The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

SUMMARY REPORT:
UNDERSTANDING AND MEASURING BIAS VICTIMIZATION AGAINST LATINOS
GRANT NO: 2016-V3-GX-0001

SUBMITTED BY:

Carlos A. Cuevas, Ph.D.[1], Principal Investigator
Amy Farrell, Ph.D.[1], Co-Principal Investigator
Jack McDevitt, Ph.D.[1], Co-Investigator
Sheldon Zhang, Ph.D.[2], Co-Investigator
Jeff Temple, MD.[3], Co-Investigator
Jesenia Robles, B.A.[1], Research Assistant
and
Sarah Lockwood, M.S.[1], Research Assistant

[1]Violence and Justice Research Laboratory
School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Northeastern University
204 Churchill Hall
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115
617-373-7462
c.cuevas@northeastern.edu

[2]School of Criminology and Justice Studies
University of Massachusetts Lowell
113 Wilder Street
Lowell, MA 01854
978-934-4160
sheldon_zhang@uml.edu

[3]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
The University of Texas Medical Branch
301 University Blvd
Galveston, TX 77555
jetemple@utmb.edu

INTRODUCTION

Hate crimes or bias motivated crimes have the power to seriously impact people and their communities. These crimes are on the one hand deeply personal, in that violence or harm is directed at a person due to their immutable characteristics, and on the other hand, they are message crimes, aimed at striking fear in communities that share characteristics with the targeted victims. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (1999) defines a hate or bias-motivated crime as "a criminal offense committed against a person, property, or society which is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias against a race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity/national origin." Despite the passage of state and federal laws, hate crimes continue to persist and for some groups have increased (FBI, 2018). In 2017, hate crimes increased 17% over the previous year and represented the third consecutive year in a row of increased rates of bias victimization (FBI, 2018).

Despite the severe consequences of bias motivated crimes (Boyd, Hammer, & Berk, 1996; Levin & McDevitt, 2002; Perry, 2002) these victims are unlikely to report victimization to authorities. As a result, bias motivated crimes are more common than suggested by police crime data (McDevitt, Levin, & Bennett, 2002; Shively & Mulford, 2007). Victimization surveys confirm that bias motivated crimes against Latinos have risen over the past decade. The Bureau of Justice Statistics documents an alarming rise in violent hate crimes perpetrated against Latinos, with reported victimization of Latinos rising from 0.6 per 1,000 persons in 2011 to 2.0 per 1,000 persons in 2012 (Wilson, 2014). Similarly, in the 2012 Nation Crime Victimization Survey (NVCS) bias crime victims were much more likely to perceive that their victimization was based on ethnicity (51 percent) compared to race, religion, gender or sexual orientation. This represents a significant increase from the 22% of hate crimes perceived to be motivated by

ethnicity in 2004 (Wilson, 2014). Although these data suggest that bias crimes against Latinos are increasing, we know little about whether the motivation for these crimes is because of a person's perceived immigration status or if immigrant Latinos are more likely to be victimized than non-immigrant Latinos since the NCVS does not include information about a respondent's immigration status. Additionally, nationally representative self-report victimization surveys, such as the NCVS, are likely to miss victimization that is concentrated in smaller sub-areas such as the communities where immigrants are likely to live. Research examining immigration patterns and bias motivated crime suggests that hate crimes targeting Latinos are more likely to occur in communities where the Latino populations have recently increased (Stacey, Carbone-López, & Rosenfeld, 2011).

In addition to needing better mechanisms to identify bias crime victims, tools such as victimization surveys need to capture a wider array to victimization experiences which necessitates the design of survey instruments that help potential victims understand their experiences. Bias crimes are not well understood among the general population and may seem to be an even more foreign concept for populations who expect to face discrimination, hostility and harassment due to their status or perceived status as immigrants. As a result, it is necessary to ask questions about bias motivated victimization in a way that captures a broad range of bias events, from harassment and micro-aggression to violent or property crime that is motivated by bias. As a result, it is crucial to measure not only events that would be clearly bias crimes (e.g., physical attack while the perpetrator is using racial slurs or other indication that they are assaulting due to the person's race) versus events that may not be clearly bias crimes, but victimizations that are bias motivated but not clearly criminal acts (e.g., name calling, work exploitation, etc.).

In addition to gaps in our understanding about the degree and nature of bias crimes against Latinos, we lack information about the factors that increase risk of bias victimization and the impact of bias victimization experiences among Latinos. Generally, victimized individuals may rely on formal resources such as reporting incidents to the police, otherwise involving the criminal justice system, and other professional help outlets (e.g. social services, counseling, medical interventions), or informal help resources including consulting friends or family (McCart, Smith, & Sawyer, 2010). Understanding when and under what conditions Latinos seek help following bias crime victimization is crucial in developing appropriate services and prevention efforts.

This study utilizes a community-based survey that provides information about the nature and pattern of bias motivated victimization among Latinos, with particular emphasis on understanding bias motivated crimes against immigrants to answers five main questions.

Key Study Questions

1. What is the nature and pattern of bias motivated victimization among immigrant and non-immigrant populations residing in high Latino population communities?

2. How frequently and in what ways does bias motivated victimization occur with other forms of victimization in immigrant and non-immigrant populations residing in high Latino population communities?

3. How often and in what ways do those immigrant and non-immigrant victims who experience bias motivated victimization report their victimization and/or seek help through formal and informal mechanisms?

4. What are cultural factors that potentially contribute to bias victimization risk?

5. Does bias victimization have a unique contribution to negative psychosocial outcomes associated with victimization generally? For example, does bias victimization lead to negative mental health outcomes that are above-and-beyond that of other forms of victimization?

DESIGN AND METHODS

Recruitment

Study participants were recruited across three major metropolitan areas of the United States: the greater San Diego metro area, Southern Texas (Galveston and Houston) and metro-Boston. This sample represents three diverse geographic regions of the U.S. which contain Latino populations from different countries of origin and with different types of immigration statuses.

Recruitment occurred through a number of approaches. Partnerships with community agencies were established in each study site and these agencies allowed the research team to recruit through the individuals connected to the agency. These agencies predominantly served the Latino community or had large percentage of Latinos that made use of their services. In addition to directly recruiting community members through community-based agencies, recruitment also took place through Latino-focused events in the community such as cultural festivals (e.g., Puerto Rican festival, Columbian festival, etc.).

The community-based agencies distributed information about the study to members of the Latino community that they serve while at festivals and other public setting the research team directly recruited eligible participants. While the recruitment methodologies were not intended to secure a sample that was representative of the entire Latino population in each study site, significant effort was made to ensure recruitment occurred in a variety of venues serving various Latino populations.

Survey Administration

Individuals who agreed to participate in the survey were randomly selected into one of two conditions, either completing the survey on a tablet provided by the research team or

completing the survey using a link to their mobile device. This administration randomization was done to evaluate whether completing the survey in person or on their own would impact reporting rates on the variables of interest[1]. Initial analysis comparing the two main condition shows that those completing the survey on their own device reported significantly lower rates of lifetime bias victimization in comparison to those completing the survey on a tablet with the research staff (49.1% vs 58.3% respectively). However, there were no significant differences on reporting rates for past year bias victimization or lifetime or past year non-bias victimization across the administration conditions. Once presented with the survey, participants reviewed the IRB approved consent form, and if they agreed, completed the survey in their preferred language (English or Spanish). Upon completion of the survey, participants were given a $30 gift card remuneration for their time.

Participants completed all the measures on the survey in addition to providing demographic information. Victimization experiences were evaluated with the *Bias Victimization Questionnaire for Latinos (BVQ - L)* (Cuevas & Farrell, 2016) to determine bias victimization events and the *Lifetime Trauma and Victimization History (LTVH)* (Widom, Dutton, Czaja, & DuMont, 2010) to evaluate other non-bias forms of victimization. The *Help-seeking Questionnaire* (Sabina, Cuevas, & Schally, 2012) was used for respondents to evaluate formal and informal help-seeking following bias victimization. Cultural factors were evaluated with the *Brief Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican-Americans (Brief ARSMA-II)* for acculturation and

---

[1] At the start of the study there was a third condition for paper and pencil administration of the survey, but this was removed from the design early on due to the challenges of competing such a complex survey on paper (e.g., not following skip patterns, challenges with data entry).

enculturation, the *Social, Attitudinal, Familial and Environmental (SAFE) Stress Scale* for acculturative stress, and an adapted version of the *Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q)* (Marian, Blumenfeld, & Kaushanskaya, 2007) to evaluate language proficiency. Finally, four of the subscales from the *Trauma Symptom Inventory – 2 (TSI-2)* (Breire, 2011) were used to evaluate mental health symptoms.

PARTICIPANTS

The sample consisted of 910 Latino adults (305 from Boston, 302 from Houston, and 303 from San Diego) with an average age of 36 years and who ranged in age from 18 to 90. The sample was evenly split between men and women (46.8% and 52.6% respectively) with the sample showing 56.1% being immigrants to the US. Detailed sample demographics are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Participant Demographics (N=910)

	Mean	SD	Range
Age (n=788)	36.3	14.59	18-90
	N	%	
Gender			
Male	425	46.8	
Female	478	52.6	
Other	5	0.6	
Education			
Less than high school	181	20.9	
High school/GED	309	35.7	
Some college/trade	182	21.0	
2-year degree	43	5.0	
4-year degree	88	10.1	
Some graduate school	20	2.3	
Graduate school	42	4.9	
Income			
Less than $9,999	226	26.8	
$10,000-$19,999	164	19.4	
$20,000-$29,999	137	16.2	
$30,000-$39,999	97	11.5	
$40,000-$49,999	68	8.0	
$50,000-$59,999	41	4.9	
$60,000-$69,999	32	3.8	
$70,000-$79,999	27	3.2	
$80,000 or more	53	6.3	
Immigrant Status			
Immigrant	509	56.1	
Non-Immigrant	399	43.9	
Documentation Status (immigrant only)			
Documented	343	72.2	
Undocumented	132	27.8	

DATA ANALYSIS

The following analyses were done to answer the key study questions

Question 1: Bias victimization rates were calculated overall and across key groupings (gender, immigrant status, and documentation status). Bias events were divided into two categories. The first represented any type of bias event and the second represented only those events that could be classified as hate crimes. For all bias events respondents were asked about both lifetime and past year victimization.

Question 2: Co-occurrence percentages of bias victimization with other forms of victimization were calculated.

Question 3: Rates of both formal and informal help-seeking were calculated for participants who reported experiencing bias victimization.

Question 4: Logistic regression models were conducted to evaluate the role of cultural factors on bias victimization overall, hate crime, and non-criminal bias events. The models controlled for demographic variables as well as non-bias victimization. Due to missing data, primarily as a result of participants not responding to the question on race, logistic regression models were calculated using multiple imputation.

Question 5: Linear regression models were conducted to evaluate the role of bias victimization while controlling for demographic characteristics, cultural factors, and non-bias victimization. As with the logistic models, multiple imputation was used due to missing data.

FINDINGS

Question 1: For question 1 we examined the rates of bias victimization overall and across groupings including gender, immigrant status, and documented status. Overall, 52.9% of participants experienced some form of bias event in their lifetime. There were significant

differences between men and women on some of the more serious events (e.g., physical assaults, assaults with weapon) but not on the overall rate. Of note, is that non-immigrants were significantly more likely to report bias victimization than immigrants (58.2% vs. 48.8% respectively) while there were no significant differences across documented and undocumented immigrants. The overall past year bias victimization rate was 25.6%, with no significant differences across gender, immigrant status, or documented status. Detailed results are presented in Tables 2 and 3. While detailed results across sites are not presented here, participants from Boston had a significantly higher lifetime bias victimization rate than those in Houston and significantly higher than both Houston and San Diego on past year bias rates.

Table 2

Lifetime Bias Victimization Percentages (N=910)

	Overall	Gender		Immigrant Status		Documentation Status	
		Male	*Female*	*Immigrant*	*Non-immigrant*	*Doc.*	*Undoc.*
Victimization type	*% (n)*	46.8 (425)	52.64(478)	56 (509)	43.94 (399)	72.2 (343)	27.8 (132)
Any Bias victimization	52.9 (472)	55.6 (234)	50.4 (234)	48.8 (244)	58.2 (227)*	49.6 (170)	46.2 (61)
Any Hate Crime	28.4 (253)	32.8 (138)	24.4 (113)*	23.6 (118)	34.4 (134)*	23 (79)	24.24 (32)
Physical Assault	12.6 (112)	17.3 (73)	8.4 (39)*	9.4 (47)	16.5 (64)*	9 (31)	8.4 (11)
Threatened w/ weapon	10.7 (95)	17.1 (72)	4.9 (23)*	7.2 (36)	14.9 (58)*	8.5 (29)	3.8 (5)
Threatened face-to-face	19.5 (173)	25.4 (107)	14.4 (66)*	15.9 (79)	23.9 (93)*	14.9 (51)	18.3 (24)
Assault w/ weapon	9.4 (84)	14.5 (61)	4.9 (23)*	6.8 (34)	12.6 (49)*	6.43(22)	6.8 (9)
Unwanted sexual activity	5.3 (47)	4.5 (19)	6 (28)	3.6 (18)	7.5 (29)*	4.4 (15)	2.3 (3)
Attempted unwanted sexual activity	5.6 (50)	5 (21)	6.30 (29)	4.2 (21)	7.5 (29)*	4.7 (16)	3.8 (5)
Unwanted sexual touching	5.9 (52)	5.7 (24)	5.8 (27)	4.8 (24)	7.2 (28)	4.9 (17)	5.3 (7)
Property damage	8.2 (73)	10.3 (43)	6.3 (29)*	8 (40)	8.5 (33)	8.5 (29)	6.8 (9)
Any non-criminal bias event	50.0 (446)	53.7 (226)	46.9 (217)	45.8 (229)	55.5 (216)*	46.67(160)	43.2 (57)
Racial slurs	32.2 (286)	36.3 (152)	28.3 (131)*	25 (125)	41.2 (160)*	26 (89)	20.45 (27)
Threatening comments about immigration status	30 (266)	31.7 (132)	28.6 (132)	28.5 (141)	31.9 (124)	27.86 (95)	29 (38)
Work discrimination	21.6 (191)	24.40 (102)	19.3 (89)	21.9 (109)	20.9 (81)	22.4 (76)	21.2 (28)
Police discrimination	22.3 (198)	30.3 (127)	15.2 (70)*	16.1 (80)	30 (117)*	16.9 (58)	12.9 (17)
Store discrimination	25 (200)	29.3 (113)	21.5 (87)	20.6 (90)	30.4 (109)*	19.6 (60)	24.8 (27)

*Significantly different at *p*=.05 (X^2 tests)

Table 3

Past Year Bias Victimization Percentages (N=910)

	Overall	Gender		Immigrant Status		Documentation Status	
		Male	Female	Immigrant	Non-immigrant	Doc.	Undoc.
Victimization type	% (n)	46.8 (425)	52.6 (478)	56 (509)	43.9 (399)	72.2 (343)	27.8 (132)
Any Bias victimization	25.6 (228)	27.3 (115)	23.9 (111)	24.8 (124)	26.5 (103)	24.2 (83)	26.5 (35)
Any Hate Crime	9.5 (85)	11.4 (48)	8 (37)	9.4 (47)	9.8 (38)	8.2 (28)	11.4(15)
Physical assault	3.4 (30)	4 (17)	2.8 (13)	3.4 (17)	3.3 (13)	3.22 (11)	3 (4)
Threatened w/ weapon	1.7 (15)	2.6 (11)	0.9 (4)	1.8 (9)	1.6 (6)	2 (7)	1.52 (2)
Threatened face-to-face	5.4 (48)	6.9 (29)	4.1 (19)	6 (30)	4.6 (18)	4.7(16)	9.12(12)
Assault w/ weapon	2 (18)	3.1 (13)	1 (5)	1.4 (7)	2.8 (11)	1.2 (4)	2.3 (3)
Unwanted sexual activity	1.2 (11)	1.4 (6)	1 (5)	0.4 (2)	2.3 (9)[*]	0.6 (2)	0 (0)
Attempted unwanted sexual activity	1.4 (12)	1.7 (7)	1 (5)	1 (5)	1.8 (7)	1.5 (5)	0 (0)
Unwanted sexual touching	1.1 (10)	1.9 (8)	0.4 (2)	1 (5)	1.3 (5)	0.9 (3)	1.5 (2)
Property damage	2.9 (26)	3.8 (16)	2.2 (10)	3 (15)	2.8 (11)	2.7 (9)	3 (4)
Any non-criminal bias event	23.7 (211)	25.9 (109)	21.6 (100)[*]	23 (115)	24.4 (95)	22.7 (78)	24.2 (32)
Racial slurs	10.2 (91)	11.5 (48)	9.3 (43)	9.2 (46)	11.3 (44)	10.2 (35)	6.8 (9)
Threatening comments about immigration status	11.2 (99)	11.9 (50)	10.4 (48)	11.1 (55)	11.3 (44)	10.3 (35)	14.5 (19)
Work discrimination	7.6 (67)	8.4 (35)	6.9 (32)	9.3 (46)	5.4 (21)[*]	9.1 (31)	8.3 (11)
Police discrimination	8.5 (75)	11.9 (50)	5.2 (24)[*]	7.4 (37)	9.5 (37)	7.3 (25)	7.6 (10)
Store discrimination	9.4 (75)	11.4 (44)	7.7 (31)	8.5 (37)	10.3 (37)	5.9 (18)	15.6 (17)[*]

*Significantly different at *p*=.05 (X^2 tests)

Question 2: We examined the degree to which bias victimization overlapped with non-bias forms of victimization. Results show that there are large overlaps between experiencing bias victimization and other forms of victimization. Overall, 63% of individuals who experience bias victimization also reported experiencing another form of lifetime victimization. The rate is 73% when you look at those who experience hate crime events specifically. Detailed results are presented in Table 4 and Table 5 for lifetime and past year rates.

Table 4
Co-occurrence of bias and general victimization in the lifetime

Victimization	Percentage Matched with Separate Incident of								
	Any other victimization	*Any bias victimization*	*Any hate crime*	*Any non-criminal bias event*	*Any physical harm*	*Any sexual assault*	*Any stalking*	*Any threats*	*Any witnessing violence*
Any bias victimization	63.4		53.6	94.7	42.8	27.5	15.7	36.7	29.0
Any hate crime	73.1	90.0		90.0	55.7	39.5	22.7	51.8	34.5
Any non-criminal bias event	63.8	50.9	50.9		43.5	27.6	16.6	36.8	30.0
Any physical harm	87.2	78.6	54.9	75.5		46.7	26.7	60.7	46.3
Any sexual assault	88.8	81.3	62.5	76.9	75.0		34.6	58.1	50.6
Any Stalking	92.0	83.9	64.4	83.9	78.1	63.2		79.3	52.9
Any threats	93.0	86.9	65.8	82.4	78.4	46.7	34.9		48.7
Any witnessing violence	92.3	81.6	51.8	79.8	70.8	48.2	27.5	57.7	

Table 5

Co-occurrence of bias and general victimization in the past year

Victimization	Any other victimization	Any bias victimization	Any hate crime	Any non-criminal bias event	Any physical harm	Any sexual assault	Stalking	Any threats	Witnessing violence
			Percentage Matched with Separate Incident of						
Any bias victimization	32.7		37.3	92.5	12.7	6.1	9.3	13.6	8.8
Any hate crime	42.9	100.0		80.0	21.2	8.2	14.5	23.5	8.2
Any non-criminal bias event	33.0	100.0	32.2		12.3	6.2	9.1	12.8	8.5
Any physical harm	70.0	72.5	45.0	65.0		20.0	30.0	42.5	25.0
Any sexual assault	55.0	70.0	35.0	65.0	40.0		30.0	20.0	30.0
Stalking	67.9	75.0	42.9	67.9	42.9	21.4		39.3	25.0
Any threats	66.7	79.5	51.3	69.3	43.6	10.3	29.0		18.0
Witnessing violence	75.0	71.4	25.0	64.3	35.7	21.4	25.0	25.0	

Question 3: Formal and informal help seeking rates are reported in Table 6. Overall 70.9% of respondents who experienced bias crimes sought some form of help. Only 18.2% of Latinos experiencing bias crimes sought help from any formal authority (e.g. police, medical providers, victim service provider, attorney) while 68.1% of victims sought informal help, generally from friends or family. Reporting to police was particularly, low with only 8% of victims who experienced a hate crime seeking help from to the police.

Table 6
Help seeking (N=313)

	Overall	*Gender*		*Immigrant Status*		*Documentation Status*	
		Male	*Female*	*Immigrant*	*Non-immigrant*	*Doc.*	*Undoc.*
% (n)		53.4 (166)	46.6 (145)	50.9 (159)	49.1 (153)	71.3 (107)	28.7 (43)
Any help-seeking	70.9 (222)	65.1 (108)	77.2 (112)	74.2 (118)	67.3 (103)	74.7 (80)	76.7 (33)
Formal help-seeking	18.2 (57)	16.8 (28)	19.3 (28)	17.0 (27)	19.6 (30)	25.2 (27)	13.9 (6)
Informal help-seeking	68.1 (213)	63.9 (106)	72.4 (105)	72.3 (115)	63.4 (97)	85.0 (91)	72.1(31)

Question 4: Logistic regression models are presented in Table 7. Results show that socioeconomic status (a score that combines education and household income), non-bias victimization, and English language proficiency (OR's 1.32, 1.44, and 1.20 respectively) are all associated with an increase in the odds of experiencing bias victimization.

Table 7

Logistic regression models predicting types of victimization (N=910)[1]

Predictor	Dependent Variables					
	Any Bias Victimization		Hate Crime		Non-criminal Bias Event	
	OR	*SE*	*OR*	*SE*	*OR*	*SE*
Boston	0.95	0.19	1.66*	0.36	1.09	0.21
San Diego	0.78	0.15	0.92	0.21	0.80	0.16
SES	1.32*	0.12	1.00	0.10	1.29**	0.11
Male	0.84	0.14	1.23	0.22	0.91	0.15
Indigenous	1.65	0.55	1.94	0.70	1.83	0.59
White	0.86	0.20	1.00	0.26	0.79	0.18
Black	1.48	0.62	1.53	0.63	1.40	0.58
Multiracial	1.39	0.38	0.79	0.23	1.38	0.34
Immigrant status	1.28	0.28	0.89	0.20	1.29	0.27
Total LT Victimizations	1.44**	0.06	1.33**	0.04	1.40**	0.06
Latino Orientation	1.15	0.13	1.21	0.15	1.12	0.13
Anglo Orientation	0.89	0.11	0.87	0.12	0.96	0.12
Spanish Language Fluency	0.99	0.03	0.90*	0.04	0.94	0.04
English Language Fluency	1.20**	0.05	1.17**	0.06	1.17**	0.05
Perception of accent	0.24	0.14	1.05	0.03	0.99	0.03

[1]All models significant at $p<.001$, full model statistics not available with imputed analyses
* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$

Question 5: OLS regression models show that bias victimization is significantly associated with all forms of mental health outcomes while controlling for other forms of victimization. Across all forms of measured mental health outcomes, bias victimization had a stronger association with than other forms of victimization. Detailed results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Ordinary Least Squares regression models predicting mental health outcomes (N=910)

Predictor	Dependent Variables							
	Anxiety		Depression		Anger		Dissociation	
	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)
Boston	0.11**	2.43 (0.82)	0.15**	3.20 (0.82)	0.93*	1.87 (0.83)	0.09*	2.05 (0.89)
San Diego	-0.01	-0.26 (0.82)	0.00	0.00 (0.83)	0.34	0.67 (0.84)	0.01	0.20 (0.86)
Age	-0.07**	-0.05 (0.02)	-0.01	-0.01 (0.02)	0.09*	0.06 (0.25)	-0.04	-0.03 (0.03)
SES	-0.09**	0.93 (0.02)	-0.03	-0.29 (0.36)	0.01	0.10 (0.36)	-0.03	-0.28 (0.40)
Male	-0.06	-1.93 (0.68)	-0.04	-0.70 (0.71)	0.11**	1.98 (0.65)	-0.11**	-2.24 (0.76)
Indigenous	-0.00	-2.05 (1.60)	-0.07	-2.22 (1.59)	-0.05	-1.60 (1.70)	-0.05	-1.76 (1.74)
White	0.04	-0.23 (1.02)	-0.00	-0.18 (1.03)	-0.03	-0.63 (1.09)	0.03	0.69 (1.07)
Black	0.05	1.66 (1.67)	-0.04	-1.64 (1.79)	0.03	1.41 (1.74)	0.02	0.96 (2.01)
Multiracial	-0.07	1.13 (1.07)	0.01	0.33 (1.11)	0.04	0.82 (1.07)	0.05	1.07 (1.15)
Immigrant status	0.30**	-1.41 (0.89)	-0.09*	-1.84 (0.88)	-0.08	-1.58 (0.87)	-0.09	-1.83 (0.94)
Total LT Victimizations	0.14**	0.89 (0.12)	0.24**	0.71 (0.12)	0.24**	0.66 (0.12)	0.26**	0.80 (0.13)
Total LT Bias Victimizations	-0.00**	0.47 (0.15)	0.15**	0.51 (0.15)	0.10*	0.34 (0.16)	0.11*	0.39 (0.16)
Latino Orientation	-0.03	-0.16 (0.52)	-0.09	-0.81 (0.52)	-0.06	-0.55 (0.52)	-0.04	-0.34 (0.60)
Anglo Orientation	0.00	-0.33 (0.56)	0.00	0.03 (0.58)	-0.06	-0.60 (0.58)	0.00	0.03 (0.62)
Spanish Language Fluency	0.08	0.00 (0.18)	0.06	0.20 (0.20)	0.00	0.01 (0.18)	0.01	0.04 (0.19)
English Language Fluency	0.03	0.27 (0.21)	0.10	0.33 (0.20)	0.18**	0.58 (0.21)	0.09	0.31 (0.21)
Perception of accent	0.11	0.12 (0.13)	0.05	0.19 (0.13)	0.08*	0.26 (0.13)	0.05	0.19 (0.14)
Full Model R^2		.25		.21		.21		.19

    * $p <.05$ ** $p <.01$

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study significantly advances our understanding of the nature and patterns of bias motivated crime victimization among immigrant and non-immigrant Latinos, a community of victims that have historically been difficult to reach through traditional victimization survey mechanisms. Experiencing bias is widespread in the Latino community, with over half of the study population experiencing bias events and 28% experiencing hate crimes in their lifetime. Over the past year, a quarter of Latino respondents indicated experiencing a bias event and one tenth specifically experienced a hate crime. Of note, non-immigrants were significantly more likely to report bias victimization than immigrants (58.2% vs. 48.8% respectively) while there were no significant differences across documented and undocumented immigrants in experiencing bias events. Latinos who were in higher social economic status and greater English language proficiency were at increased risk for experiencing bias victimization, though these findings should be interpreted cautiously as groups with more social resources may be disproportionately likely to recognize and report bias events on surveys. Although there were no gender differences in likelihood of experiencing bias events overall, male respondents were more likely to report some hate crime victimizations that included physical violence or threats of violence. Importantly, individuals who experience other forms of victimization are at increased risk for bias victimization. This finding is of particular note since the mechanisms behind bias victimization do not necessarily have common situations or environments where overlapping victimization would be expected to occur. For example, a victim of childhood physical abuse who is also physically assaulted by siblings/peers may live in a violent household, and a result is in an environment where multiple forms of violence may occur. Bias events potentially occur across various environments and situations, and do not necessarily have opportunity to naturally

occur in scenarios where other forms of victimization may happen. These findings suggest significant steps are needed to help prevent bias events among a broad range of Latino populations in the US. Because there is a significant overlap between those at risk for bias crime victimization and those who experience non-bias victimization, it is particularly important to identify and protect groups who are vulnerable to multiple forms of victimization, as well as understand how bias victimization may co-occur.

As with other research on the harms of bias crime, we find a strong negative impact of bias victimization among Latinos. Bias victimization is significantly associated with all forms of negative mental health outcomes, even when controlling for other forms of victimization. This is significant within the arena of victimization work as prior research on polyvictimization consistently finds that the impact of any one form of victimization ceases to be significant when controlling for other forms of victimization (Cuevas & Sabina, 2010; Finkelhor, Ormrod, & Turner, 2007). As such, bias victimization is unique in its negative impact on mental health, which has notable implications for both prevention and intervention within the community. Despite the severe consequences of bias victimization, for those Latinos who experienced bias crimes, only 18% sought help from any formal authorities and only 8% specifically sought help from the police. Latino victims of bias crime are much more likely to seek help from informal sources such as friends or family members (68%) compared to formal authorities. Although hate crimes are unreported generally, additional efforts must be made to improve identification and promote reporting of bias victimization among Latino communities. Interventions including police training about risks associated with bias victimization in Latino communities and increased education and awareness about bias victimization among Latino population groups are important steps to improve formal response to these negative events. Although both citizen and

non-citizen Latinos experienced bias victimization, those without legal status or those who fear being perceived as out of status may forgo formal help seeking. These findings underscore the importance of communities creating opportunities for safety and inclusion that promote crime reporting and foster victims seeking the help they need.

There are a number of policy implications from this work. Efforts to decrease bias victimization can begin by addressing anti-immigrant rhetoric in communities. While community leadership and government can help promote this, additional work focusing on where this most often happens and who the perpetrators are can help target prevention efforts. Additionally, interventions to help promote disclosure and reporting are key. Given the challenge of reporting these events, and the distrust some of these communities may have toward law enforcement due to recent developments in immigration policy and enforcement, community agencies that are serving the community may help facilitate formal help-seeking and reporting to law enforcement. Trusted community agencies can function as a gateway to formal services, so that individuals feel less vulnerable coming forward. This can be coupled with educational efforts to the community about who they can report to and what are their rights are within the legal and criminal justice system. Addressing this unique form of violence will require efforts at multiple levels including individual-level efforts as well as those within the community and higher levels of government. As with many other forms of violence, education and prevention efforts will be crucial to begin to turn the growing problem of bias violence toward this community.

References

Boyd, E., Hammer, K., & Berk, R. (1996). "Motivated by hatred or prejudice": Categorization of hate-motivated crimes in two police divisions. *Law & Society Review, 30*(4), 819-850. doi:10.2307/3054119

Breire, J. (2011). Trauma symptom inventory-2: Professional manual. *PAR*.

Cuevas, C. A., & Farrell, A. (2016). Understanding and Measuring Bias Victimization against Latinos. In. Washington D.C.: U.S Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Cuevas, C. A., & Sabina, C. (2010). Final report: Sexual assault among Latinas (SALAS) study. In. Washington DC: U.S Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

FBI. (1999). *Hate Crime Statistics, 1999*. Washington, DC: U.S.: Department of Justice

FBI. (2018). *Hate Crime Statistics, 2018*. Washington, DC: U.S.: Department of Justice

Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., & Turner, H. A. (2007). Poly-victimization: a neglected component in child victimization. *Child Abuse Negl, 31*(1), 7-26. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17224181. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2006.06.008

Levin, J., & McDevitt, J. (2002). *Hate crimes revisited: America's war on those who are different*: Westview Press.

Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H. K., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2007). The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing Language Profiles in Bilinguals and Multilinguals. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 50*, 940-967.

McCart, M. R., Smith, D. W., & Sawyer, G. K. (2010). Help seeking among victims of crime: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Traumatic Stress: Official Publication of the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies, 23*(2), 198-206.

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

Perry, B. (2002). Defending the Color Line: Racially and Ethnically Motivated Hate Crime. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46(1)*, 72-92.

Sabina, C., Cuevas, C. A., & Schally, J. L. (2012). Help-seeking in a national sample of victimized Latino women: the influence of victimization types. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(1), 40-61. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21859753. doi:10.1177/0886260511416460

Shively, M., & Mulford, C. F. (2007). Hate crime in America: The debate continues. *National Institute of Justice Journal, 257*(6), 8-13.

Stacey, M., Carbone-López, K., & Rosenfeld, R. (2011). Demographic change and ethnically motivated crime: The impact of immigration on anti-Hispanic hate crime in the United States. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 27*(3), 278-298.

Widom, C., Dutton, M., Czaja, S., & DuMont, M. (2010). Lifetime Trauma and Victimization History (LTVH), Adult Protocol. *Recuperado em, 6*.

Wilson, M. M. (2014). *Hate crime victimization, 2004 - 2012, statistical tables*. Retrieved from Washington, DC: