisexual  
   C. Gay (Homosexual)  
   D. Lesbian (Homosexual)

6. Please list any physical disabilities you have: ________________________________

7. What is your current class rank?  
   A. Freshman  
   B. Sophomore  
   C. Junior  
   D. Senior  
   E. Graduate Student

8. What is your current GPA (Based on the last report period)? __________

9. What is your major? ________________________________
10. In your own words, please define a hate crime: ________________________________

11. (Please circle all that apply) At Youngstown State University, do you perceive any of the following as problems?
   A. Discrimination against gender
   B. Discrimination against race/ethnicity
   C. Discrimination against religion
   D. Discrimination against sexual orientation
   E. Discrimination against persons with disabilities
   F. Other (please specify) ______________________________________________________

12. (Please circle yes or no to each of the following) Do you believe you have ever been harmed, either physically or verbally, because of your:
   A. Gender: yes no
   B. Race/Ethnicity: yes no
   C. Religion: yes no
   D. Sexual Orientation: yes no
   E. Disability: yes no

13. If you were ever harmed due to any of the reasons indicated in question #12, WHAT was the harm and WHERE did the harm occur. (Examples of where the harm could have occurred include: Youngstown State University, a public arena, place of employment, high school, elementary school, home, religious institution, a social event… etc.) Please circle yes or no for each of the following and then indicate where the harm occurred.

   A. You were called inappropriate names. Yes No
      Where: ________________________________________________

   B. You were asked to leave a particular function or not to participate in an activity.
      Yes No
      Where: ________________________________________________

   C. You were encouraged (verbally or physically) not to reside in a particular community. Yes No
      Where: ________________________________________________

   D. You were asked to engage in certain behaviors. Yes No
      Where: ________________________________________________

   E. You were physically attacked. Yes No
      Where: ________________________________________________
F. You were sexually assaulted or raped.
   Where: ________________________________ Yes No

G. You were robbed.
   Where: ________________________________ Yes No

H. Your property was damaged, vandalized, or stolen.
   Where: ________________________________ Yes No

I. A friend or family member was murdered.
   Where: ________________________________ Yes No

J. You were overlooked for a particular job or promotion.
   Where: ________________________________ Yes No

14. (Please circle all that apply) When you were harmed, how many people committed the act?
   A. One person
   B. Two people
   C. A group of individuals (3 – 5 people)
   D. A crowd (5+)
   E. An organized group

15. When you were harmed, how many people were with you?
   A. You were alone
   B. One person
   C. Two people
   D. A crowd (5+)
   E. More than 5 people

16. (Please circle yes or no to each of the following) Have you ever harmed someone, either physically or verbally, because of their:
   A. Gender yes no
   B. Race/ Ethnicity yes no
   C. Religion yes no
   D. Sexual Orientation yes no
   E. Disability yes no
17. (Please circle all that apply) If you ever harmed due to any of the reasons indicated in question #16, what was the particular harm?
   A. I called an individual or group of individuals inappropriate names.
   B. I asked an individual or group of individuals to leave a particular function or not to participate in an activity.
   C. I encouraged (verbally or physically) an individual or group of individuals not to reside in a particular community.
   D. I asked an individual or group of individuals to engage in certain behaviors.
   E. I physically attacked an individual or group of individuals.
   F. I sexually assaulted or raped an individual or group of individuals.
   G. I robbed an individual or group of individuals.
   H. I damaged, vandalized, or stole property from an individual or particular group.
   I. I murdered an individual or member of a particular group.
   J. I overlooked an individual for a particular job or promotion.

18. (Please circle all that apply) Per your response to question #17, when you committed the particular harm indicated, where did the harm occur?
   A. Youngstown State University
   B. Home
   C. Public Arena
   D. Religious Institution
   E. Place of Employment
   F. Social Event
   G. Elementary or High School

19. (Please circle all that apply) When you committed the incidents indicated in question #17, how many people were involved in committing the act?
   A. One person
   B. Two people
   C. A group of individuals (3 – 5 people)
   D. A crowd (5+)
   E. An organized group

20. (Please circle all that apply) You committed the incident indicated in question #17 because:
   A. I dislike members of that particular group.
   B. A member of that particular group harmed a friend, a family member, or me.
   C. I was bored and needed something to do.
   D. I was just having fun with my friends.
   E. I do not want members of that particular group living in my community.
   F. I do not want members of that particular group going to my school.
   G. I do not want members of that particular group working at my place of employment.
   H. I was trying to teach that particular group a lesson by harming an individual member.
   I. Since they are lower class individuals, they deserve to be treated as such.
   J. Causing harm to particular individuals will remind the entire group that they are inferior.

21. (Please circle yes or no to each of the following) Have you ever witnessed a person or a group of people being physically or verbally harmed because of their:
   A. Gender yes no
   B. Race/Ethnicity yes no
   C. Religion yes no
   D. Sexual Orientation yes no
   E. Disability yes no
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22. (Please circle all that apply) If you witnessed harm being committed due to any of the reasons indicated in question #21, what was the harm that occurred?
A. I witnessed a person(s) being called inappropriate names.
B. I witnessed a person(s) being asked to leave a particular function or not to participate in an activity.
C. I witnessed a person(s) being encouraged (verbally or physically) not to reside in a particular community.
D. I witnessed a person(s) being asked to engage in certain behaviors.
E. I witnessed a person(s) being physically attacked.
F. I witnessed a person(s) being sexually assaulted or raped.
G. I witnessed a person(s) being robbed.
H. I witnessed the property of others being damaged, vandalized, or stolen.
I. I witnessed a person(s) being murdered.
J. I witnessed a person(s) being overlooked for a particular job or promotion.

23. (Please circle all that apply) Per your response to question #22, when you witnessed the particular harm, where did the harm occur?
A. Youngstown State University
B. Home
C. Public Arena
D. Religious Institution
E. Place of Employment
F. Social Event
G. Elementary or High School

24. (Please circle all that apply) When you witnessed the particular harm indicated in question #22, how many people were involved in committing the harm?
A. One person
B. Two people
C. A group of individuals (3 – 5 people)
D. A crowd (5+)
E. An organized group

25. I feel hate crimes cause greater negative consequences, to both the individual and the community, than do traditional crimes. Please circle your level of agreement or disagreement with this statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. In reference to the punishment hate crime offenders should receive, do you feel punishment should be:
A. Less severe than the punishment issued to traditional crime offenders.
B. More severe than the punishment issued to traditional crime offenders.
C. Equal to the punishment issued to traditional crime offenders.
D. I am indifferent to the whole issue regarding the punishment of hate crime offenders.
E. I do not feel hate crimes should be punished through legal means.
27. (Please circle all that apply) In looking at the issue of hate crime incidents, who do you perceive suffers most from the consequences? (Please rank from 1 – 8; with 1 being the most affected.)
   A. The victim
   B. The offender
   C. The victim’s family
   D. The offender’s family
   E. The particular group the victim is associated with
   A. The particular group the offender is associated with
   B. The community in which the incident occurred
   C. The nation as a whole

Additional Comments: ___________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

*** AGAIN, I WOULD LIKE TO THANK ALL THOSE WHO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN MY STUDY ON HATE CRIMES. YOUR HELP AND HONESTY IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.
Appendix E

Respondents’ Definitions of Hate Crime
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent #</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Crime that you comment out of hate – very bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A crime in which someone is a victim due to race, gender, and so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A violation of one’s personal space without their permission, and physically or mentally injuring them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A crime based on hate of an individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Something that someone does to another person/group of people that causes pain is out of pure dislike and complete ignorance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A crime committed against someone of a different status committed by someone who does not like what or who he or she represents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A hate crime is something you do out of hate for someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A crime committed out of hate for someone or something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A hate crime is a crime aimed at a person or group of people who is the object of a certain type of prejudice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>An act against someone that is based on hatred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Crime that is committed by feelings of hatred towards any specific set of people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A crime committed on a person due to their age, gender, race, etc. It is not done to that person but to that person’s ethnicity.

A crime committed against someone due to prejudice or racism.

A crime that is based towards degrading another race.

Rape.

Anything that is done in a way to hurt yourself, the people around, or your environment.

A crime committed against a person or a group of people based on prejudice such as race or religion.

A crime committed either out of hatred or anger towards self, other people or life.

A crime that is done out of a way to get back at someone or something.

A crime that is done out of anger.

Being bigoted towards a group, possibly to the point of doing physical damage like vandalism, or beating someone up.

Rape.

Rape and drugs.

Crime committed against someone based on race, creed, etc.

Killing a person because you don’t like what race they are.
When a crime is committed for no reason but hate for something that person is.

Unlimited bias.

A crime, which is done because of, hate of race or any discrimination.

A crime committed against a person because of their race, gender, religion…. etc.

Crime done against a person due simply because of their race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, etc. or any characteristic that the person doing the crime disagrees with.

Picking on a person for their customs, race, religion, or gender.

A crime based on ignorance and prejudice.

When someone is killed because of his or her race, religion, etc.

Crime committed against a person because of race, religion, and sexual orientation.

Something done in hate.

Something done against another race because of dislike.

Committing a violent act out of hatred towards another person or thing.

Hating someone of a different race for no reason besides color.

A crime against someone you hate or someone that is different.
Crime towards a specific person for reasons that are not controllable.

A crime against any person having to do with race.

Crime in which a person deliberately harms someone or something that they don’t like.

I think anything that is legal for one to do and yet is nasty is a hate crime.

Any crime that makes a person feel bad about their ethnic background.

A crime based on certain prejudices.

Physical violence based on discrimination of some sort.

The act of inflicting pain on someone else or an object because of a wrongdoing against yourself.

A crime committed on the basis of race, religion, or sexual orientation and not for personal gain such as theft.

A crime committed against someone based on their gender, race, or ethnicity.

Abuse to someone else – physical or verbal.

A crime that is acted upon emotions of dislike towards an individual.

Disliking a person because of who they are or what they do.
Any act that is discriminatory (mental or physical) towards another person.

Any mentally or physically injuring action against another person or group.

Crimes committed against someone due to ignorance about a special group or individual life choices.

Any crime that takes place against someone that is different from another person's perspective.

Murder.

A crime that involves a hateful act towards another person.

Racism – Like the Rodney King beating.

An act that violates the law done out of anger.

A hate crime is something that is illegal and can cause you to go to jail.

Someone that hates you because of your race, religion, or the way you look.

A crime someone performs against another person or group because of their differences.

A crime directed towards a particular group of individuals because of what they believe or who they are.

Committing a crime against someone because of being bias, prejudice or racist. Discriminating.
78 Any way of breaking the law due to discrimination or prejudice towards another.

79 People hating people – Racism.

80 A person being harmed because of their race, sex, or sexuality.

81 Someone who kills because of the color of their skin.

82 A crime that is hurtful towards a certain group of individuals.

83 A crime against a person based only on the victim’s race, gender, and sexual orientation.

84 Crime against person/group by person/group that hates them.

85 An act of ones nature from anger or/and frustration either to oneself or another person or object.

86 A crime committed because you dislike something about that person/group (racism).

87 A crime committed for no purpose other than out of hate, spite, or anger.

88 A crime that is committed because of hate towards a person or thing.

89 A criminal act against someone of a different race/ethnic or religious background because of their race/ethnicity or beliefs.

90 Verbally demeaning – causing physical harm to someone because you don’t agree with their race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.
91 Something to hurt or affect someone else.

92 A crime committed towards another person because of their race or sexual preference.

93 A crime which is done to someone to harm them physically or emotionally very badly.

94 Crime committed on a person or group just because of their ethnic background.

95 A hate crime is a crime committed because of wrong behavior of a person because of their personal discriminations.

96 Crime committed out of hate because of a person’s race, sex or gender.

97 Any action against another person or persons which is either verbally or more times physically abusive.

98 A crime done on the basis that person being of different race or religion.

100 A hate crime is a crime committed against a person because of their race, creed, color .. etc.

101 A crime committed with no other purpose in mind than to harm a specific group or person within that group.

102 A crime committed because of prejudice.

103 An act that is done upon someone because of race, gender, religion, or any other reason.
When somebody hurts another individual due to race, sex, gender, or creed.

Killing or harming someone because of their different color, race, or sexuality.

Murder.

An attack against any racial or ethnic group.

A crime committed out of ignorance and stupidity.

When someone hurts someone because they have a dislike for them.

A crime where someone is being discriminated against for no particular reason.

A crime committed by an extremely ignorant creature due to their inability to accept, understand, or even acknowledge something different.

Any crime.

A crime committed from the basis of hate for another person, religion, or the like.

Something done to someone else because you don’t share the same views.

A crime that does harm to someone else.

Vicious act of violence against a specific individual.
Any action directed towards an individual or group of different sex, belief, value, race, or any other reason for being different.

Any harmful act committed against a person based on the differences of that person and the one committing the act.

Anything that would degrade an individual to make him/her feel less than human.

Any crime done to a person or thing because of racial, ethnic, or religious backgrounds.

An act perpetrated on someone else because of a surface issue such as skin, color, sexual orientation, etc.

When someone does something like hit or steal something from someone they dislike.

Something someone does to another to cause brutal, physical or verbal, harm to them with no other reason except for spite or dislike or revenge.

A definite crime motivated by ignorance to the victims’ free will and lifestyle.

Crime committed against a person or group of persons due to race or religion.

Violence (in any of its varied forms) inflicted by one because of a deep-rooted hatred of another’s race, religion, sex orientation, etc.

Crime used against someone because of race or status.

A crime that is done in the aspect that it is planned.
A crime committed because of prejudice.

An act of violence which is inflicted because of being different from another individual.

A crime committed against a race, a gender, or a religion.

A crime which occurs over hate for another person, or group of persons.

A crime committed towards a person because of their race, sex, or gender.

A crime that is committed due to the motivation of hatred towards a victim due to race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or ethnicity.

A crime that is committed because of gender, race, religion. The criminal hates something about the victim.

A crime committed because of dislike or hate to a person or group of people because of differences in opinion or race etc.

A crime inflicted on others with the intent to be hateful and/or harmful because of race, gender, etc.

A crime that is done to do wrong to others.

A crime committed against a person because of reasons such as race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation.

Any crime, either physical or verbal, because of race, gender, religion, sexual orientation or disability.
A crime acted out based on prejudices.

An act that is committed towards a person because of their race, gender, etc.

Ex: Racism. Killing them because they are black or white or whatever. Putting harm to others.

Anything that may make you feel uncomfortable about a situation that could be legal.

Discrimination.

Something committed against something without any cause or reason.

An act of violence against someone or race you do not like.

Any wrong doing committed against someone of a "non-traditional" practice, belief, or way of life...

Any type of crime committed purposely to physically or mentally abuse an individual.

A crime that is done without any remorse or feeling for the other person.

A crime committed against any person or group of persons because of their race, religion, sexuality or appearance.

Committing a crime against a person because of their race, religion, or sexual orientation.

A crime which is based on nothing other than what the victim is.
A crime committed by an individual or group on a person who is of a different background.

A crime performed for no justified reason other than your feeling of dislike for the victim.

Crime committed out of hate for another person.

Anything that harms or destroys something.

A crime because of ignorance and discrimination.

A violent act that involves a disagreement or fight that is based on gender or race or religion (being different than that person).

Breaking a law with no other motive than the hate one feels towards the person of another race he/she has just directed the crime towards.

Crime committed against a certain race.

Burning the American flag.

Racism.

A hate crime is an act against another person because different prejudices.

A crime committed that most people would deem is particularly obscene and which inflicts great emotional distress on the victim. Hate crimes are generally against women.

A heinous act of violence against someone.
Crime committed through RAGE.

A crime against a person based on their ethnicity, race, religion, or sexual orientation.

Crime based on personal bias against a person or persons who are or appear to be a member of a group who are hated because of some characteristic (ex: race, class, sexual preference).

A crime perpetrated on another person because of his/her race, religion, beliefs.

A crime acted on or towards a person based only on one’s ethnic background.

Any crime done to a person or persons due to a negative stereotype placed upon them by the aggressor.

A crime committed senselessly due to extreme prejudice.

Unnecessary crime based on jealousy or dislike of someone.

Violence directed at a person because of their race, religion, sexual preference, etc.

A crime committed by a person who is in a state of rage or a crime committed against a person due to their race, culture, sexuality and so on.

A violent crime committed by a member or members of one race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, etc., against a member or members of another.

Blacks beating whites or whites beating black people.
Something an individual does to another because of race, religion, gender, etc.

Any crime that is acted out due to a strong dislike (hate) for the person that falls victim.

To hurt someone because of their race.

A hate crime is harm to another person, either physical or verbal, due to prejudice.

A crime committed by someone who hates a particular kind of person for example, race, religion, sex, etc.

Murder.

A crime committed out of spite or dislike of something, person, group.

Any crime done out of anger toward a certain group.

A crime against someone based on prejudices.

A violation of any law based or founded on racism, sexism, or any type of discrimination.

A crime committed against someone because of something about them that the criminal does not like. Eg: gay, race, etc....

A crime that is based on hate due to race or gender.

An attack upon someone based on gender, race, etc.
It is an act that is harmful to another person or people due to a preconceived prejudice.

Violent attack on someone because of personal dislike.

A crime committed against someone or something based on ethnic or sexual orientation or any other symbolic representation of that person or object.

Any violent act, physical or mental.

A crime committed by someone who finds another person’s lifestyle offensive or different and that physical abuse results.

A crime that is done to harm another person.

Anytime one person or group takes action against another person or group with intent to hurt due to differences in race or religion.

Crimes against a certain race, religion, or ethnic group that is done out of hate.

A crime committed due to a person’s hate of one’s own insecurities. Done to provide a source of security.

Just because of the color of your skin you are killed.

When someone commits crime against you because your race or background.

An act that is done solely on ones’ emotion, fears and ignorance.

A crime that takes place because of the hatred of one to another.
209 Crime that affect one personally.

210 An act against person or persons because of race, age, etc.

211 A crime in which the victim is targeted specifically on the basis of race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.

212 Something done to someone because of their race or gender.

213 A crime committed because of differences of opinions, which is not called for.

214 A crime committed due to hate.

215 A hate crime to me, is a crime committed upon someone from someone who thinks that they are superior to the other.

216 Physical harm to another person solely because of dislike of race, creed, culture, or beliefs.

217 A crime that is committed by one race against another, because of their race.

218 A crime committed on the basis that you don’t like a certain ethnic group of people.

219 A crime committed due to the lack of intelligence and understanding of one attacker.

220 A crime that happens to someone because of their race, religion, or sexual orientation.

221 Commit a crime against something or someone because of hatred to the person or object.
A crime against someone due to race, gender, sexual preference or other.

Hate crime is the act of committing crime based on race or other difference in status to show disapproval.

Acting hatefully towards another simply because he/she is different.

Someone with some type of prejudice against another individual.

An unlawful act due to some sort of discrimination or anger.

One who discriminates against others.

A crime or act of hate perpetrated on someone due to their race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.

Violent, physical or mental, abuse of a person who is of another race, creed, or system of beliefs.

Any illegal event that is done to another because of who they are.

Wrongful acts against another person.

When a crime is committed against an individual(s) because of their religion, race, gender, or sexual orientation.

A crime committed against another person due to race, sexual preference, gender, disability ...

Beating or murder due to race or sexual preference.
People committing violent/unlawful acts on people because of who they are, their color, sexuality, etc.

When someone of one race kills someone of another race.

Purposely doing harm because of gender, race, or other prejudices.

When some person is attacked on the basis of sex, religion, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or any other difference from the attacker.

Any crime committed based on prejudice.

Hatred against another person.

A crime committed against those who are of a different race, religion, and sexual orientation.

Any crime done against a person/group for the sole reason of hatred towards a person/group.

A crime committed due to some person’s beliefs against another person.

When someone injures or does a criminal act against someone or some race that he hates.

A crime committed against someone by another person who dislikes them.

A hate crime is a crime committed that is done with rage towards another because of race.
248 A crime committed against someone simply because of who they are, regardless of their actions.

249 Unnecessary discrimination.

250 When you are jealous or are against something or someone.

251 A crime based on a prejudice towards a group or single person of an ethnic or racial difference to the perpetrator.

252 A crime against a group or race of people.

253 A crime that is done on race or sexual orientation.

254 When a crime is based on hate and no other reason. People are very stupid as a whole, and will follow just about anything.

255 A crime against a person based on their race, gender, nationality, religion, etc.

256 A hate crime is when a law is broken simply because of one person’s prejudices toward another.

257 A crime committed against someone of a different race or religion they don’t like.

258 A hate crime is any wrongful act committed on any person or group due to gender, race, religion, etc.

259 A crime that is directed towards one or more people of a different group (example: ethnic, religion, etc).

260 A crime generally consisting of ethnic, religious, physical and or sexual intolerance.
Wrongdoing done upon someone based on their race, sex physical handicap, etc.

A crime that is done only because feelings of rage are present.

Hate crime is a crime committed when a person acts in a violent behavior toward someone because of race or religious beliefs.

A crime carried out by an individual or individuals against someone due to race or beliefs.

Is something like rape. Everyone hates it.

A crime that is done to hurt or intimidate a person for their beliefs or race.

A crime against a specific group for reasons that are unjustified.

Crime that is done out of hate towards a person or organization.

A crime against someone just because they are a different race or religion than the person committing the crime. Being different.

A criminal action that is done against someone’s will – rape, murder, assault, etc.

When a person commits a crime against another because of his/her race, gender, or ethnic background.

Something that is totally wrong and should not have been done.

Any type of crime committed against a different gender or race, as a result of .....
Any criminal act propagated by hate.

A crime committed against someone where the only motivation is hate.

A crime committed against a person for reasons based on race, color, sexual preference, etc.

Something based on hate to others.

A crime done in hate.

An act against someone or something just because you don’t like them/it.

Crime committed because of a dislike of race, religion, etc.

One that stems from prejudice toward a person or group.

Killing in the name of _____.

A crime committed against someone because of their religion or race or ethnicity or gender or sexual preference or personal handicaps.

Any and all violent crimes that inflict pain (mental/physical) or death. Based on a person's race, gender, religion, or social standing.

Crimes perpetrated by emotionally disturbed individuals often times affecting innocent victims. The cause is generally misguided superiority.
Violent ways of expression against others that are different than oneself.

I think a hate crime is something done in rage over something that was said. Like one person doing something that affects the community.

Crime stemming from hate toward someone or something.

A crime committed because of hate or anger.

A hate crime is a crime in which a person violates someone not because they know them personally, but because they do not like their gender, race, age, etc.

Crime committed when a person is angry or in the heat of the moment.

A hate crime is when a person inflicts damage to another person because of gender, race, or sexual orientation.

A crime one person commits on another because of a personal prejudice.

Any crime that is motivated because of race, gender, religion, sex or disabilities.

A crime that is done purposefully because of dislike.

A crime committed because of hate for a person or thing. No other reason.

When the KKK kills niggers.
Crime against someone because of their race, religion, etc.

An act of violence in which the only provocation is race, gender religion, etc.

A crime motivated by someone’s insecurity and hate of another person differing in race or sexual orientation.

A crime of violence or degradation aimed at a group or individual based upon factors such as race, religion, sexual orientation, etc.

I feel a hate crime is when a citizen of any race, creed, or religion beats the person, burns their home, or uses other forms of violence on another citizen because of their nationality, race, creed, or religion.

Actually I don’t know so I’ll guess. Someone who does something morally wrong to some other person because of age, race, gender.

A crime committed against a person/group because of their race, gender, or religion, or sexual orientation.

A crime committed against a person because the offender has a bias or prejudice against another based on race, gender, or other reasons that are not personal.

Crime committed with the purpose to hurt.

An unprovoked attack of violence against a member of a labeled group – usually a minority of some type.

A hate crime is a crime committed against a person/group based solely on some feature (example: race) of that person/group.
Crime against a group of people who have a different belief than you so you hurt them.

Crimes committed due to angry, disturbed, people who feel negative toward someone different then themselves.

A crime against someone other than your race, sex or sexuality.

Crimes or acts of violence that are triggered because of prejudice viewpoints to a group or people or one person.

A crime committed against someone based only on their race, sex, and religion.

Any crime committed against someone who is labeled as “different” - especially involving violence.

Something done to another person because of anger towards that person.

Something that somebody does to someone out of hate.

A crime committed by someone who is racist or very radical. A crime that hurts people.

A crime that is committed that is against the law, and directly against a specific person/group for a specific reason.

When a crime is committed against someone because of race, sexuality or beliefs.

Any violation that occurs with the intention of harm.
Actions that were caused from anger and were used against another person.

Any act committed against a person.

A crime committed to another individual acting out of hatred.

I am unaware of the definition of hate crime – possibly the hatred and rudeness of people of our society.

A crime committed against someone based upon their race, color, creed, or sexuality.

A crime committed against someone based solely on their race, color, religion, and sexual orientation.

Someone who attacks or slanders someone because of race, sexual preference or gender.

Something that is directed to a certain group or minority and is crime related.

A crime against a certain group.

Crime which is done to hurt someone.

Crime committed against someone because of race, gender, religion, etc.

A crime against a person or group of persons because of race, ethnicity, color and or handicap.

A hate crime is a crime where people place you as an object not a person.
A crime committed in a certain manner to specifically hurt a gender or race.

A crime against a person because of their race, sex, nationality, or sexual preference, etc.

When one person harms another because that person is not like them. People commit these acts simply because they “hate” certain groups of people or individuals.

A racial crime.

Don’t really know. Committing a crime against someone because of their race or gender.

A terrible mishap in society that allows violence to occur and obstruct danger which results in a violation of the law because of negative actions.

Crime committed out of hate towards a gender or race.

A crime committed against a certain group of people or person because..... blacks, Asians, Catholics .... etc.

A criminal act done for reason of hatred towards that person, group of persons, business, race, etc.

A crime targeted at another person.

A crime against another just because he/she is gay.

Any crime perpetrated against another due to race, gender, age, etc.... (verbal or physical).
Any crime that is intended to hurt someone.

Any crime committed because of a person’s race, gender, or any other distinguishing characteristic.

A crime aimed to hurt someone or something.

Any action that intentionally cause any type of discomfort because of race, gender, etc. Also this act is usually committed out of ignorance.

Robing or harming a person because of his/her race, gender or even religion.

A crime committed by a person who hates or disagrees with another person’s lifestyle, gender, race, etc. without actually knowing the person.

Assault, murder, or any crime with intent to hurt another person or persons.

When you do something bad to someone because you do not like him or her.

Something done against a person because of reasons beyond a person’s control.

Crime against someone for no reason or cause except one’s own personal beliefs.

Crime performed on a person(s) due to a prejudice attitude on the group.

A crime committed because of race, religion, or sexual orientation.
Crime done only out of anger and hate.

A crime committed against you because of race, gender, etc.

A crime committed against someone because of "who" they are (black, gay, etc.).

A crime similar to racism.

A crime that is an uncivilized action.

Well, when you despise someone or somebody to the point where you feel the person needs to be hurt in any type of way – mentally or physically.

When a person is physically harmed by the color, gender, or any other factor of being different.

A hate crime is an act of violence on another person or group of persons because of gender, race, nationality, etc.

A crime that is between people who for no reason totally hate someone and cause problems or get violent.

A crime that involves fear, hostility, and prevents a specific social, ethnic group or class of people from living freely.

Any crime that is based on a person's gender, race, religion or lifestyle.

A crime committed against a person for the sole purpose of intimidation of that person's ethnic background, sexual orientation, religion, etc.
An act of violence for no reason against an individual.

Crime committed against another for religious, racial, sexual orientation, or reasons thought to be wrong in that person’s eyes.

A crime perpetrated with the intent to harm.

A crime committed due to race, creed, sexual orientation, or gender.

Any illegal activity done in rage or anger. Any crime that disturbs the victim.

Someone inflicting some kind of pain on someone else due to their race.

A crime committed out of hate.

Crime against someone because of gender, race, nationality, etc.

Crime that involves hate.

Crime committed against a person(s) different than yourself.

A crime that comes about because of someone’s gender, sexual orientation, race, or religion.

An act of violence done towards someone because of ignorance.

Crime committed out of hate maybe hate against another race.

A crime motivated by prejudice.
401  Something done out of anger only.

402  When one person of one race or group goes after another race or group, because of who they are.

403  A crime committed with intent to hurt just because you don’t like the way someone looks.

404  Crime against another person of a different race, gender, ethnic background, etc.

405  Any crime based solely on causing harm to a particular segment of the population.

407  A crime committed solely because one person hates another for a particular reason.

408  A crime directed at you because of race or gender or economic status.

409  Crime of discrimination towards another person because of race, sex, sexual preference or spite.

410  Any discriminating gesture, comment, or expression of contempt towards a person(s).

411  A crime committed due to hatred of gender, race, creed, color, etc.

412  A crime that is not random, but based merely on the prejudice or hatred of a person or group.

413  Crimes that occur due to the presence of hate, anger, and ignorance towards another person.
Anything done to another for the purpose of hurting in any way because of their appearance, ethnicity, beliefs, etc.

Crime that occurs because of a person(s) hate for another race, religion, sexual preference, etc.

A hate crime is one in which we (they) do something horrible to another person because of his race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation.

A crime that is acted upon someone or something that is wrong, hurtful and hateful.

A crime committed against person or group of persons because they are different in any way, shape, or form.

A crime committed with no personal dislike for the individual but for what they are (gay, black, and white).

A crime that is meant to bring harm to a person or group of people, due to the hate of them by a person.

A crime that is committed and is bad enough to cause fury and disgust with the public.

Crime committed to hurt a person(s) for such reasons as race, ethnicity, gender, or certain groups or organizations, etc.

A crime committed because of race, gender, or sexual orientation.

A crime committed against someone of a different background by someone in an ignorant fashion.

A racial crime committed only out of hate for a person whom has not done anything to provoke it.
In a general sense, any crime committed towards someone from a stereotypical viewpoint (race, handicap, and religion).

A violent action against another person to provoke or hurt.

A crime committed against a person due to a certain reason such as race, sex...

A crime committed with the purpose of harming someone because of their age, sex, race, religion, or other social status.

Crime committed out of no other purpose than prejudice.

Discrimination.

A crime in which racism is used as a motivating factor.

A violent action by one person against another based on either race, religion, sexuality, etc.

A crime against anyone that is different in any way from someone else.

When someone commits a crime out of hatred.

Racism. A crime committed out of dislike for a particular group of people.

A violent act done because of one’s prejudices.

A crime committed only because one hates a person or thing, without having a legitimate reason to back the “hate” up.
A crime that is committed against someone because of gender or ethnic background.

A crime committed out of anger. A crime caused by disagreements, etc.

An attack on a certain social group or culture in hate, rage, or fury.

Hate crime is usually committed by one or more younger kids where they really don’t mean any harm.

A crime committed against a member of a type of group such as gender, race, ethnic group, etc. out of hate.

I believe it is a discrimination against a person for a particular reason.

Someone who does something to get revenge on someone else.

Crime committed against a person because or their race, religion, disability or other.

A crime that is committed against you because of your background, race, religion, etc.

A crime that takes place because of dislike of someone or something.

Doing something to someone or a group because you are against them.

Any crime committed towards another person because of their race, gender, or sexual orientation.
A hate crime is an act of hatred one has against someone for reasons such as being a different race, gender, religion, etc.

A violent crime against people or groups of people because of a bias or some type or prejudice.

A crime committed due to an individual or groups own personal hate of another individual or group without logical reason.

A crime done to someone because of race, gender, religious beliefs, a disability, etc.

Crimes committed against a person for what they are and believe in.

An act that involves violence towards a person of another gender or various religion.

Any crime that targets another, based on race, gender, sexual orientation or any other specific racist or bigoted motive.

Crimes involving people of different race, gender or orientation, or otherwise committed due to dislike of others beliefs or lifestyles.

A crime that is done out of hate for the victim.

Crimes against specific races, religions, and/or other groups.

Some act done upon someone due to prejudice.

When you assault or do something wrong to someone you dislike regardless of gender.
Any crime committed against a person (s) whether physically or verbally.

When you are discriminated against because of race, gender, religion and other things.

Something bad done to a person of a different race, sexual orientation than the person who committed the act.

An act specifically violating a certain group of people based on race, sexual orientation, and so on.

A very serious discrimination against someone’s own personal background.

An act or attack on someone of a different race, religion, etc.

A crime against someone because they are a different race, religion, gender, or have a different sexual orientation.

Physical or mental abuse.

A crime which is committed solely on the basis of any preconception toward a person or group based on something that the criminal does not like (homosexuals, women, ethnic groups).

Crime committed out of hatred towards someone of a certain race, religion, or even sexual status.

One which is done out of malice, includes victims.

A crime committed on someone because of certain traits believed to be wrong by the offender.
A crime against another in which stereotypical depiction's played an important role in the choice of the victim.

Any crime that is exercised due to one's internal dissatisfaction with another based on race or sexual preference.

A crime committed by anyone who is the opposite of the attacker's gender or race.

A crime that has to do with hate against a person because of the person's beliefs, race, gender, etc.

A crime committed against a particular race, gender, sex, etc.

A violent act towards somebody or thing causing serious harm.

Crime against person because of these race, religion, gender, etc.

A crime committed solely because of the victims' race, sex, or gender orientation.

A crime committed against someone because of their race, sex, religion, etc. Example: the KKK crimes.

A crime that someone commits in spite of someone that they don't like very much. They either harm them verbally or physically.

When a crime is committed based on hate.

A hate crime is a crime committed by an individual with a motive of "hating" a specific group whether it be ethnic, racial, gender, sexual preference, etc.

Crime that happens because of your color, religion, etc.
Something done to show your hate for someone (illegal).

Crime due to discrimination.

A crime that is committed in order to hurt or humiliate a certain group of people.

A crime between different races.

Any crime dealing with a certain race or because of a certain dislike of a race.

Crime of one or more persons towards another of verbal or physical abuse due to lack of knowledge of a person.

When criminals hate their victims.

A hate crime is an outward abuse against someone that is “different” than oneself.

A crime committed because someone doesn’t like another person’s way of life or how they look.

A deliberate act upon someone with the intention to do physical harm to a particular group, race, gender, etc.

A crime that occurs because of a person’s specific race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.

A crime committed against a person by someone who hates or dislikes them with intentions to hurt a person.

A violent act of physical or verbal abuse against someone because of gender, race, religion, or sexual orientation.
Some form of crime committed because of someone’s race, gender, sexual preference, religion, etc.

Any act against a specific group of people.

A violent crime which involves deliberately trying to harm another human being.

A crime done towards a person based solely on the victim’s race, gender, religion, etc.

Crime committed against a person because of their race, color, creed, or sex, or personal beliefs.

An either physical or mental scaring from racial hate/discrimination.

People who do things out of hate to hurt others

A crime committed because of a prejudice.

A crime committed based on the hate a person has of another person because of something a person believes in or is.

Hate crime is a crime committed against a person because the criminal does not agree with the victim’s age, gender, race, etc.

A crime against a person of one race or gender by a person of another race or gender.

A crime purposely committed to harm, scare, discriminate against people of another race.
Criminal action towards a person due to their race, sexual orientation, and gender.

An act of violence done to one because of race, creed, color, orientation, etc.

Crime committed out of anger against someone whose race, gender or status does not match the aggressors.

An evil act upon someone for reasons of hatefulness.

A crime committed against someone because of their race, ethnic background, or sexual preference.

Abuse to another person or group based on the personal beliefs of the person or group.

Someone putting all their anger on to innocent people.

A crime that is committed that has no reference to the individual that it is acted upon. It is purely hate of something that person is or stands for.

Crimes based on a racial platform.

A crime that the person does because he/she dislikes how things are.

You hate someone or something and take it out by doing something illegal.

A crime that is committed out of hate. Hate of another race.

A crime done out of hatred to a specific group or person.
A crime or abuse of someone by someone who abused because of a physical, or prejudicial reason for hatred.

Doing something to someone because you don’t like their sex, race, etc., not because they did anything to you personally.

A crime that is carried out with premeditation, for no other reason but revenge or something along that line.

A terrible crime attempted to get revenge or acted out just for fun.

A crime done in a state of rage or hate at another person or thing.

A hate crime is an act of violence committed against a person or a group of people because of their race, religion, sexuality, gender, disability.

A crime in which discrimination against any group is obvious, hurtful, degrading. Violent actions directed toward a person for no real reason other than their “belonging” to a certain group.

Crime based on prejudices against a race, religion, people’s sexual preference or nationality or for even those you hang around.

Something done intentionally to harm someone very seriously.

A crime against a person(s) motivated solely out of contempt for that person’s race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.

A crime motivated by racial tensions.

A crime done by torture.

Evil happening due to something that was done to you. Revenge.
549 A crime committed against a person for no reason (money) other than a characteristic about them (race).

550 A crime against someone due to their sexuality, ethnic background or other. This must be also done unprovoked.

551 Crime committed by someone as a result of his/her hatred/dislike for someone different (sex, race).

552 Any crime that is a direct violation of a person’s rights.

553 Discrimination against someone because of a characteristic of a person.

554 An unlawful action stemming from a strong disliking of another classification of people.

555 People who hate outside of their own race.

556 Crime committed because of hate for one’s race, sex, or other personal enigmas.

557 Verbal abuse, violence or other criminal act against another party exclusively motivated by prejudice in regards to ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, etc.

558 When you hate someone based on their color or beliefs.

559 Saying or doing mean things to someone. Being hateful.

560 All crimes are hateful, but I think a “hate crime” is one where the victim is hurt, killed, etc…. for a specific reason. Ex: victim is chosen for belonging to a particular religion, or for being born into a certain race.
A crime which is done out of spite or dislike for a person or thing for what they are and what they stand for.

An act of violence, or any physical abuse, or mental, verbal abuse towards a person different then yourself.

Something that happens because someone hates some (one, group or thing) and is not adult enough to handle differences.

A crime committed with no other fulfillment but the fact that the criminal did not like or the victim was different than the criminal.

Crime that exists when two different races are involved and one of the races are physically or verbally harmed because of their race.

Disliking a certain race, ethnic group or person with any disability and committing a crime.

A crime that is committed because of a person’s race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religious belief, etc.

Crime committed because you dislike a specific race/ethnicity.

A crime which is committed to show a form of hatred.

Something done too purposely harm another.

A crime (any crime) done to someone to harm that person.

Any crime (verbal or physical) that can degrade a group, society, or person.

A type of violence, physical or verbal toward a certain race.
A crime against a person solely because they are of a certain race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, etc.

A crime based on fears caused by a combination of ignorance and total disregard of one's religious, ethnic, or sexual stance in life.

Based on race or sexuality and sometimes gender.
Appendix F

Places Victimization Occurred
### PLACES WHERE THE RESPONDENTS WERE VICTIMIZED

Where the Respondents Were Called Inappropriate Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s Home</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Event</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Event</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institution</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everywhere</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Respondents Were Asked Not to Participate or Leave a Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s Home</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Event</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institution</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Respondents Were Asked Not to Reside in a Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown, OH</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowelville, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield, OH</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austintown, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardman, OH</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Respondents Were Asked to Engage in Particular Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s Home</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Event</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Line</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everywhere</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Respondents Were Physically Attacked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend's Home</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Event</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Event</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown, OH</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean City</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Respondents Were Raped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s Home</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Event</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</td>
<td>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</td>
<td># OF RESPONDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend's Home</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struthers, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Respondents' Property was Damaged, Vandalized, or Stolen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s Home</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Event</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Event</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown, OH</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Respondents’ Family Member/Friend was Murdered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s Home</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown, OH</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardman, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples, Italy</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Respondent was Overlooked for a Job or Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE INCIDENT OCCURRED</th>
<th>% OF SAMPLE GROUP</th>
<th># OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Arena</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struthers, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles, Oh</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardman, OH</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On line</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donofrio Women’s Center</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packard</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Motors</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payless Shoe Store</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather Not Say</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Shack</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Respondents' Additional Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent #</th>
<th>Additional Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Blacks are more bias/hate whites than vice versa. Eliminate affirmative action --- less qualified get the job. This will eliminate incompetence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>This test is too long!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge in aspect to people who commit hate crimes, forget or just don’t care to respect life and the fact that human beings deserve a right to life in a sometimes unjust environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>I think everyone should be judged as being an individual, no matter what race, religion, or sexuality they are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>I believe hate crimes are nearly impossible to control. Most people when assaulted are too embarrassed to admit to the assault and therefore drive themselves insane trying to forget about it. People should get help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>I feel that you should treat people the way you would want to be treated no matter of race, sex, religion...etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Because this is my first year in Criminal Justice, I’m sure my views will change in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Hate crimes are a major problem in today’s society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Good Report!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why do you ask opinions? If evil is going to survive, it will survive. If not, well so. Do not label hate crimes as more important than others.

Discrimination at YSU is subtle and often disguised as socially appropriate behavior. In reality, it is manipulative, sneaky, and sinister. In reality, many otherwise respected people on campus do not treat others they way they would expect someone to treat their loved ones. There is hypocrisy and manipulation at play here.

I’m sure that after I have studied Criminal Justice in detail my views on a lot of these things will change.

Some of these questions depend on what kind of hate crimes—Ex. murder or physical assault, verbal assault?

Organize your questions!

This was a very interesting and educational survey!

Read any bathroom wall on campus.

I really appreciate this survey – it really gives a person a chance to voice their opinion.

I feel that hate crimes are committed by ignorant hateful people who have no place in our society. Although I believe punishment should be equal to that of non hate crimes, I believe punishment for both should be extremely severe. If the punishments were more severe, less crimes would be committed.

Although hate crimes are bad and wrong, people do have the right to hate. You cannot force people not to hate through law. Only punish any illegal actions that they carry out because of it.
I think hate crimes occur out of ignorance, lack of education, and past events of the world’s history. Hate crimes are sad, because the world as a whole can never progress - only regress.

With every hate crime, new volunteers are recruited into the warring parties.

I think hate crimes are within everyone. To some extent everyone is singled out and somewhere along the line that person is hated for it. Whether it be race, sexual orientation, financial standards, the way one is dressed ... etc. I think everyone hates some individual for some reason or another.

I have grown up and realized that hate crimes are ridiculous.

HATE CRIMES SUCK!

In response to question #26, I feel hate crime punishment should be equal to that of traditional crimes, perhaps different punishment, such as counseling can be used.

I feel there is hate in this nation because the government lets there be. We are all brothers on this earth together. So we might as well just get along. No one is better than anyone else. Life is too short for things like this to be going on.

I called people inappropriate names to persuade them that their point of view was wrong.

I think that crime happens because of hate groups. Crime would not exist without them. They are the problem and the cause of crime. You are welcome and good luck.

I feel that each hate crime should be legally analyzed separately and should have its own severity of punishment due to the severity of the crime.
I think hate crime offenders need to be exposed to everyday life of the group they assault.

Hate is a product of ignorance and insecurity.

Sometimes discrimination (if you consider this a hate crime) is not that obvious. Your choices seemed to attempt to categorize my opinions and experiences with discrimination. That is impossible. Discrimination occurs everywhere, against everyone by everyone, on all levels. It is an inevitable consequence of life.

Good Luck.

I feel that if a person is such a selfish person to do harm to someone that is different then them (in anyway) should get the same thing done to them so they could feel the wrong in their crime.

I am a firm believer in the “eye for an eye” policy. This way you know what degree of punishment you will receive for the crime. No if, ands, or buts about it. Your welcome and I hope you do well with this information.

People are cruel sometimes and it is wrong.

I disagree with the statement that hate crimes cause more negative consequences than traditional crimes because any crime is bad – whether it is a result of hate or not.

It is ridiculous that a person would do harm or degrading things to another individual just because that person is somehow different.

I feel that hate crimes are very severe and rising. YSU is a very diverse school and I do not see many hate crimes although I do know that things often happen in high schools. When someone is raised a certain way also they seem to be more active in hate crimes.
I don’t know how you’re going to get anybody to circle I in question # 17.

The punishment of hate crime offenders should be based on the severity of the crime itself.

I’m grateful for the opportunity to complete a survey that will be used to educate and inform people or peoples of the injustices and intolerable acts committed on a daily basis and hope this will aid in bettering the views and actions of those involved and those indirectly involved as a result. Thank you.

You placed calling a person a name and murder in the same level. When asked about punishment there should be a range in the degree of crime.

Your welcome and I hope this works out for you.

Hate crimes as defined in your research may not necessarily be (only) what you’ve given us as choices. Others may include lack of benefits in school due to your ethnicity, this however, occurs here in Youngstown. Please include this as a crime.

I am against hate crimes based on race, however there are certain groups that by acting in such a manner may deserve the consequences they receive.

I believe people have a right to their own opinions and should not be forced into changing it, but there is a limit to how they express their opinion. They have gone too far when they act out violently and must face the consequences of their actions.

Good Luck.

Good survey. But sorry I could not be more helpful. I guess I have lived a secluded life.
You should give (tell) the punishment for hate crimes – many do not know.

I have been called inappropriate names at high school because of the certain races that I have dated. I feel that it is a shame that for as many different nationalities, races etc…. That we can’t celebrate each other’s diversity and instead we cause verbal or physical abuse because some feel being different is wrong.

I’ve only had limited exposure to hate crimes.

Though I am nauseated by hate crimes, I do not feel our judicial system should be given the responsibility of determining that sort of motive for a crime. If a robbery occurs, the punishment should be equal for both the greedy offenders as well as the hate motivated offender. It is not the courts’ responsibility to tell us how to think. By the First Amendment, we are entitled to hate anyone we wish.

The only reason most of these things are labeled hate crimes is because of the fact that they are against someone who is different. How come if a murder is committed against a black by a black, it is not called a hate crime? It’s motive was hate or anger for the other. Every crime is a hate crime. No discrimination.