



HRWG 2016 Annual Meeting
Gateway to Homicide:
Patterns, Police, & Prevention



8-11 June 2016
St. Louis, MO ---- Drury Plaza Hotel at the Arch

Program Committee: Jay Corzine & Sarah Ann Sacra
Local Arrangements: John P. Jarvis, Greg Weaver,
Jay Corzine, & Sarah Ann Sacra

Gateway to Homicide: Patterns, Police, & Prevention

Proceedings of the 2016 Meeting
of the Homicide Research Working Group

St. Louis, Missouri

Editors

Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine & Jolene Vincent, MA
University of Central Florida

Suggested citation: Lin Huff-Corzine and Jolene Vincent (Eds.) (2016). ***Gateway to Homicide: Patterns, Police & Prevention. Proceedings of the 2014 Meeting of the Homicide Research Working Group.*** St. Louis, Missouri: University of Central Florida.

The views expressed in the ***Proceedings*** are those of the authors and speakers, and not necessarily those of the Homicide Research Working Group or the co-editors of this volume.

© 2016 University of Central Florida. All rights reserved.



PLENARY SPEAKER

DR. DAVID A. KLINGER

Dr. David A. Klinger is Professor of Criminology & Criminal Justice at the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL). He received a B.A. in History from Seattle Pacific University in 1980, a Masters in Justice from American University in 1985, and a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Washington in 1992. Prior to joining the Criminology and Criminal Justice faculty at UMSL, Professor Klinger was Assistant (1992-1998) and Associate (1998-1999) Professor of Sociology at the University of Houston.

Prior to pursuing his graduate degrees, Professor Klinger worked as a patrol officer for the Los Angeles and Redmond (WA) Police Departments. In 1997 he was the recipient of the American Society of Criminology's inaugural Ruth Cavan Young Scholar Award for outstanding early career contributions to the discipline of criminology. Professor Klinger's research interests include a broad array of issues in the field of crime and justice, with an emphasis on the organization and actions of the modern police. He has published scholarly manuscripts that address arrest practices, the use of force, how features of communities affect the actions of patrol officers, and terrorism. He has conducted three federally-funded research projects dealing with the use of force by police officers; two on officer-involved shootings and one on police special weapons and tactics (SWAT) teams. His book, *Into the Kill Zone: A Cop's Eye View of Deadly Force*, was published by Jossey-Bass in 2004.

Plenary Speech

Studying Deaths from Police Gunfire and Other Aspects of Officer-Involved Shootings

The use of deadly force by American police officers is a much talked-about, occasionally studied, and poorly understood social phenomenon. Dr. Klinger discussed some of the more prominent reasons for this sad state of affairs, identified some particular issues in the realm of deadly force that are worthy of research, and suggested some specific types of studies that might yield some insight into these particular issues.

Homicide Research Working Group Goals

The Homicide Research Working Group (HRWG) is an international and interdisciplinary organization of volunteers dedicated to cooperation among researchers and practitioners who are trying to understand and limit lethal violence.

The HRWG has the following goals:

- ◆ to forge links between research, epidemiology and practical programs to reduce levels of mortality from violence;
- ◆ to promote improved data quality and the linking of diverse homicide data sources;
- ◆ to foster collaborative, interdisciplinary research on lethal and non-lethal violence;
- ◆ to encourage more efficient sharing of techniques for measuring and analyzing homicide;
- ◆ to create and maintain a communication network among those collecting, maintaining and analyzing homicide data sets; and
- ◆ to generate a stronger working relationship among homicide researchers

Homicide Research Working Group publications include the Proceedings of each annual Intensive Workshop, beginning in 1991, and the journal, *Homicide Studies*, beginning in 1997.

More information is available on the HRWG web site at

<http://www.homicidresearchworkinggroup.org>

Table of Contents

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Plenary Speaker: - Professor David Klinger, University of Missouri St. Louis
“A Model Plan for Measuring Police Shooting Incidents:
Patterns, Police, and Prevention”.....1
Homicide Research Working Group Goals.....2

Thursday, June 9, 2016

Panel Session #1: **Perspectives on Child Murder** - Chair: Lin Huff-Corzine &
Recorder: Jay Corzine.....12

Child Homicide: The Role of Family Planning - Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller & Stephen Watts,
University of Memphis

Child Homicide - Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller, University of Memphis & Greg Weaver, Auburn
University

Panel Session #2: **Homicide Investigations** - Chair: Richard Hough &
Recorder: T.J. Taylor.....28

Small Agency Homicide Investigative Practices (paper not included) - Richard Hough,
University of West Florida

Sexual Homicide of Elderly Females: Perspectives on Current Trends and Past Research
John Jarvis, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Mark Safarik, Federal Bureau of Investigation (ret), Forensic Behavioral Services
Amber Scherer, George Mason University

**Successful/Effective Investigations: How Homicide Detectives Define the Goal (Success) in
Their Work (abstract only include** - Pawel Waszkiewicz, University of Warsaw

Panel Session #3: **Research on Serial and Mass Killings** - Chair: Jay Corzine &
Reporter: Jolene Vincent.....38

**A Mixed Methods Comparative Analysis of Mass Murder and Mass Violent Victimization
Events** - Mindy Weller, University of Central Florida

**Expanding Multidisciplinarity: Can Leisure Science Contribute to a More Complete
Understanding of Serial Homicide?** - D. J. Williams, Idaho State University

Serial Killers: A Comparison of Men and Women and Their Methods - Dana Rosenfeld,
University of Central Florida & Alexis Yohros, University of Central Florida

Panel Session #4: *Community Impact of Homicide* - Chair: Greg Weaver.....69

Panelists - Amber Scherer, George Mason University; Tim Keel, Federal Bureau of Investigation & Wendy Regoeczi, Cleveland State University

Friday, June 10, 2016

Panel Session #5: *Connecting Research to Practice: The Logic and Utility of Social Science Applications to Homicide and Other Violent Crime* - Chair: John Jarvis

Discussant: Tim Keel, & Recorder: Dallas Drake.....70

Child Abduction/Homicide: What is known at the Time of Abduction - Sarah Craun, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Operational Needs for Case Linking - Tom Dover, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Recent Explorations of Crime and Policing: Implications for Homicide Research - John Jarvis, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Panel Session #6: *Advances in Theory and Research* - Chair: Candice Batton & Recorder: Mindy Weller71

A Computationally Implemented Simulation of Violent Offending - Thomas J. Dover, Federal Bureau of Investigation

The Effect of Weapon, Offender, and Situational Characteristics on the Number of Deaths in Mass Murder Incidents - James McCutcheon, University of Memphis; Sarah Ann Sacra, Lin Huff-Corzine, & Jay Corzine, University of Central Florida

Conducting Homicide Research with Hard to Obtain Data: Case Study Poland (abstract only included) - Piotr Karasek & Pawel Waszkiewicz, University of Warsaw

Saturday, June 11, 2016

Panel Session #7: *Police Homicides* - Chair: Jay Corzine & Recorder: Ashley Mancik...90

Shoot to Kill: A Closer Look at the Police Killing of Civilians in 2015 - Jolene Vincent & Lin Huff-Corzine, University of Central Florida

Counting Police Homicides: What we Can Learn from the National Homicide Data Improvement Project (prepared as a power point presentation) - Wendy C. Regoeczi, Cleveland State University; Randolph Roth, Ohio State University; Rania Issa, University of Akron

Panel Session #8: *Potpourri* - Chair: Jolene Vincent & Recorder: James McCutcheon...112

Making Public Service Announcements: Active Learning in a Murder Class II - Kim Davies,
Augusta State University

Female Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence - Alexis Yohros & Alec Szalewski,
University of Central Florida

Program Overview

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

8:30 a.m. – 11:30 p.m. ***Getting to Know NIBRS Workshop****

John Jarvis, Federal Bureau of Investigation
James McCutcheon, University of Memphis

**This workshop will be held on the campus of the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL). Transportation to UMSL will be provided and will leave from the 4th Street entrance of the Drury Plaza Hotel at the Arch at 8:00 a.m. We wish to thank Dr. Finn Esbensen and Dr. Beth Huebner of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice for arranging our use of an UMSL computer lab for the workshop. The traveling group will stop for lunch before returning to the Drury Plaza Hotel.*

6:15 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. ***Opening Reception – Carmine’s Ballroom*** - adjacent to the Drury. Open bar and hors d’oeuvres begin at 6:00 p.m.

6:45 p.m. – 7:45 p.m. ***Plenary Speaker***
Professor David Klinger, University of Missouri St. Louis
“A Model Plan for Measuring Police Shooting Incidents: Patterns, Police, and Prevention”

9:00 p.m. – 12:00 a.m. ***Hospitality Suite open***

Thursday, June 9, 2016

6:00 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. Breakfast – Drury Lobby

8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. Introductions – Lewis/Sacagawea Room

9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m. Announcements

Perspectives on Child Murder

9:15 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. Panel Session #1 Chair: Lin Huff-Corzine
Recorder: Jay Corzine

 ***Child Homicide: The Role of Family Planning***

Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller & Stephen Watts, University of Memphis

 ***Child Homicide***

Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller, University of Memphis & Greg Weaver, Auburn University

10:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. Break
11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Business Meeting I**
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. **Lunch** - Drury Lobby, Catered by Angelo's Taverna

Homicide Investigations

1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Panel Session #2 Chair: Richard Hough
Recorder: T.J. Taylor

✚ *Small Agency Homicide Investigative Practices (paper not included)*

Richard Hough, University of West Florida

✚ *Sexual Homicide of Elderly Females: Perspectives on Current Trends and Past Research*

John Jarvis, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Mark Safarik, Federal Bureau of Investigation (ret), Forensic Behavioral Services
Amber Scherer, George Mason University

✚ *Successful/Effective Investigations: How Homicide Detectives Define the Goal (Success) in Their Work (abstract only included)*

Pawel Waszkiewicz, University of Warsaw

2:15 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Break

Research on Serial and Mass Killings

2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Panel Session #3 Chair: Jay Corzine
Reporter: Jolene Vincent

✚ *A Mixed Methods Comparative Analysis of Mass Murder and Mass Violent Victimization Events*

Mindy Weller, University of Central Florida

✚ ***Expanding Multidisciplinarity: Can Leisure Science Contribute to a More Complete Understanding of Serial Homicide?***

D. J. Williams, Idaho State University

✚ ***Serial Killers: A Comparison of Men and Women and Their Methods***

Dana Rosenfeld, University of Central Florida

Alexis Yohros, University of Central Florida

3:45 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Break

Community Impact of Homicide

4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Panel Session #4 Chair: Greg Weaver
(no papers included)

Amber Scherer, George Mason University

Tim Keel, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Wendy Regoeczi, Cleveland State University

5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. ***Kickback – Drury Lobby*****

***The 5:30 Kickback is a nightly reception at the Drury featuring hot food and cold beverages, both non-alcoholic and alcoholic (limit of three per person each night).*

Dinner on your own

Dinner is on your own for Thursday night. A list of nearby restaurants that are within walking distance or a short cab ride will be provided on Thursday morning. The recommendation of the Co-Program Chairs and President is 360, a restaurant that is on the 26th floor of the Hilton, one block from the convention hotel. It features very good food, indoor and outdoor seating, and panoramic views of the City of St. Louis.

9:00 p.m.–12:00 a.m. ***Hospitality Suite open***

Friday, June 10, 2016

6:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. Breakfast – Drury Lobby

Connecting Research to Practice: The Logic and Utility of Social Science Applications to Homicide and Other Violent Crime

✚ Please note that this was a discussion session. There were no papers prepared.

8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

Panel Session #5

Chair: John Jarvis

Discussant: Tim Keel

Recorder: Dallas Drake

✚ *Child Abduction/Homicide: What is known at the Time of Abduction*

Sarah Craun, Federal Bureau of Investigation

✚ *Operational Needs for Case Linking*

Tom Dover, Federal Bureau of Investigation

✚ *Recent Explorations of Crime and Policing: Implications for Homicide Research*

John Jarvis, Federal Bureau of Investigation

9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. Break

Advances in Theory and Research

9:45 a.m.–11:15 p.m.

Panel Session #6

Chair: Candice Batton

Recorder: Mindy Weller

✚ *A Computationally Implemented Simulation of Violent Offending*

Thomas J. Dover, Federal Bureau of Investigation

✚ ***The Effect of Weapon, Offender, and Situational Characteristics on the Number of Deaths in Mass Murder Incidents***

James McCutcheon, University of Memphis
Sarah Ann Sacra, University of Central Florida
Lin Huff-Corzine, University of Central Florida
Jay Corzine, University of Central Florida

✚ ***Conducting Homicide Research with Hard to Obtain Data: Case Study Poland (abstract only included)***

Piotr Karasek, University of Warsaw
Pawel Waszkiewicz, University of Warsaw

11:15 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Lunch (on your own)

1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. **Field trip** to Real Time Crime Center at the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, 915 Olive***

****Transportation will be provided. Vehicles will leave from the 4th Street entrance to the Drury Plaza Hotel at 12:30 p.m.*

3:00 p.m. – 4:15 p.m. **Tour** of the Anheuser Busch Brewery****

*****Transportation will be provided. Vehicles will leave from the main entrance to the Drury Plaza Hotel at 2:30 p.m. The tour of Anheuser Busch lasts approximately 45 minutes and involves a moderate amount of walking with some steps. Another option is to visit the St. Louis Arch only several hundred feet from the Drury Plaza. The Arch was undergoing major interior renovations and landscaping changes when we were in St. Louis for the site visit, so we don't know what the "new Arch" features. A ride to the Top of the Arch is worthwhile, but persons who have more than mild claustrophobia may want to forego the experience.*

5:30 – 7:30 p.m. **Kickback – Lobby of the Drury**

6:30 – 9:00 p.m. Dinner at Favazzi's on the Hill*****

******This is a group dinner and there will be a sign-up. Favazzi's is an Italian restaurant featuring Northern Italian, Southern Italian, and Italian American cuisine located on the Hill, St. Louis' Italian neighborhood. Unlike many ethnic neighborhoods in U.S. cities that mostly consist of a concentration of themed businesses, the Hill maintains a strong residential base, with an estimated 75% of the residents being of Italian (mostly Sicilian) heritage. Transportation will be provided, with vehicles leaving the main entrance of the Drury Plaza at 6:00 p.m.*

9:00 p.m. – 12:00 a.m. *Hospitality Suite open*

Saturday, June 11, 2016


7:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Breakfast – Lobby of the Drury

Police Homicides

9:00 a.m.–10:00 a.m. Panel Session #7 Chair: Jay Corzine
Recorder: Ashley Mancik

 *Shoot to Kill: A Closer Look at the Police Killing of Civilians in 2015*

Jolene Vincent, University of Central Florida
Lin Huff-Corzine, University of Central Florida

 *Counting Police Homicides: What we Can Learn from the National Homicide Data Improvement Project (prepared as a power point presentation)*

Wendy C. Regoeczi, Cleveland State University
Randolph Roth, Ohio State University
Rania Issa, University of Akron

10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. Break

Potpourri

10:15 a.m. – 11:15 a.m. Panel Session #8 Chair: Jolene Vincent
Recorder: James McCutcheon

 *Making Public Service Announcements: Active Learning in a Murder Class II*

Kim Davies, Augusta State University

 *Female Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence*

Alexis Yohros, University of Central Florida
Alec Szalewski, University of Central Florida

11:15 a.m.–12:00 p.m. *Business Session II & Final Announcements*

Perspectives on Child Murder

Panel Session #1

Chair: Lin Huff-Corzine

Recorder: Jay Corzine

 ***Child Homicide: The Role of Family Planning***

Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller & Stephen Watts, University of Memphis

 ***Child Homicide***

Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller, University of Memphis & Greg Weaver, Auburn University

Child Homicide: The Role of Family Planning

Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller

&

Stephen Watts

University of Memphis

Abstract

The current study explores macro-level characteristics and their impact on child homicide. In addition to examining socio-demographic characteristics, we also consider the impact of access to family planning services. Homicide data for children utilized in this work, from birth to five years, came from the National Incident-Based Reporting System. County level socio-demographics were obtained from the Census. The number and locations of Planned Parenthood Offices were obtained from plannedparenthood.org. Finally, laws were examined to gain an understanding of access to birth control and abortion services.

Child murder can be traced throughout history (Barlow and Clayton, 1996). Meyer, Oberman, and White (2001) propose that there is every reason to believe that infanticide is as old as human society itself and that no culture has been immune to it. By 1888, all European states established a legal distinction between infanticide and murder and gave more lenient penalties to infanticide offenders (Spinelli, 2004). Meyer et al. (2001) discussed how infanticide was considered a crime committed exclusively by unmarried women, and even in societies with infanticide laws that governed all citizens, it was speculated that married women who committed infanticide generally avoided punishment. Spinelli (2005) notes that certain cultures began to see women as biologically—vulnerable around the time of birth, and therefore allowed medical treatment of the offenders in the early 1900s. Meyer et al. (2001) discusses how this “medicalization of infanticide was embraced in England where they recognized infanticide as a distinct form of homicide due to the impact of pregnancy and birth upon the mother's mental status” (p. 11).

Different countries began having contrasting views concerning child murder in the 1900s. Whereas countries such as the United Kingdom held lenient views due to the opinion that the murder was the outcome of an illness, the response in the United States (U.S.) was harsh because it was seen as murder. According to Meyer et al. (2001), the U.S. did not have any laws regarding infanticide; it was seen as a type of murder and the individuals found guilty of child murder were convicted without regard to the age of the victim (Caron, 2010; Finkel, Birk, and Chaves, 2000). However, it is the individual states within the U.S. which decide on mitigating and aggravating circumstances. This action helps to decide how an individual who kills a child

should be convicted. An offender may be treated more leniently or harshly for the murder of their child depending on local community views.

According to Davis (2005), there are many categories of child murder. Most scholars, however, agree with the following definitions: neonaticide—murder of a newborn within the first 24 hours of birth; infanticide—murder of an infant child who is less than one year (Alt & Wells, 2010) old; and filicide—murder of one’s own child, including both step-children and adult children (Barlow & Clayton, 1996; Davis, 2005; Lyman, McGwin, Malone, Taylor, Brissie, Davis & Rue, 2003). However, some contradictions concerning the definitions exist. For example, only some scholars use the maximum age of 18 when discussing filicides (Lucas, Wezner, Milner, McCanne, Harris, Monroe-Posey, & Nelson, 2002). In addition, at least one scholar suggests that neonaticide is from birth to one week in age (Jason, Gilliland, & Tyler, 1983). Further, various scholars have also suggested other terms to account for child murder such as: prolicide—murder of one’s offspring, including infants and fetuses in-utero (Davis, 2005), and familicide—murder of the entire family (Alt & Wells, 2010).

There has been research conducted on child murder, but when compared to other types of killing, such as adult homicide, it is relatively new and undeveloped. In most cases, research on child homicide examines psychological influences, biological impacts, and/or the specifics of the crime. When discussing the offender, it has been suggested that children from birth to four years old are more likely to be murdered by a parent or caregiver (Davis, 2005). Some research suggests that a mother usually murders younger (under one year old) children, while a father, stepfather, or mother’s boyfriend usually commits the murder after the child is one (Davis, 2005). Death by abandonment, suffocation, or poison (Shelton, Corey, Donaldson, & Dennison,

2011) is more common when a mother commits infanticide, and firearms (Davis, 2005) are more common when the father, stepfather, or mother's boyfriend commits the murder. Research also looks at why an individual murder happened, with many scholars pointing to the stigma of having a child, not wanting the child, depression following the birth, and financial issues (Finkel, Burke, & Chavez, 2000; Shelton et al., 2011; Spinelli, 2005).

Contextual and situational variables have been included in research concerning child murder. Sociocultural factors, such as poverty and pre-existing social relationships, "explain almost all state-to-state differences in adult homicide rates, but they do not explain differences within states and homicide deaths of infants" (Gelles, 1991, p. 64). Research has found that there is a direct relationship between the incidence of child homicide and economic conditions. Specifically, the typical families with child abuse fatalities are poor, rural, and white (Jason & Andereck, 1983). Findings also suggest that "the higher the number of [child] homicides, the higher the unemployment and percentage of families living below the poverty level" (Abel, 1986, p.711). Putkonen, Amonc, Eronena, Klier, Almirone, Yourstone, Cederwalf, and Weizmann-Henelius, (2011) reported that nearly half of the fathers who committed filicide were employed, whereas only approximately one-fourth of the mothers worked outside the home. In Lucas et al.'s (2002) study, the victim's family was most likely composed of married couples, but the families of the youngest victims were represented by single parents, separated parents, or divorced parents. Putkonen et al. (2011) found that family disintegration seemed relevant to child homicide, a fact that was truer for fathers than for mothers

It has been acknowledged that an unfavorable social environment is considered a vulnerability for child homicide (Putkonen et al., 2011). Still, Lyman et al. (2003) declare that

the impact of community-level factors and social stressors has not often been addressed in previous literature, and the inclusion of these ecological variables in an appropriate analysis may increase our understanding of how contextual factors translate into differences in individual-level risk.

The current study explores macro-level characteristics and their impact on child homicide. In addition to examining socio-demographic characteristics, we also consider the impact of access to family planning services. It has been established that poverty and the lack of access to certain amenities such as medical needs, healthy foods, education, and/or jobs can cause an increase in crime. We are interested in access to family planning services to see if it has an impact on the murdering of children. Homicide data for children utilized in this work, from birth to five years, came from the National Incident-Based Reporting System for 2014. County level socio-demographics were obtained from the Census. The number and locations of Planned Parenthood Offices were obtained from plannedparenthood.org. Finally, we decided to examine legislation pertaining to birth control and abortion services to gain a better understanding of access.

References

- Abel, E.L. (1986). Childhood homicide in Erie County, New York. *Pediatrics*, 77, 709-713.
- Barlow, S. H., & Clayton, C. L. (1996). When mothers murder: Understanding infanticide by females. In H. V. Hall (Ed.), *Lethal violence 2000* (pp. 203-229). Kamuela, HI: Pacific Institute for the Study of Conflict and Aggression.
- Caron, S. (2010). Killed by its mother: Infanticide in Providence County, Rhode Island 1870-1938. *Journal of Social History*, 213-237.
- Davis, K. (2005). *The Murder Book*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Finkel, N.J., Burke, J.E., & Chavez, L.J. (2000). Commonsense judgments of infanticide: Murder, manslaughter, madness, or miscellaneous. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 6, 1113-1137.
- Gelles, R. (1991). Physical violence, child abuse, and child homicide: A continuum of violence, or distinct behaviors? *Human Nature*, 2, 59-72.
- Jason, J., & Andereck, N. D. (1983). Fatal child abuse in Georgia: The epidemiology of severe physical child abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 7, 1-9.
- Jason, J., Gilliland, J. C., & Tyler, C. W. (1983). Homicide as a cause of pediatric mortality in the United States. *Pediatrics*, 72, 191-197.
- Lucas, D., Wezner, K., Milner, J., McCanne, T., Harris, Monroe-Posey, C., & Nelson, J. (2002). Victim, perpetrator, family and incident characteristics of infant and child homicide in the United States Air Force. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 167-186.
- Lyman, L., McGwin, G., Malone, D., Taylor, A., Brissie, R., Davis, G., & Rue, L. (2003). Epidemiology of child homicide in Jefferson County, Alabama. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 1603-1073.
- Meyer, C. L., Oberman, M., & White, K. (2001). *Mothers who kill their children: Understanding the acts of moms from Susan Smith to the "Prom Mom,"* New York, New York: University Press.
- Putkonen, H., Amonc, S., Eronena, M., Klier, C., Almirone, M., Yourstone Cederwallf, J., & Weizmann-Henelius, G. (2011). Gender differences in filicide offense characteristics: A comprehensive register-based study of child murder in two European countries. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 35, 319-328.
- Shelton, J.L., Corey, T., Donaldson, W.H., Dennison, E.H. (2011). Neonaticide: A comprehensive review of investigative and pathological aspects of 55 cases. *Family Violence*, 26, 263-276.
-

Spinelli, M. (2004). Maternal infanticide associated with mental illness: Prevention and the promise of saved lives. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 161, 1–10.

Spinelli, M. (2005). Infanticide: Contrasting views. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 8, 15-24.

Child Homicide Characteristics

Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller

University of Memphis

Greg Weaver

Auburn University

Abstract

This study examines child murder by exploring victim, offender, and contextual characteristics. Data was obtained from the Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR) for the years of 2005-2014. The data are limited to children who were under the age of five. This study aims to increase our understanding of child murder and may help guide policy makers, law enforcement personnel, and any other individuals who are concerned with areas where there are varying degrees of risk for child homicide.

The reported prevalence of child murder tends to fluctuate. For example, in 1990, the worldwide prevalence of violent deaths for children four years old and under accounted for 1,926 out of 17,472 violent deaths (Murray and Lopez, 1996 as cited in Spinelli, 2005). Shelton, Corey, Donaldson, and Dennison (2011) contend that the U.S. has the fourth highest rate of infant homicide relative to population size, behind Japan, Austria, and Finland. Yet, the Center for Disease Control reports that since 2007 homicide has been the third leading cause of death in the United States (U.S.) for children between the ages of one and four (CDC, 2007-2011). Child Welfare Information Gateway (2014) discussed that child abuse and neglect fatalities are highest in the U.S. compared to other industrialized nations. In the U.S., there are an estimated four child deaths per day from primary caregiver maltreatment (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2014).

Child homicide is a rare crime in Western societies (Putkonen, Amonc, Eronena, Klier, Almirone, Yourstone, Cederwalf, and Weizmann-Heneliusa, 2011), but research points out that both child murder and fatal cases of child abuse are undercounted (Herman-Giddens, Brown, Verbiest, Carlson, Hooten, Howell, & Butts, 1999; Jason & Andereck, 1983; Overpeck, 2002). This underreporting is accounted for by poor documentation, infanticides reported as SIDS deaths, lack of death certificates, unfound corpses, and undocumented births due to pregnancy denial (Herman-Giddens et al., 1999, Spinelli, 2005). Lyman, McGwin, Malone, Taylor, Brissie, Davis and Rue (2003) say that the “under ascertainment is due to restrictions into inaccuracies in coding causes of death, incomplete or inaccurate information on death certificates or police reports, variable case definitions, and the absence of a national system for reviewing child homicides” (p. 1064). Other reasons for inaccurate estimations could be that investigators may lack certain skills, fail to communicate findings, and lack access to additional professional

records. Overall, these authors suggest that the rate of child homicide is considerably higher than the data suggest. Due to the underreporting, accurate data are difficult to obtain and, when data are collected, reporting methods vary (Alt & Wells, 2010). “Data collection and reporting procedures among health, law enforcement, and social service agencies are not uniform, standardized, or coordinated” (Ewigman, Kiyhlahan, & Land, 1993p. 335). Ewigman et al. (1993), who studied underreporting of maltreatment as a cause of death, found significant underreporting in all the data used, including vital statistics, FBI – UCR homicide data, and the child protective service information.

The majority of research on child homicide has been done by public health scholars, who generally provide descriptive studies rather than explanatory investigations. Research concerning risk factors for child homicide has reported some contradictory findings.

Victim Characteristics: Sex, Age, and Race. While some scholars indicate an even distribution between male and female child homicide victims (Chew, McCleary, Lew, Wang, 1999), most report a difference between sexes. Whether the majority of victims are male or female tends to be debatable, depending on the study. Some scholars suggest that the majority are male victims (Ewigman et al., 1993; Goetting, 1988; Putkonen et al., 2011; Shelton et al., 2011) while others report predominately female victims (Abel, 1986; Crittenden & Craig, 1990; Lyman, et al. 2003). An additional observation is that the difference in sex may be characterized by age (Chew et al., 1999; Lucas, Wezner, Milner, McCanne, Harris, Monroe-Posey, & Nelson, 2002) where males are more vulnerable in one age group and females in another.

Children under the age of five tend to be at the greatest risk for death (Abel, 1986; Levine, Compann, & Freeman, 1995). Abel (1986) affirmed that children aged one to four years contained the highest number of homicide victims; while Christoffel (1983) remarks that a

homicide is most prevalent during infancy. In fact, it has been indicated that the greatest number of child homicides occur among infants (under age 1), young children (ages 1 to 4), and in teenagers (ages 13 to 17) (Abel, 1986; Chew et al. 1999; Cristoffel, 1984). In Crittenden and Craig's (1990) study, it was determined that the rate of homicide was highest during the first month of life, dropped dramatically after the first month, and slowly decreased from that point.

Race and ethnicity of the victim is another area in which findings are inconsistent. Findings from some studies have suggested that victims of child homicide tend to be overrepresented by African Americans (Abel, 1986; Goetting, 1988; Lyman et al. 2003). Other research reports that Caucasians are the primary victims of child homicide (Brewster, Jason, & Weniger, 1998; Ewigman et al., 1993; Lucas et al., 2002; Shelton et al., 2011).

Offender Characteristics: Sex, Age, and Race. The literature acknowledges a discrepancy pertaining to the offender's sex. Some research suggests that females are more likely to be the offender (Abel, 1986; Crittenden & Craig, 1990; Goetting, 1988; Putkonen et al., 2011) while others suggest males are most likely to be the offender (Brewster et al., 1998; Ewigman, et al., 1993; Strang, 1996). Some scholars suggest that age of victim tends to differentiate the sex of the offender, whereas females are more likely to be the offender when the child is less than one year (Brewster et al., 1998; Lucas et al., 2001).

When studies examine the age of the offender, it is generally agreed that the offenders tend to be young adults. Brewster et al. (1998) found the mean age of the female offender to be about 23 years and the male offender to be about 24 years. Chew et al. (1999) found that as the victim's age increases, the offenders tend to be older.

Some discrepancy exists regarding the race/ethnicity of the offender involved in child homicide cases. Studies have found that the offender is more likely to be Caucasian (Brewster et

al., 1998; Shelton et al., 2011), while others have found the offender is more likely to be African American (Crittenden & Craig, 1990; Goetting, 1988). The racial distribution of homicide perpetrators and victims is similar because most of these offenses are intra-racial.

Despite the inconsistencies, there still tends to be some agreement about certain risk factors. The literature indicates that the age when children are at the greatest risk of murder and the age of offenders are congruent across studies. Children under the age of five tend to be at the greatest risk for death (Abel, 1986; Levine et al., 1995), with homicide being most prevalent during infancy (Christoffel, 1983). Similarly, scholars agree that offenders tend to be young adults, usually in their twenties (Brewster et al., 1998; Chew et al., 1999; Lucas et al., 2001; Shelton et al., 2011). This finding may be related to the time (age) when individuals usually have young children.

Contextual Characteristics: Weapons and Relationships. Children are significantly more likely to be murdered by personal weapons, that is, hands, fists, or feet than by other types of weapons (; Lucas et al., 2002; Lyman et al, 2002; Mayhew, 2007). Mayhew (2007) asserts that beatings are the primary cause of child murder, but mentions that neonaticide generally occurs from suffocation (being wrapped in a towel or placed in a box), abandonment, or drowning, especially if born into a toilet. Another consistent finding about child homicide is the observation that children are most likely to be killed by someone they know, usually a parental figure (Brewster et al, 1998; Mayhew, 2007).

The current study examined child homicide by exploring victim, offender, and contextual characteristics. The simultaneous examination of these characteristics is important in understanding the complexities of these violent incidents. Data was obtained from the

Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR) for the years of 2005-2014 and limited to children who were under the age of five.

References

- Alt, B. S., & Wells, S. (2010). *When caregivers kill: Understanding child murder by parents and other guardians*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Brewster, A., Nelson, J., Hymel, K., Colby, D., Lucas, D., McCanne, R., & Milner, J. (1998). Victim, perpetrator, family and incident characteristics of 32 infant maltreatment deaths in the United States Air Force. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 22, 91-101.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2007-2011). National Vital Statistics System, National Center for Health Statistics, CDC. Office of Statistics and Programming, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, CDC using WISQARS. Retrieved on May 31, 2015 from http://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/pdf/leading_causes_of_death_by_age_group_2011-a.pdf
- Chew, K., McCleary, R., Lew, M., & Wang, J. (1999). The epidemiology of child homicide in California, 1981 through 1990. *Homicide Studies*, 3, 151-169.
- Child Welfare Information Gateway. (2014). Child abuse and neglect fatalities 2012: Statistics and interventions. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Children's Bureau.
- Christoffel, K. (1984). Homicide in childhood: A public health problem in need of attention. *American Journal of Public Health*, 74, 68-70.
- Crittenden, P., & Craig, S. (1990). Developmental trends in the nature of child homicide. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 202-216.
- Ewigman, B., Kivlahan, C., & Land, G. (1993). The Missouri child fatality study: Underreporting of maltreatment fatalities among children younger than five years of age, 1983 through 1986. *Pediatrics*, 91, 330-337.
- Goetting, A. (1988). When parents kill their young children: Detroit, 1982-1986. *Journal of Family Violence*, 3, 339-346.
- Herman-Giddens M.E., Brown, G., Verbiest, S., Carlson, P.J., Hooten, E.G., Howell, E., & Butts, J.D. (1999). Under ascertainment of child abuse mortality in the United States. *JAMA*, 282, 463-467.
- Jason, J., & Andereck, N. D. (1983). Fatal child abuse in Georgia: The epidemiology of severe physical child abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 7, 1-9.
- Levine, M., Compann, C., & Freeman, J. (1995). Maltreatment-related fatalities: Issues of policy

- and prevention. *Law & Policy*, 16, 449-471.
- Lucas, D., Wezner, K., Milner, J., McCanne, T., Harris, Monroe-Posey, C., & Nelson, J. (2002). Victim, perpetrator, family and incident characteristics of infant and child homicide in the United States Air Force. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 167-186.
- Lyman, L., McGwin, G., Malone, D., Taylor, A., Brissie, R., Davis, G., & Rue, L. (2003). Epidemiology of child homicide in Jefferson County, Alabama. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 1603-1073.
- Mayhew, L. (2007). *Child death investigations: Interdisciplinary techniques from cradle to court*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Murray, C.J.K., & Lopez, A.D. (1996). *The global burden of disease*. Harvard University Press, Boston.
- Overpeck, M.D. (2002). *Epidemiology of infanticide*. In: Spinelli M (ed.), *Infanticide: psychosocial and legal perspectives on mothers who kill*. (pp 3–18). American Psychiatric Press, Washington D.C.
- Putkonen, H., Amonc, S., Eronena, M., Klier, C., Almirone, M., Yourstone Cederwallf, J., & Weizmann-Henelius, G. (2011). Gender differences in filicide offense characteristics: A comprehensive register-based study of child murder in two European countries. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 35, 319–328.
- Shelton, J.L., Corey, T., Donaldson, W.H., Dennison, E.H. (2011). Neonaticide: A comprehensive review of investigative and pathological aspects of 55 cases. *Family Violence*, 26, 263-276.
- Spinelli, M. (2005). Infanticide: Contrasting views. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 8, 15-24.
- Strang, H. (1966). Children as victims of homicide. Australian Institute of Criminology: *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 53, 1-6.

Homicide Investigations

Panel Session #2

Chair: Richard Hough

Recorder: T.J. Taylor

✚ Sexual Homicide of Elderly Females: Perspectives on Current Trends and Past Research

John Jarvis, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Mark Safarik, Federal Bureau of Investigation (ret), Forensic Behavioral Services

Amber Scherer, George Mason University

✚ Successful/Effective Investigations: How Homicide Detectives Define the Goal (Success) in Their Work

Pawel Waszkiewicz, University of Warsaw

**Sexual Homicide of Elderly Females:
Perspectives on Current Trends and Past Research**

Mark Safarik
Federal Bureau of Investigation (retired)

John Jarvis
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Amber Scherer
George Mason University

Abstract

Cases of sexual homicide are rare but have been noteworthy in their examination in the literature. Even rarer still are cases in which the victim is an elderly female. The infrequent occurrence of such cases as well the apparent behavioral oddities of such criminal outcomes challenges conventional notions of what motivates such crimes. This evolving work not only outlines the existing scholarship pertaining to cases of this nature but also attempts to delineate the investigative avenues which may be most fruitful in apprehending offenders that engage in these horrific crimes. Other correlates that have emerged in investigative practice, but may escape empirical validation, are also noted and discussed where relevant.

Overall awareness of victimization of the elderly throughout the United States has greatly increased over the last two decades. However, relatively little attention has been focused on elderly female victims of sexual homicides and the offenders who commit them. Law enforcement agencies are often faced with rarely seen and excessively violent crime scenes as they attempt to solve them. Some of the dynamics in these cases is captured in the following case narratives:

CASE 1

A 77 year-old widow was sexually assaulted and murdered in her bedroom. The Medical Examiner identified three separate causes of death. The offender strangled the victim into unconsciousness, severely fractured her skull using a nearby clock he removed from the bedroom dresser, then repeatedly stabbed her in the face, chest, and vagina with a butcher knife he retrieved from the kitchen. A twenty-year-old individual living two blocks away was arrested. He later was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment without parole.

CASE 2

A 72 year-old woman was found murdered and left on her bed. She had been raped and sodomized, and she suffered severe biting injuries to her breasts. The offender strangled her with her own stockings, and beat her to death with the phone handset taken from the night stand beside her bed. The 27-year-old offender, who lived next door, had entered through an unlocked rear door. He was identified more than a year later, arrested and convicted.

CASE 3

A 19-year-old offender, while walking by the apartment of a 76-year-old woman at 2 A.M., noticed a light on and began peeping through her windows. He saw her sitting alone watching television. He smashed out the front door window, reached in, and unlocked the door.

He blitz-attacked the victim, shattering her jaw as he knocked her unconscious to the floor. He ripped off her clothing, raped her vaginally, then anally, and finally assaulted her vaginally with an umbrella that had been lying nearby. He used a piece of glass from the broken window to cut her throat. He returned to a friend's house covered in blood and told him he had just killed an "old lady." He was arrested shortly thereafter.

CASE 4

A 70-year-old woman was found dead, lying on her bed in a blood spattered bedroom on the second story of a rural farm house. She suffered 28 stab and incised wounds to the face, neck and chest. The offender had pushed her night clothes above her breasts and had spread her legs. She was nude except for the nightshirt. After killing her, the offender placed a pillow over her face. No semen was located at the scene. Ten years later, investigators still pursue leads in this woman's death and her daughters are haunted on a daily basis because the case remains unsolved.

Goals and Objectives

To further understand the dynamics of these cases and possible investigative avenues, an overview of three foundational studies as well as companion information from more recent studies of crimes against the elderly are leveraged to identify and discuss the state of knowledge relative to these rare and horrific crimes. Most law enforcement agencies in the United States rarely face the unenviable task of investigating the brutal sexual assault-homicide of an elderly female member of their community. However, this crime does occur and its prevalence may increase as the nation's population continues to age. Before examining the elderly sexual homicide research, however, an understanding of the existing research surrounding the scope and nature of crimes against the elderly, with special attention to sexual assault and homicide, is

necessary to insure a fuller understanding of these difficult cases. The goal here is to provide a glimpse into the dynamics of sexual homicide of elderly victims as well as provide a comprehensive overview of the behavioral and psychological details of these violent crimes through a summary of three foundational studies that have produced empirical findings relative to the offenders' physical, sexual, and, in some cases, verbal behavior with the victim. As these cases are a subset of a larger population of sexually motivated homicides which often are subject to criminal investigative analysis employed by law enforcement as a tool in investigating these particularly violent, difficult, rare, or unusual crimes such applications to these cases will be also be noted. Other studies have examined similar dynamics in sexual homicides or excessively violent assaults (Canter & Heritage, 1990; Ressler, Burgess, & Douglas, 1988), rapes (Hazelwood & Warren, 1990; Warren et al., 1999), or arsons (Kocsis, Irwin, & Hayes, 1998; Sapp, Huff, Gary, & Icove, 1995) where the suspect is believed to be a serial offender. However, where merited the basic tenets of criminal investigative analysis that are reflected in these cases will be highlighted. Before examining the available evidence pertaining to elderly sexual homicide; however, an appropriate overview of the current understanding of the general scope and nature of two dynamics are necessary: 1) a general overview of the demographics of crimes against the elderly; and 2) an exploration of the current trends in sexual assault and homicide where elderly persons are victims. This context and background will insure a fuller understanding of the characteristics of these difficult and unusual cases that comprise sexual homicide of the elderly.

Crimes Against the Elderly

Both the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the National Crime Survey reflect that crimes against the elderly tend to be more serious in nature than those against younger persons (Bureau

of Justice Statistics, 1994). Older victims of violent crimes are more likely to be attacked by total strangers (Kennedy and Silverman, 1990; Muram et al., 1992) and are most likely to be victimized in their own homes. They are less likely to try to protect themselves during a crime and are more likely to sustain injuries. These findings are confirmed by numerous studies that discuss the general problem of victimization of the elderly and by specific research addressing violent offenses (Faggiani and Owens, 1999; Nelson and Huff-Corzine, 1998; Fox and Levin, 1991; Lent and Harpold, 1988 and Antunes, et al., 1977); Lent and Harpold, 1988 and Antunes, et al., 1977).

These, and similar studies, demonstrate the elderly female victim is inherently more vulnerable to crime than younger women for a variety of reasons. First, they are more likely to live alone. Nearly 80% of elderly persons who live alone are female due in large part to increased risk of widowhood and longer life expectancy (Tauber & Allen, 1990). Second, “vulnerability is related to physical size and strength; elderly females are less capable of fleeing or resisting a physical attack than a younger person’ (Nelson and Huff-Corzine, 1998:135). This may be particularly true of the older members of the aged population (75 years and older) who are disproportionately female (Moen, 1996), who live alone and who are more likely to experience health-related problems that increase their susceptibility to injury. Diminishing physical capabilities that accompany aging contribute to an older woman's vulnerability to crime. As women age they experience skeletal, neuromuscular, and other systemic changes (Davis and Brody, 1979). These age-related changes restrict mobility and reduce their ability to escape or defend against an assailant.

Sexual Assault of Elderly Females

Narrowing consideration of the research literature to sexual assault of the elderly female reveals that these victims are much more likely to be injured or killed compared to other victims of similar crimes (Kerschner, 1976; Davis and Brody, 1979; Gerry, 1983; Pollock, 1988). However, there is a paucity of research literature regarding the rapist who specifically selects elderly victims. Some studies have examined rapists (Warren et al., 1998; Hazelwood and Burgess, 1995; among others) but fewer have focused specifically on rapists of the elderly (Fletcher, 1977; Groth, 1978; Pollock, 1988, and Muram, 1992).

Elderly Female Homicide

Homicide of elderly females is a rare phenomenon. According to the FBI, approximately 14,249 homicides were reported to the police in 2014 (FBI, 2015). Of these homicide victims, approximately 950 were determined to be elderly (60 years of age or older) and approximately one-third of this total (344) were identified as female. Therefore, elderly female homicides constituted about 2% to 3% of all homicides in 2014. According to annual editions of the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports, this percentage has been fairly stable over past two decades.

Elderly Female Sexual Homicide

Complicating this picture is uncertainty relative to the number of sexual homicides that occur each year (Safarik et al., 2000) but this will be discussed in more depth later. Other difficulties include lack of proper investigation to identify such behavior as a homicide rather than a death due to some other cause or manner, poor communication between investigators and other personnel relative to the nature of the offense, and classification errors in official data entries (see Burgess et al., 1986). An additional complication is uncertainty relative to the number of sexual homicides that occur each year, much less those involving elderly victims. There are many difficulties in obtaining reliable statistics relative to the number of elderly sexual

homicides. One of the most problematic of these difficulties involves the identification of the offense as a homicide without note of the subordinate offense of rape or sexual assault (Brownmiller, 1975).

Although official statistics are elusive, one fact is inescapable—demographic data show that an increasing proportion of the baby boom generation have aged into the elderly population and this will continue for some years to come. Supporting this demographic trend, the recent census data reveals that more people were 65 years and over in 2010 than reported in any previous census with nearly 60% of those being women (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2010). Couple this with the fact that people are living longer, this suggests that the risk of violent victimization to elderly individuals is likely to increase. Overall, this information suggests that examination of these types of cases and anything that may lead to protecting potential victims is important and valuable to public safety. Additionally, because cases of this type are uncommon, law enforcement must continue to strive to become more aware of such incidents and utilize the most effective investigative strategies available to confront such incidents. Although homicide may result from a confrontation between an offender and a victim in the course of other crimes, most studies have not focused exclusively on homicide of the elderly. Conversely, the few studies that have focused on homicide of the elderly appear to concentrate on types of homicide which, in most cases, do not exhibit an identifiable sexual component. Finally, as noted earlier, many of the remaining studies have largely been limited to aggregate analyses regarding both male and female victims with little attention to the importance of both qualitative and quantitative analyses that may support successful investigations of these cases.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Safarik, Mark E., Jarvis, John P., & Nussbaum, Kathleen. (2000). "Elderly Female Serial Sexual Homicide: A Limited Empirical Test of Criminal Investigative Analysis," *Journal of Homicide Studies*, Vol 4. No. 3, pp. 294-307.

Safarik, Mark E. Jarvis, John P., & Nussbaum, Kathleen. (2002). "Sexual Homicide of Elderly Females: Linking Offender Characteristics to Victim and Crime Scene Attributes," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 17 No. 5, pp. 500-525.

Safarik, Mark E. and Jarvis, John P. (2005). "Examining Attributes of Homicides: Toward Quantifying Qualitative Values of Injury Severity," *Journal of Homicide Studies*, 9, 183-203.

OTHER REFERENCES USED ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

**Successful/effective investigations –
How homicide detectives define the goal (success) in their work?**

Paweł Waszkiewicz
University of Warsaw

Abstract

No matter how popular are CSI alike TV shows, homicide investigations are still "the least understood aspect of policing" (Innes & Brookman, 2013). The death investigations are not an exception, since "the history of criminology marginalized the (...) techniques in the pursuit of the criminal" (Valier, 1998). Available literature (with some exceptions, see Innes, 2003) focuses on proposing different approaches toward criminal investigations; however, it is limited to the presentation of theoretical assumptions that are often supported by examples of mistakes made in the course of specific investigations. This applies both to classic works (Geberth 2006; Walton 2006), but also to research studies delivered with the assistance of the leading police forces and think-tanks (ACPO 2006; Cronin 2008). Among the main reasons for that significant gap in the existing literature is the problem with getting access by researchers to the criminal investigators and their work. Definition of one's goal and defining success shapes the proceedings (and their outcomes) in every sphere of human activity, with no exception for homicide investigations. The most common way of defining success in homicide investigations seems to be "clearing the case" by identifying the suspect and charging him/her for committed crime, but existing literature offers four alternate definitions of investigative success: (i) outcome success, (ii) procedural success, (iii) community impact reduction success and (iv) preventative success (Brookman & Innes, 2013).

The important part of the Effective homicide investigation research project that has been conducted by the author in United States (2014-2016) was to identify the ways in which homicide detectives themselves define success of their work. The semi-structured interviews with 32 experienced homicide detectives working in 3 different law enforcement agencies offer insight into their perception of the (ultimate) goals in their work.

Research on Serial and Mass Killings

Panel Session #3

Chair: Jay Corzine
Recorder: Jolene Vincent

A Mixed Methods Comparative Analysis of Mass Murder and Mass Violent Victimization Events

Mindy Weller, University of Central Florida

Expanding Multidisciplinarity: Can Leisure Science Contribute to a More Complete Understanding of Serial Homicide?

D. J. Williams, Idaho State University

Serial Killers: A Comparison of Men and Women and Their Methods

Dana Rosenfeld, University of Central Florida

Alexis Yohros, University of Central Florida

**A Mixed Methods Comparative Analysis of Mass Murder
and Mass Violent Victimization Events**

Mindy Weller
University of Central Florida

For decades there has been a growing body of literature and research on the topic of mass murder with little attention paid to incidents of mass violence whose death toll falls just short of the minimum three body requirement, as stated in the Investigative Assistance for Violent Crimes Act of 2012 whereby a mass killing is when “three or more killings occur in a single incident.” Mass killings, such as the one in Colorado Springs, CO where a man laid siege to a Planned Parenthood clinic, killing three and wounding nine, or the mass shooting in Charleston, SC where a man entered the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church and executed nine people in 2015, are the types of cases that garner the attention of news media, politicians, academics, and the public. Yet these incidents, though devastating, account for approximately 1% of homicides each year. Studies on mass violence have consistently failed to include all victims, living and dead, and as such have created a gap in the field. Recently, the FBI produced a monograph, which highlighted the need for law enforcement to begin taking a proactive approach geared toward the prevention of violent mass victimizing events (FBI 2015). This notes law enforcement’s acknowledgement that more information and understanding of violent events resulting in mass casualties is necessary to attempt reducing the volume of violence and harm incurred by these events. The purpose of this study is to address this gap in the field. As a definition for violent mass victimization, which stands apart from that of mass murder, does not currently exist, this study begins the construction of that definition through a mixed methods comparative analysis.

Since the study of mass murder is structured, valid, reliable, and broad enough to encompass various violent crimes resulting in multiple victims under one umbrella, but not so broad as to create research impeding theoretical or methodological overlap between incidents, it provides the best basis of comparison for the foundation for this study. In developing this definition the following questions are addressed.

- How is a victim identified as a victim making them distinctly different from a witness?
- Beyond number of deaths are there notable differences between incidents of mass murder and violent mass victimization?
- What does inclusion of surviving victims of violent mass victimization events offer to future research?

To answer these questions a mixed methods study design was employed beginning with a qualitative content analysis of news articles documenting incidents of mass violence which occurred within the time frame of 2009 through 2012. This analysis provided the definitional basis for identifying victims and in turn recognized reoccurring themes found throughout the dataset which were then coded for a qualitative statistical analysis.

It seems as though it would be an easy task to explain what constitutes a victim and victimization but there is actually some debate in how these terms are defined throughout the field. How a victim is defined by law also varies from state to state and only occasionally differentiates between a victim and a witness. One of the more common definitions employed in victim and crime related surveys refers to an individual who acknowledges or reports that they have experienced a crime against their person or property by another individual (Nettlebeck & Wilson 2002). The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) defines a victim as the recipient of a

criminal act which is usually used in relation to personal crimes (BJS 2015). For personal crimes, according to this definition, the number of victimizations is equal to the number of victims involved and the total number of victimizations may be greater than the number of incidents because more than one person may be victimized during a single incident. This explanation of victims is one of the few that clearly incorporates multiple victims within a single incident, whereas most speak of the singular victimization of an individual.

Data

Data for this study were compiled from news articles documenting violent criminal events which occurred between 2009 and 2012 and were perpetrated by one or more motivated offenders producing a minimum of three victims within a single event. The parameters for article inclusion are based on the current three victim count requirement for mass murder. Incidents of both mass murder and violent mass victimization are included in the final dataset. News articles from 42 states, within the Continental United States, meeting the three victim minimum were collected and aggregated to produce a sample size of 550 cases of violent mass victimization. On average, each case was comprised of two to three news articles with some cases being comprised of five or more articles. Sources of the news articles included local and national, print and digital, news media with online accessibility. Key word searches were used to identify news articles for the data set. The most commonly used key words were: injured, wounded, hurt, killed, and dead. Incidents which met the three victim count requirement but indicated that victimization was caused by an accident, natural disaster, or act of God were omitted.

Methods & Analysis

A qualitative analysis was conducted to determine an operational definition for “victim” that would differentiate between a “victim” and a “witness.” Headlines of news articles often recited the number of injured and killed victims in a violent event, such as “One dead, two wounded in Sunday shooting” and “Shooting outside NY home leaves 2 dead, 3 wounded.” Information within the articles would then detail how and where the victim was injured such as being shot in the shoulder or that the victims’ forehead had been grazed by a bullet. The level of detail varied by article but it supported the notion that an individual present at the violent event must sustain a physical injury to be categorized as a victim. However, the injury did not have to be caused by the offender(s). If an individual received medical attention for a broken arm or cuts and bruises from falling as a result of the event, and not the direct actions of the offender(s), the injury was documented in the article indicating that the injured person was a victim of the event. Offenders who were wounded, killed, or took their own lives were not classified as victims regardless of injury. For the purposes of this analysis, this was how victims were identified, defined, and coded for each case.

During the qualitative analysis various themes emerged regarding victim/target selection, incident environment, causal factors, and the time of day in which the event occurred. These themes were coded for statistical analysis. Themes that were not quantified included police presence, normalization of violence, and community reaction.

In the majority of cases police and emergency services arrived after the violence had come to an end. Though news reports cite that they arrived in minutes after being notified, that was as long as it took for the violence to have ended and the offender(s) to escape, if they were

not wounded or killed. Police presence at the start of a violent incident corresponded with the officers delivering arrest warrants or executing sting operations which caused violent reactions from offenders. In these incidents the officers present were often among the wounded and killed. Occurrences of officer involvement were too low to quantify in a meaningful way for statistical analysis.

Urban areas, where it was suggested a high volume of gang activity and violence occurred, expressed a level of acceptance and apathy toward the violence. One man is quoted as saying “There’s a lot of gunshots you hear around down in the projects there...It don’t bother me” (Fritscher 2009, November 1). News sources would also keep a running tally of homicides within the article noting that the victim was “among at least 34 CPS students killed this school year in gun violence” (Sun Times 2009, July 14). Many articles expressed this sentiment of acceptance. Communities would gather to mourn and indicate distaste for the violent state of their community. However, these gatherings were not exempt from violence. Funerals and wakes were among the places targeted by offenders. Authors and authorities would suggest that the shootings were retaliation for prior shootings and that these gatherings were a way for offenders to know where their targets would be.

One of the more notable differences between incidents of mass murder and mass victimization was the time of day that they occurred. Times of the violent events were often documented in the news articles as the time in which the violence started or when first responders were notified through a call for service. These times were coded as 1:00 AM-11:59 AM for Morning, 12:00 PM-5:00 PM for Afternoon, and 5:01 PM-12:59 AM for Evening. The majority (46%) of mass violent events took place in the morning followed by 36% of cases

occurring in the evening. Incidents of mass murder that took place in the evening hours accounted for 50% of the mass murder cases, while incidents of violent mass victimization were reported as occurring in the morning. It is in the early hours of the morning that bars are closing their doors and intoxicated patrons are at a higher risk of becoming involved in a deadly altercation. An argument or fight is the most commonly occurring cause for violence during these hours, and gun shots are often reported as the offender(s) “opening fire on the crowd.” This suggests that the violence is at least partially indiscriminately dispersed resulting in high casualties but low mortality counts.

Discussion

Analysis of victim injury and classification from the data have provided a definition for what constitutes a victim in a violent mass victimization event. The victim must have been physically injured as a direct cause of the event and that injury will have been documented as receiving medical attention. By combining this definition with that of the three victim requirement instituted by mass murder events, incidents of mass violent victimization can be identified, classified, and analyzed. Though only a few of the results of the overall analysis are discussed in this paper there are notable differences between incidents of violent mass victimization and mass murder. The time of day in which these events occur speak directly to the state of mind the offenders are likely to be in. Target selection is associated with this finding in that incidents of spontaneous violence occurring as a result of an argument indicate a lack of premeditation that is often associated with mass murder. Though it remains to be seen what affect this analysis will have on future research, it can potentially aid law enforcement in identifying problem areas so that they may allocate their resources as efficiently as possible.

References

- BJS. (2015). Definitions, Retrieved from Bureau of Justice Statistics from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tdtp&tid=9>
- CPS Student Killed, 2 Men Wounded in Shooting. (July 14, 2011). Sun Times. Retrieved from <http://www.nbcchicago.com/news/local/CPS-Student-Killed-2-Men-Wounded-in-Shooting.html>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mass Victimization, Promising Avenues for Prevention. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/mass-victimization-promising-avenues-for-prevention>
- Investigative Assistance for Violent Crimes Act of 2012. (2013). Public Law 112-216, 112th Congress. Retrieved at <https://www.congress.gov/112/plaws/publ265/PLAW112publ265.pdf>
- Fritscher, B. L. (2009, November 1). 2 dead, 2 hurt in Halloween shooting. Rockford Register Star. Retrieved from <http://www.rrstar.com/article/20091101/NEWS/311019916>
- One dead, two wounded in Sunday Shooting. (July 11, 2011) St. Clair News-Aegis. Retrieved from http://www.newsaegis.com/news/one-dead-two-wounded-in-Sunday-shooting/article_3c136e1c-bf41-5798-8c0c-a78662da82bb.html
- Krouse, W. J. and Richardson, D. J. (2015). Mass Murder with Firearms: Incidents and Victims, 1993-2013, Congressional Research Service, Federation of American Scientist. Retrieved from <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R44126.pdf>
- Thompson, C. (2009, August 5). Shooting outside NY home leaves 2 dead, 3 wounded. The San Diego Union Tribune. Retrieved from <http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/2009/aug/05/usbuffalo-five-shot-080509/>

**Expanding Multidisciplinarity:
Can Leisure Science Contribute to a more Complete Understanding of Serial Homicide?**

D J Williams, PhD

Center for Positive Sexuality (Los Angeles) and Idaho State University

Introduction

It is commonly known among forensic scholars and practitioners that many serial murderers enjoy killing and do so for intrinsic rewards, consistent with the German concept of lustmord (Leyton, 2005; Skrapec, 2001). For example, in a letter to a San Francisco newspaper, the “Zodiac” serial murderer wrote, “I like killing people because it is so much fun” (Newton, 2006, p. 303), which statement apparently was later echoed by Lee Boyd Malvo (Leyton, 2005, p. 12). Indeed, numerous serial homicide offenders have applied terms such as “fun,” “pleasure,” “enjoyment,” “excitement,” and so on to describe how they experience committing murder. However, although the scholarly study of serial homicide is informed by a diverse multidisciplinary literature, the field of leisure science remains conspicuously absent on this topic. It would seem that because leisure scholars specifically address questions pertaining to what (and when, how, and why) people do for enjoyment, fun, and pleasure; then perhaps the field of leisure science may be a useful complement to the range of existing forensic sciences in helping to better understand the process of serial homicide.

Serial Homicide as Potential Leisure

Leisure science is a small, distinct field of study with roots in sociology and social psychology. Although a precise definition of leisure remains elusive, scholars agree that leisure

experience must be freely chosen and intrinsically motivated but can be conceptualized as activity (behavior), time, setting, or mental state (Kleiber et al., 2011). Leisure experience is often associated with enjoyment or pleasure, various additional positive emotions, reduced stress, excitement, sense of adventure, and self-expression. Because people choose their specific leisure experiences and these are intrinsically motivated, leisure is also personally meaningful. Despite the fact that leisure descriptions have been commonly applied to serial homicide and much of such violent offending is intrinsically motivated, only a few scholars have rigorously explored the possibility that these crimes may be a form of deviant leisure (Caissie & Gunn, 2006; Rojek, 1999; Williams & Walker, 2006). While existing explorations are useful, there remains much more to examine both theoretically and empirically in how leisure science may provide insights into serial homicide research.

Casual, Serious, and Project-Based Leisure (Serious Leisure Perspective)

The prolific work of Robert Stebbins illustrates that specific forms of leisure can be understood as falling somewhere on a continuum with casual leisure at one end and serious leisure at the other. Casual leisure is described as being immediate, primarily hedonic, intrinsically rewarding, short-lived pleasurable activity that requires little or no training (Stebbins, 2001). Furthermore, casual leisure is often spontaneous and playful, and its benefits are largely associated with stress-reduction, relaxation, and restfulness associated with restoring life balance (Stebbins, 2001). On the other hand, serious leisure is so interesting to participants that it becomes career-like and requires ongoing effort and perseverance, special skills, has a unique ethos, produces durable benefits and rewards, and leads to formulation of a specific identity around it (Stebbins, 2001). Serious leisure participants include amateurs, hobbyists, and volunteers, and benefits associated

with participation include cherished experiences, gaining new knowledge and skills, self-expression, self-image, and self-gratification (Stebbins, 2001). Stebbins (2005) also described a third major form of leisure, project-based leisure, which is “a short-term, moderately complicated, one-shot or occasional though infrequent, creative undertaking carried out in free time” (p. 1). Although only a one-shot or occasional undertaking, project-based leisure has properties of both casual and serious leisure, shares benefits with serious leisure, but often has additional social rewards depending on the type of leisure project (Stebbins, 2005).

Although many serial cases of murder-as-leisure (especially sexual serial murder) seem to reflect salient properties of serious leisure (Williams & Walker, 2006), other cases seem to better fit project-based leisure, or even several key attributes of casual leisure. For example, Dennis Rader organized his murders as “projects,” which, consistent with project-based leisure, were structured in a particular fashion and reflected elements of both serious and casual leisure, and account for his unusual responses to law enforcement personnel when he was apprehended (Williams, 2016). Donald Henry Gaskins Jr. described his killings as either “coastal,” which were quite random, targeted strangers as victims, and occurred relatively frequently with little planning or preparation (akin to casual leisure); or “serious murders” (Newton, 2006), which were considerably more goal-oriented; targeted known-persons or acquaintances; could involve accomplices; required more planning, preparation and skill; and occurred less frequently (serious leisure).

Because casual and serious leisure are at opposite sides of a continuum rather than being understood as completely dichotomous constructs, there is considerable flexibility in assessing and classifying specific cases of multiple murder, including serial homicide, as particular types

of leisure. Furthermore, leisure theory would predict that most offenders would display a somewhat limited range, regarding the casual to serious leisure continuum or project-based leisure, of their specific type of operationalization of murder-as-leisure. Empirical research on this possibility is currently underway. Such a theoretical prediction is compatible with emerging research that focuses on identifying consistent behavioral themes or patterns, as opposed to expecting the same behaviors across murder series committed by particular serial offenders (Sorochinski & Salfati, 2010).

Flow Theory: Serial Murder as Optimal Experience

Flow, or the psychology of optimal experience (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997), occurs when there is a close balance between the skill level of the participant and the challenge level of an activity. Flow has been examined across a range of leisure experiences, and has emerged as a salient and robust contemporary theory within the field of leisure. For a given activity, if the skill level is too low compared to the challenge, then the participant becomes bored; conversely, if the inherent challenge exceeds skill level, then the participant experiences anxiety or frustration (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). According to Csikszentmihalyi (1997), flow experience occurs when there is: (a) a balance between challenge and skill; (b) a clear goal; (c) a sense of control; (d) a merging of action and awareness; (e) concentration; (f) absorption in the activity; (g) time seems to be altered; and (h) the experience is autotelic.

A diverse array of leisure activities, from casual to serious leisure types to project-based leisure, are capable of producing flow experiences. Only very recently has flow theory been seriously considered with respect to serial homicide, yet initial exploration into this possibility provides initial evidence that the properties of flow do apply to serial murder-as-leisure

(Williams, 2016). Several serial offenders have expressed the intense pleasure and enjoyment that killing people sometimes gives them. However, consistent with flow theory, many serial offenders seem to have experienced frustration after committing their first homicides, due to their initial lack of experience (activity challenge exceeds skill level) and inability to control important aspects of the murder in comparison to high expectations dictated by their detailed fantasies. As offenders gain more homicidal experience and thus more skill, aspects of the homicidal challenge must also be increased somewhat proportionally in order to attain optimal satisfaction derived from the murder-as-leisure experience. Thus, while it is well-known that many serial homicide offenders are ultimately caught in large part due to high narcissism; from a leisure flow perspective, increased risks (thus creating a higher degree of challenge) must also be taken, perhaps largely subconsciously, by the offender over time in order to continue enjoying the serial murder-as-leisure (Williams, 2016).

Conclusion: Further Exploration is Warranted

Both Flow Theory and the Serious Leisure Perspective (classification of leisure) offer new ways to understand how serial homicide offenders may structure and subjectively experience committing murders. Additionally, leisure scholars have explored leisure place attachments and preferences, which may apply to mobility differences (i.e., those who travel to commit murder vs. those who murder locally vs. place-specific offenders) among serial homicide offenders as explained by Hickey (2016). Leisure constraint negotiation theories (Schneider, 2016) may also help explain how various intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural barriers to committing murder are negotiated. Theoretical explorations suggest that leisure science may

have value in complementing multidisciplinary research on serial homicide. Thus, much empirical work is warranted.

*Author Note: A full-length version of this paper is forthcoming.

References

- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement in everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gunn, L., & Caissie, L. T. (2006). Serial murder as an act of deviant leisure. *Leisure/Loisir*, 30(1), 27-53.
- Hickey, E. W. (2016). *Serial murderers and their victims (7th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Kleiber, D. A., Walker, G. J., & Mannell, R. C. (2011). *A social psychology of leisure (2nd ed.)*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Leyton, E. (2005). *Hunting humans: The rise of the modern multiple murderer (2nd ed.)*. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart.
- Newton, M. (2006). *The encyclopedia of serial killers (2nd ed.)*. New York: Checkmark Books.
- Rojek, C. (1999). Abnormal leisure: Invasive, mephitic, and wild forms. *Leisure and Society*, 22, 21-37.
- Skrapec, C. (2001). Defining serial murder: A call for a return to the original lustmord. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 16, 10-24.
- Schneider, I. E. (2016). Leisure constraints and negotiation: Highlights from the journey past, present, and future. In G. J. Walker, D. Scott, & M. Stodolska (Eds.), *Leisure matters: the state and future of leisure studies* (pp. 151-161). State College, PA: Venture.
- Sorochinsky, M., & Salfati, C. G. (2010). The consistency of inconsistency in serial homicide: Patterns of behavioral change across series. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 7, 109-136.
- Stebbins, R. A. (2001). *New directions in the theory and research of serious leisure*. Queenston,

ON: Edwin Mellen Press.

Stebbins, R. A. (2005). Project-based leisure: Theoretical neglect of a common use of free time. *Leisure Studies*, 24, 1-11.

Williams, D J (2016). *Mephitic projects: A forensic leisure science analysis of the BTK serial murders*. Manuscript available at Idaho State University.

Williams, D J, & Walker, G. J. (2006). Leisure, deviant leisure, and crime: Caution: Objects may be closer than they appear. *Leisure/Loisir*, 30(1), 193-218.

**You Can't Fake Smart:
A Comparison of Serial Killer IQs and Victim Typology**

Alexis Yohros

&

Dana Rosenfeld

University of Central Florida

Researchers, writers for TV shows, and people alike have long held an interest in gaining access into the minds of serial killers. A Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) symposium in 2005 agreed to the most current definition of a serial killer: “Serial Murder: The unlawful killing of two or more victims by the same offender(s), in separate events.” Shows such as *Criminal Minds* and books such as *Murder Most Rare* have attempted to understand the makings of a serial killer. Countless research articles, true crime books, and documentaries have done a thorough job in collecting information on serial killers and their motives, typologies, childhood experiences, and biographical timelines.

One dimension that has been greatly overlooked but may provide new insight into the behavior of serial murders is intelligence, more specifically, IQ. The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale is the most commonly used method for testing intelligence in adults.

According to the definition of Intelligence Quotient by the Salem Press Encyclopedia of Health 2015,

IQ scores typically have a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. This means that average intelligence is considered to be any score between 90 and 109. IQs from 110 to 119 are considered to be high average, while scores that range from 80 to 89 are considered to be low average. Scores that fall in the 120 to 129 range are labeled superior, and scores of 130 and above are regarded as very

superior. In some instances, individuals who score above 130 are labeled as intellectually gifted. Scores in the 70 to 79 range are considered borderline scores. Those who score below 70 are usually further assessed to determine if a diagnosis of intellectual disability is appropriate (Watson, 2015).

The media are heavily attracted to “high IQ killers” and “criminal geniuses,” such as the fictional Hannibal Lector (Oleson, J. C 2006). This has led to the idea that all serial killers have these same intelligent characteristics. In reality, the mean IQ of serial killers is average but the range of serial killers’ IQs varies greatly, with the lowest recorded being 54 (way below the cutoff point for mental retardation) and the highest being 186 (way above the cutoff point for gifted IQ), according to the research collected by the Radford/FGCU Serial Killer Database. Along with IQ, serial killers’ behaviors in terms of choosing their victims, killing their victims, and disposing of their victims also vary tremendously. For example, the infamous Ted Bundy with an IQ of 136 beat thirty-six young women to death and proceeded to leave them at the murder scene with no attempt to move or hide the bodies. In contrast, Daniel Joseph Bank with an IQ of 85 bludgeoned or stabbed to death six victims and was eventually caught at one of the murder scenes (Radford University 2012). This calls into question whether IQ has something to do with this variation between serial killers and their choice of victims, what they do with their victims, how many victims they are able to kill before getting caught, and how they dispose of their victims’ bodies.

The purpose of this study is to provide more accurate information about serial killers in the United States (1970-2012) by examining this under-researched area of IQ and victim typology including: number of victims, method of killing, victim type, and disposal of the body. More specifically, the study aims to compare serial killers with low, average, and gifted IQs to

see whether there are differences and/or similarities between the different IQ categories and the victim typologies, more specifically: choice in victims, method of killing, number of victims, and post-mortem behavior.

Research Question

It is seen through the literature that much is known about characteristics, typology, and victimology of serial killers, yet little is known about their cognitive ability and IQ. More specifically, there is limited information on whether IQ is related to serial killers' victim typology. The current proposed study will address this research by analyzing serial killers' intelligent quotients by low, average, and high to see if these scores are related to choice in victims, method of killing, number of victims, and post-mortem behavior. Further regression analysis will be conducted to provide more detail using IQ on a continuous scale. Ultimately, this study will analyze if higher intelligence is related to being more meticulous of their crime scene and a higher victim count. Because the United States has the highest number of serial killers, and the vast increase in number of serial killers during the 1970s-2000s, this study will focus only on serial killers in the US from 1970-2012.

Methods

Serial killer IQs and characteristics of victims are being obtained from the Radford/FGCU Serial Killer Database. This research is quantitative and descriptive as it describes various characteristics of serial killer victims. It is also explanatory as it analyzes the relationship between IQs and these victim characteristics. The unit of analysis in the study is serial killer incidents. The purpose is to see if a serial killer's IQ has an effect on their number of victims before they get caught, victim type, method of killing, and disposal of the body. First,

chi-square tests were run using the IQ cutoffs stated by based on the IQ ranges used in the WAIS: category one: borderline/intellectual disability (IQ: below 70 up to 79), category two: low/high average (IQ: 80-119), category three: superior/gifted (IQ: 120 up to 180 and above). These cut off points were established using Salem Press Encyclopedia of Health. These were used to provide information on association. Then, a series of regression analysis were run using IQ on a continuous scale to further analyze the relationship between IQ and victim typology.

Data

The data collected for the study come from the Radford/FGCU Serial Killer Database. To date, the Radford/FGCU Serial Killer Database contains data on 3,873 serial killers. The database was created using information collected by Radford University students from a variety of sources including prison records, court transcripts, media sources, true crime books, and the Internet (Radford University 2012). For this reason, one of the limitations may be the accuracy of the data collected. This dataset is useful as it contains the IQ of 236 serial killers as well as other variables needed to compare serial killer IQ and victim typology (victim type, number of victims, method of killing, and disposal of body). The dataset will encompass the years 1970-2012 and include serial killers in the United States who were tested for IQ before their sentencing. After removing spree killers and “suspected” serial killers from the dataset, 219 serial killers were left to use for the analysis.

Dependent variable

The dependent variables in the study are victim type, number of victims killed, method of killing, and disposal of body. This was done using the Radford/FGCU Serial Killer Database, which explicitly labels each variable.

Victim types. These range from street people (1), hitchhikers (2), sexual encounters/johns (3), patient wards (4), family (5), employees/customers (6), home invasion (7), street (8), convenience (9), criminals (10), and multiple victims (11). These original categories were used for chi-square analysis but were later recoded for the regression. These were recoded into dummy variables of high and low risk victims using FBI's Manual, "Serial Murder Pathways for Investigation." High-risk victims include: street people (such as prostitutes), hitchhikers, and sexual encounters. Low-risk victims include: family, employees, general public (such as grocery shoppers), and home invasions. Low risk victims were coded (0) and served as the reference category. High-risk victims were coded as (1).

Number of victims. This is on a continuous scale and is the variable labeled "number of victims" in the Radford Database.

Method of Killing. This is categorical and was recoded into nine distinct categories, because many of the original categories had little to no information. These categories were coded as: (1) bludgeoned, (2) shot, (3) poisoned, (4) cutting/stabbing/axed, (5) strangulation/suffocation/drowning, (6) two weapons, (9) all other weapons and (15) three or more weapons. These were later created into dummy variables, in which gun was labeled (1) and other method was labeled (0). This was done because a large sample of serial killers used multiple methods of killing, and so a hierarchy rule was created to see if IQ influenced the use of a gun as a weapon. In addition, most of the weapons in the "other" category involved personal

contact. Therefore, one is able to compare gun and personal contact as the main method of killing.

Disposal of Body. A dummy variable was created for disposal of body in which “no attempt” was labeled (0) and “attempt” was labeled (1). No attempt means that there was no attempt to dispose of or remove the body. This means the body was left as is at the crime scene. Any case in which the body was moved, buried, or disposed; the variable was coded (1) for an attempt to dispose of the body.

Independent variable

Intelligence Quotient. The independent variable in this study is Intelligence Quotient derived from Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. There are four different IQs in the dataset, but IQ1 will be used as it is labeled as the most reliable at the time of conviction. In order to compare high, average, and low IQs in a series of chi-squares and ANOVAs, the data will be recoded these three distinct categories. The cutoff points for each will be based on the IQ ranges used in the WAIS: category one: borderline/intellectual disability (IQ: below 20 up to 79), category two: low/high average (IQ: 80-119), category three: superior/gifted (IQ: 120 up to 180 and above). These cut off points were established using Salem Press Encyclopedia of Health. Regression analysis will also be run using IQ1 on a continuous scale.

Control variables

Sex. Sex of the serial killer is coded (1) to represent male respondents and females are coded (0). This was derived using the variable in the dataset that determined the sex of the serial killer.

Race. A dummy variable is created for White respondents. Since early years of the dataset did not identify other specific ethnic groups, the analysis is restricted to two racial categories. White respondents are coded (1) and non-white respondents are coded (0).

Analytic strategy

The study involved a series of bivariate and multivariate analyses. First, a series of chi-square tests and a one-way analysis of variance were run to analyze association between the three IQ cutoffs and victim typology. This included analyzing associations between borderline/low, average, and high/superior IQ and method of killing, victim type, and disposal of body. For method of killing, the chi-square used the original coding of (1) bludgeoned, (2) shot, (3) poisoned, (4) cutting/stabbing/axed, (5) strangulation/suffocation/drown, (6) two weapons, (9) all other weapons and (15) three of more weapons. The same was done for victim type using the original coding in the Radford Database: street people (1), hitchhikers (2), sexual encounters/johns (3), patient wards (4), family (5), employees/customers (6), home invasion (7), street (8), convenience (9), criminals (10), and multiple victims (11). A one-way analysis of variance was also done using the IQ categories and number of victims.

IQ was then used on a continuous scale in a series of multivariate tests. First, OLS regression was used to analyze the effect of serial killer IQ and the two control variables (race and gender) on number of victims. Then, separate logistic regressions were run to analyze the effect of IQ on the various dependent variables. Separate regressions were run for each: disposal

of body (attempt or no attempt), victim type (high or low risk), and method of killing (gun or other weapon). The control variables race and gender were included in each regression.

Results

Table 1 displays the means, standard deviations, and proportions for the dependent and independent variables in the analysis. Our analysis began with a series of chi-square tests and one way analysis of variance tests (not shown). The chi-square that was significant looked at the association between the three IQ cutoffs and disposal of body. In addition, an analysis of variance between the three IQ cutoffs and number of victims was also significant. The results further showed significant mean differences at the .01 level between those with borderline/low IQ and those with high/superior IQ. Results show that those with higher IQs had higher victim counts. For further analysis we ran three logistic regressions and one multiple regression model using the whole sample. Dummy variables were created for race, sex, victim type, and body disposal method. The analysis reveals that two of the regression models are significant; the models for the effect of IQ on the number of victims and disposal method.

(Table 1 about here)

Victim type, method of killing, and body disposal method are dichotomous; therefore logistic regression is the appropriate statistical technique. Table 2 shows the results of the analysis for body disposal method, as that test was the only one in which the model was significant at the .05 level, with the independent variable being IQ the control variables being sex and race. The logistic regression models for victim type and method of killing are not significant at the .05 level and therefore the results are not shown. Results show that white serial killers are

more likely to attempt to dispose of the body than their non-white counterparts, controlling for all other variables in the model. In addition, those with higher IQs are more likely to attempt to dispose of the body. Table 3 shows the results of the analysis for the number of victims a serial killer had. Because number of victims is an interval variable, linear regression is the appropriate statistical technique. IQ was the only significant variable at the .05 level. The results show that higher IQ results in a higher victim count.

(Table 2 & 3 about here)

References

- Oleson, J. C. (2006). Contemporary Demonology: The Criminological Theories of Hannibal Lecter, Part Two. *Journal of Criminal Justice & Popular Culture*, 13(1), 29-49.
- Watson, T. S. (2014). Intelligence quotient (IQ). Salem Press *Encyclopedia of Health*.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Proportions for IQ, Sociodemographic Variables, and Dependent Variables

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
IQ			
(Higher = higher IQ)	93.018	24.47	219
Male Serial Killers	.9498	----	219
High Risk Victim	.2744	----	215
Attempt to Dispose Body	.4398	----	216
White Serial Killers	.5662	----	219
Gun	.4771	----	218
Number of Victims	6.082	6.78	219

Table 2: Multiple Regression Results: Effect of IQ and Socio-demographic Variables on Number of Victims*

Independent Variable	Model
IQ	.048/.172 * (.021)
Male Serial Killers	.941/.030 (2.087)
White Serial Killers	.614/.045 (1.058)
Intercept	.412
N	219 .040 *
Adjusted R Squared	.026

Note: Cell entries are given as unstandardized regression coefficient/standardized (beta) coefficient with the standard error given in parentheses.

* $p < .05$

Table 3: Binary Logistic Regression Results: Effect of IQ and Socio-demographic Variables on Attempt to Dispose of Body

Independent Variable	Model
IQ	.016/1.016* (.007)
Male Serial Killers	1.308/2.822 (.732)
White Serial Killers	.702/2.018 * (.332)
Constant	-3.160
N	216
Cox & Snell R ²	.095
Nagelkerke R ²	.127
Chi-Square	21.568 **

Note: Cell entries are given as unstandardized regression coefficient/standardized (beta) coefficient with the standard error given in parentheses.

* p < .05, ** p < .01

Panel Session #3 Recorder Notes: Research on Serial and Mass Killings

Recorder: Jolene Vincent - Chair: Jay Corzine

A Mixed Methods Comparative Analysis of Mass Murder and Mass Violent Victimization Events

Mindy Weller, University of Central Florida

Becky Block: “Good for you, a lot of work is involved. You said 24-hour time limit, but location could change (provides example) Given location is changing, how could you account for this?”

Mindy Weller: “I had location in there, but it was not significant. People get away at early hours and aren’t found. It has a lot to do with jurisdiction and adult offenders.”

(?): “How do you distinguish mass murder from spree murder?”

Mindy Weller: “Spree is over a few days to a week, not as short lived as mass murder which is 24 hours. It should be reduced to 12 hours, usually they don’t take long.”

Candice Batton: “In the table, the bottom left number is 1.34. Is that the average for adult offenders for mass victimization?”

Mindy Weller: “Yes, but mostly were single offenders, one was six [offenders], a few were 3-4 [offenders], but the mean was 1.34.”

Dick Block: “Can you have mass victimization and mass murder?”

Mindy Weller: “Mass victimization is 2 or less victims and mass murder is 3 or more victims.”

Expanding Multidisciplinarity:

Can Leisure Science Contribute to a More Complete Understand of Serial Homicide?

D.J. Williams, Idaho State University

Jay Corzine: “Lots of leisure has resources... Serial killers need time and he had kids that took his time.”

D.J. Williams: “My hypothesis would be killing is leisure and it would need certain things.”

Dallas Drake: “How would this transfer to mercy killers in hospitals?”

D.J. Williams: “The work on leisure blends.” (Discusses his work on S&M and dungeons).

Tom Dover: “Fascinating new perspective.”

Dallas Drake: “Where will this take us?”

D.J. Williams: “Leisure compliments many areas. It bridges many areas together.”

***You Can't Fake Smart:
A Comparison of Serial Killer IQs and Victim Typology***

Alexis Yohros and Dana Rosenfeld, University of Central Florida

Becky Block: “Confused on two things. You had a total of almost four thousand serial killers in the data, but in the table you have N=216?”

Dana Rosenfeld: “Because those were the only ones that had IQ. They didn't have IQ for every single serial killer.”

Becky Block: “That's a really small number and percentage that they had IQ for.”

Dana Rosenfeld: “Well that's what we were given.”

Becky Block: It might be a good idea, in just checking the validity, to compare the ones with IQ information and all the other ones and see if there hugely different in any way. And a couple other things I didn't quite understand. When you talk about independent variables you say IQ 1 is labeled as the most reliable at the time of conviction and I didn't understand who is doing the labeling. It was a passive statement and you don't tell us who labeled it. And what do you mean by time of conviction? Are you looking at when the IQ was measured?

Dana Rosenfeld: “Yes.”

Becky Block: “Sometimes it's measured at different times and sometimes the IQ measure changes.”

Dana Rosenfeld: “From what we gathered from the data set was that, as we talked about, sometimes serial killers sometimes dumb down, so they don't get executed or have the death penalty. So, from what we understand, the court sentencing, right before that, they take their IQ. That's what we got from the data set.”

Becky Block: “So that is supposed to be the most accurate point?”

Dana Rosenfeld: “That's what they were measuring. That's what we were given.”

Becky Block: “That's the only IQ given?”

Dana Rosenfeld: “Yes.”

Becky Block: “Okay. And I keep wondering how many women there were in the 200 and whatever cases and is it enough to analyze separately?”

Dana Rosenfeld: “There were not enough.”

Becky Block: “Then maybe you should take them out all together because they might be different.”

Dana Rosenfeld: “We didn't think about that but there really weren't that many women.”

Becky Block: “That's what I figured. So I was thinking that I would suggest just taking them out and seeing if that raises your significance. Things might fit better. I think this is great; you're looking at IQ, no one else did that.”

Marc Riedel: “I would suggest comparing results of group testing to see if IQ individual tests to group IQ tests because group test of IQs can vary a lot. You might want to see if there is any variation you have to take account of when you analyze the data. If you can find a good data set that’s reliable, you will find that there are all sorts of subtests of IQ tests and you might want to get a hold of a psychologist and ask him especially what kind of IQ variables attribute to serial killers. Which ways of thinking? I would also take a look at some of the subtests and see what affect it has.”

?: “So, you’re trying to look at IQ, divided into 3 categories, to see if it is predictive of some of these patterns?”

Dana Rosenfeld: “Yes.”

?: “So, have you looked at the cases that do have IQ to determine how it does predict against the other 4,000 cases that you have data on? That it is even worth the work?”

Dana Rosenfeld: “We would like to. We just ran the analysis two weeks ago so we are still working on it a bit. But, we would like to continue to see what we can find.”

?: “Is this a thesis or dissertation or separate project?”

Dana Rosenfeld: “It’s a separate project.”

Community Impact of Homicide

.Panel Session #4

Chair: Greg Weaver
Recorder: Tom Dover

Amber Scherer, George Mason University

Tim Keel, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Wendy Regoeczi, Cleveland State University

***Connecting Research to Practice: The Logic and Utility of Social
Science Applications to Homicide and Other Violent Crime***

Panel Session #5

(non-paper session)

Chair: John Jarvis
Discussant: Tim Keel
Recorder: Dallas Drake

✚ Child Abduction/Homicide: What is known at the Time of Abduction

Sarah Craun, Federal Bureau of Investigation

✚ Operational Needs for Case Linking

Tom Dover, Federal Bureau of Investigation

✚ Recent Explorations of Crime and Policing: Implications for Homicide Research

John Jarvis, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Advances in Theory and Research

Panel Session #6

Chair: Candice Batton
Recorder: Mindy Weller

✚ *A Computationally Implemented Simulation of Violent Offending*

Thomas J. Dover, Federal Bureau of Investigation

✚ *The Effect of Weapon, Offender, and Situational Characteristics on the Number of Deaths in Mass Murder Incidents*

James McCutcheon, University of Memphis
Sarah Ann Sacra, University of Central Florida
Lin Huff-Corzine, University of Central Florida
Jay Corzine, University of Central Florida

✚ *Conducting Homicide Research with Hard to Obtain Data: Case Study Poland*

Piotr Karasek, University of Warsaw
Pawel Waszkiewicz, University of Warsaw

A Computationally Implemented Simulation of Violent Offending

Thomas J. Dover, Ph.D.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Within current criminological research, the availability of information about “murder offenders” and access to the offenders themselves is limited to those offenders who have been identified. This is a source of biased sampling and (potentially biased) extrapolation when applying findings to unknown offenders or speculating about causative factors of violence. Yet, from an investigative standpoint, it is the offenders who have not been identified that are often the most relevant, and the least understood. Without a baseline understanding of the offender attributes in unknown offender and non-offender populations, there is limited diagnostic value to the results in violence research (Alison, Smith, Eastman, & Rainbow, 2003; Johnson & Groff, 2014). Additionally, researchers do not understand the scope or nature of populations that come close to offending but never actually do (Malamuth, 1981; Polaschek, Hudson, Ward, & Siegert, 2001). While this “primed” but non-offending population is less relevant to prosecutorial elements of the legal system, it is extremely important in understanding issues of offense prediction and prevention (Reiss & Roth, 1993; Eck & Liu, 2008). Both unknown offenders and “primed” but non-offenders constitute hidden populations that are under-explored and clearly pose significant gaps in criminological insight.

These limitations are due, in part, to outcome-driven approaches to research, sampling issues within data collection efforts, and inadequate methodological solutions to capturing, expressing, and exploring the complexity of behavioral processes that culminate in offending (Johnson & Groff, 2014). To address these methodological challenges, it is suggested that violent

offending be re-framed not as the product of offender, victim, or environmental attributes, but rather as the result of conflict-driven social interactions (Black, 2010) and dynamic adaptations within those interactions (Dover, 2010). Furthermore, it is important to recognize the path-dependencies of violent offending and “view a violent event as the outcome of a long chain of preceding events” (Roth, 1994, p. 6). From this perspective, violence is regarded as an emergent feature of a complex adaptive social system.

One way to address this complexity is through the use of computational modeling as a means to augment criminological research. In this type of approach “models are primarily seen as surrogate systems that facilitate the examination of real-world situations and phenomenology that are too complex or uncontrollable to study and control directly.” (Frank, 2012, p. 18) This is accomplished by abstracting the referent system, developing these abstractions into concepts and then implementing those concepts into an explicit formalization (Cioffi-Revilla, 2014). Computational models can take on many arrangements and vary in scale and formalization. However, regardless of the implementation, “the traditional role of a model in the social sciences is a translation of theory into a form whereby it can be tested and refined” (Crooks, Castle, & Batty, 2008, p. 418). This can be further underscored by the notion that “if a theory is valid, then a formal implementation of it should be able to “grow” the outcomes the theory was developed to explain” (Johnson & Groff, 2014, p. 4).

Growing and studying an offender *in silico* will allow researchers to move away from outcome-driven research, explore offending as a process-driven compound event (Cioffi-Revilla, 2014), and provide unique insights regarding internal and external factors that contribute to the emergence of violent behavior. Viewing violent offending as a compound event opens new and

powerful analytical possibilities that add value to assessments and can provide conceptual insights into individual offending trajectories, variability of offender adaptations, responses to stimuli, and offender strategic and tactical processes. Furthermore, the emergence of geospatial and temporal behaviors can be used to inform investigative efforts to understand violent offenders (i.e., victim selection or possible triggers for violent interactions) in the real world (Groff & Mazerolle, 2008; Johnson & Groff, 2014).

The computational implementation of a synthetic offender does not replace the necessity for collecting criminological data via traditional methods (i.e., police records, case files, or interviews), but instead complements it. However, research will benefit from the ability to computationally “grow” offenders to supplement and understand empirical offending data. In some cases, the cultivation of a synthetic offender will provide the means to quickly and inexpensively test and proto-type theory and/or explore large populations of agent-based synthetic offenders without the large resource expenditures or concerns regarding the health and safety of human subjects. Additionally, model outcomes and relevant process features can be quickly and directly documented and collected as data, thereby also eliminating significant resource expenditures (and potential error) on multiple data collection and data entry trials.

In criminology and crime analysis, computational methodologies offer practical contributions to understanding the complexity of crime as a social phenomenon. With increasing computational resources, expanding methods, and no shortage of “hard” problems to be addressed, there is a significant amount of momentum to be gained. This research furthers the field of computational criminology by integrating macro-level subject-environment interactions with bounded rational endogenous features of the violent offender himself. In this way, the

integrated model adds to general discourse about crime trends and can offer specific insights about offending behavior.

For instance, the current research findings suggest a subject's ability to vary his methods and adapt are key elements in temporal clustering characteristics and series longevity. Additionally, while areas of privacy and comfort provide the subject with targeting and crime site options, dynamic interactional factors influence specific choices. As a whole, this modeling effort highlights the possibility that there may be a process of violent interaction that can be applied to offending outcomes expressed through various temporal scales.

This research is motivated by the need to apply new methodologies to violent offender research. This is not to say that traditional research is without merit. Instead, this research seeks to address the "hard" problem of getting to hidden attributes of violent offending and the endogenous features that implicit theories of violence attempt to address. While general methods of social and behavioral research depend on observation of outcomes, the methods executed in the current research highlight that additional focus on simulating the underlying process of violent offending can produce interesting and insightful conclusions that may validate current understanding of violent behavior and suggest deeper interconnectedness generated by offender, victim, and environment interactions.

References

- Alison, L., Smith, M., Eastman, O., & Rainbow, L. (2003). Toulmin's Philosophy of Argument and Its Relevance to Offender Profiling. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 9(2), 173-183.
- Black, D. (2010). *The Behavior of Law* (special ed.). U.K.: Emerald Group Publishing, Ltd.
- Cioffi-Revilla, C. (2014). *Introduction to Computational Social Science: Principles and Applications*. London and Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Crooks, A., Castle, C., & Batty, M. (2008). Key Challenges in Agent-based Modelling for Geo-Spatial Simulation. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 32(6), 417-430.
- Dover, T. J. (2010). The Offender Interaction Process Model. *The Forensic Examiner*, 19: 28-40.
- Eck, J., & Liu, L. (2008). Contrasting Simulated and Empirical Experiments in Crime Prevention. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 4(3), 195-213.
- Frank, A. B. (2012). *Agent-Based Modeling in Intelligence Analysis* (Doctoral Dissertation). George Mason University.
- Groff, E. R., & Mazerolle, L. (2008). Simulated Experiments and Their Potential Role in Criminology and Criminal Justice. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 4, 187-193.
- Johnson, S., & Groff, E. (2014). Strengthening Theoretical Testing in Criminology Using Agent-based Modeling. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 51(4), 509-525.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1981). Rape Proclivity Among Males. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37: 138-157.
- Polaschek, D. L., Hudson, S. M., Ward, T., & Siegert, R. J. (2001). Rapists' Offense Processes: A Preliminary Descriptive Model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(6), 523-544.
- Reiss, A. J., & Roth, J. A. (1993). *Understanding and Preventing Violence*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Roth, J. A. (1994). *Understanding and Preventing Violence*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Weapon, Offender and Situational Effects on the Number of Deaths in Mass Murder Incidents: A Multivariate Analysis

James McCutcheon

University of Memphis

Sarah Ann Sacra

Lin Huff-Corzine

Jay Corzine

University of Central Florida

Although the number of mass murder incidents in the United States (U.S.) and the percentage of total homicide victims who are killed in mass murders have been increasing in recent years (Fox & Levin, 2015; Jarvis & Scherer, 2015), there remains relatively little scholarly attention to the dynamics of these tragic events. As a prime example, few studies have focused on the offender, victim, and situational characteristics that influence the body count. Most studies have emphasized the role of different weapons in impacting the body count and been influenced by the question of whether assault weapons in the hands of motivated mass shooters translate into more fatalities (Sacra, McCutcheon, Huff-Corzine, Corzine, & Weller, 2015). In a sense, this narrow focus is not surprising. Efforts to unravel the effect(s) of the 1994 assault weapon ban (AWB) have been ubiquitous in the literature (Kleck, 2001; Koper & Roth, 2001), and mass killings such as the ones at Aurora, Colorado and Newtown, Connecticut in 2012 inevitably stimulate calls for additional federal and state controls on assault weapons. This is true even though as with homicides with fewer than three victims, handguns are the predominant type of firearm used as weapons in mass murders.

Although a focus on the connections between weapons and the number of fatalities in mass murders is important, with the findings potentially having important implications for public policy, this research direction is unlikely to be very useful in understanding the impact of a broader range of variables that may affect the number of casualties. Moreover, studies to date have shown few differences in the number of fatalities by weapon type (Sacra et al., 2015).

A conceptual problem with the literature linking weapon and number of mass murder victims is the failure to consider that there are different types of mass murder, and the circumstances of some may impose a cap on the body count. Family annihilations, for example, are the most common type of mass murder (Huff-Corzine, McCutcheon, Corzine, Jarvis, Tetzlaff, Weller, & Landon, 2014), and the number of potential victims is self-limiting. That is, these killings follow a common scenario in which the shooter, typically the adult male kills or attempts to kill all members of his immediate family and then commits suicide. Whether the perpetrator uses a handgun, rifle, or shotgun, or another type of weapon, will have little to no impact on the number of dead and injured. High body counts are more likely in mass killings that occur in public locations or institutions, e.g., schools, with a larger number of potential victims and a perpetrator with a different motivation.

An additional problem with existing studies is that their method of analysis has been limited to bivariate analyses of the mean number of victims by weapon type. This approach does not allow for the inclusion of control variables that may impact the relationship between weapon and fatality count. This has been a surprising omission with the easy availability of Poisson-based regression techniques that can model count dependent variables such as the number of victims in mass murder incidents (Osgood, 2000).

In the following analysis, we advance beyond prior empirical investigations by analyzing Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR) data on mass murders from 2000-2012 with a multivariate approach that allows for the incorporation of additional variables beyond weapon. Given the paucity of similar investigations in the literature, this study should be viewed as exploratory.

Data

The data used in the current study are taken from the Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR) for the years 2000-2012. The SHR includes a field for total homicide victims in a case, so the identification of mass murder incidents is straightforward. We use the criterion of three or more victims currently accepted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to define a mass murder (Huff-Corzine et al., 2014). To our knowledge, most studies of mass murder have relied on the SHR, often supplemented by media sources (Duwe, 2007), because its coverage is more comprehensive than the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), the other possible data source.

Unfortunately, the SHR provides limited information that would allow for identification of the type of mass murder and no information on the specific location of the killings. Therefore, we use the relationship between the offender and the first-listed victim as an admittedly imperfect proxy. We believe this approach will permit a reasonably accurate identification of family annihilations, because with rare exceptions, the relationship in these cases will be spouse or child. Other variables in the analysis are taken directly from the SHR data file.

Methodology/Analytic Strategy

Negative binomial regression is used to estimate the effect of both demographic and circumstantial based data on the total victim count for mass victimizations that led to 3 or more homicides. The mean is not higher than the standard deviation ($\mu=3.46$, $\sigma=1.02$); this is due to three being the cutoff for data collection. Importantly, the dependent variable demonstrates a Poisson distribution. There were a total of 1,376 cases from 2000 to 2012 that were identified as having 3 or more homicides. Variables included in the model often required recoding for estimation purposes.

Circumstance

Victim/Offender relationship was included as a circumstantial variable in the model. The category was divided into four options (family, acquaintance, stranger, and other). Stranger was then added to the model with the reference category being any other “known” assailants.

The weapon category includes various types of weapons ranging from firearms, knives, blunt objects, explosives/fire, and personal weapons (hands, feet). Based on its significance in previous studies (Sacra et al., 2015), fire/explosives are added to the model as all other types of weapons are set as the reference group.

Circumstance type listed descriptive categories of the crime. Unknown circumstance was coded as to be in contrast with all known types of offenses.

Demographics

Offender age, race, and sex are all added into the model. Age is coded as a continuous variable, while sex and race are divided into categories.

Results

Shown in Table 1 are the results of the analysis. All circumstance related measures utilized in the analysis show a significant relationship with the victim totals. The strongest relationship was the fire/explosive category as for every one unit increase in fire/explosive incidents there was an IRR increase of 1.13. Additionally, incidents involving strangers and unknown circumstances were associated with higher victim totals. None of the demographic variables were significant.

(Table 1 about here)

Notably, several modifications of the guns categories were included in additional models (not shown). Simply stated, no gun variable was significant in any of the models. Incidents with offenders using long guns (rifles and shotguns) do not have a higher body count than those involving handguns. An unexplored question is whether the lethality rate among the total number of victims is higher for particular types of firearms. This question is worthy of attention but the high fatality rate in family annihilation incidents suggests that lethality may be influenced more by the type of mass murder than the weapon.

Discussion

The results from the data analyses point to directions for developing a more complete understanding of mass murder in the U.S. There is no indication that the type of weapon is related to the number of fatalities in these incidents beyond fire/explosives and other, and there are no differences in the body count for different types of firearms. Although data limitations in both the SHR and NIBRS preclude the identification of “assault weapons,” a continued emphasis on type of gun is unlikely to produce policy initiatives that are helpful in decreasing the

casualties from mass victimization events, not to mention the political feasibility of their implementation. On the other hand, further investigation of fire and arson is warranted to ascertain any consistent patterns in these modes of killing that may present opportunities for intervention.

The strong significance of the residual weapon category of “Other” is problematic because there is no way to interpret its meaning. There is a total of approximately 90 cases in the SHR with Other listed as the weapon, and a search of media accounts for these incidents is necessary to hopefully provide some clarification. This undertaking is now underway. There may be some consistency in how police use this category, but it is also possible that the cases are heterogeneous and have little in common.

The results point to limitations with existing FBI data on mass murders that limit researchers’ ability to systematically examine many of the specifics of these killings. The lack of information on specific locations in SHR is of particular concern in trying to determine if body counts are primarily determined by the potential number of victims rather than offender and situational characteristics. The significance of the stranger relationship points in this direction. Family annihilations most often occur in a residence, and most people who are murdered in their homes are not killed by strangers.

A major implication of this study is that we have reached a point where research on mass murders as a homogeneous category may not be the most fruitful approach to increasing our understanding. Disaggregating the total number of homicides by type, motivation, and relationship between offender and victim has led to advances in understanding killings in general. It is the time to begin the process of disentangling subcategories within mass murder

incidents. We suggest that the first step is to begin examining family annihilations as a separate category of mass murder.

References

- Duwe, G. (2007). *Mass murder in the United States: A history*. Jefferson, NC: McFarlane and Company.
- Huff-Corzine, L., McCutcheon, J. C., Corzine, J., Jarvis, J. P., Tetzlaff, M. J., Weller, M., & Landon, M. (2014). Shooting for accuracy: Comparing data sources on mass murder. *Homicide Studies*, 18, 105-124.
- Fox, J. A., & Levin, J. (2015). Mass confusion concerning mass murder. *The Criminologist*, 40, 8-11.
- Jarvis, J., & Scherer, J. A. (2015). *Mass Victimization: Promising Avenues for Prevention*. Washington, D. C.: Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- Kleck, G. (2001). Impossible policy evaluations and impossible conclusions: A comment on Koper and Roth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 17, 75-80.
- Koper, C. S., & Roth, J. A. (2001). The impact of the 1994 federal assault weapon ban on gun violence outcomes: An assessment of multiple outcome measures and some lessons for policy evaluation. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 17, 33-74.
- Osgood, D. W. (2000). Poisson-based regression analysis of aggregate crime rates. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 16, 21-43.

Table 1: Negative Binomial Regression of Circumstantial and Demographic Measures on Victim Total (N=1376)

<u>Variables</u>	<u>IRR</u>	<u>(Beta)</u>
Relation (Stranger)	1.08*	(.04)
Fire/Explosive	1.13*	(.07)
Circumstances Unknown	1.08*	(.03)
White	.99	(.03)
Age	1.00	(.00)
Sex	1.00	(.06)
Constant		3.30***
<u>Pseudo R2</u>		<u>.003</u>

*p < .05, ***p < .001

Conducting Homicide Research with Hard to Obtain Data:

Case study Poland

Piotr Karasek

&

Paweł Waszkiewicz

University of Warsaw

Abstract

Gathering relevant data is a crucial element of all homicide research, as all findings should be based on empirical data. This task is much easier with access to a national database which include various and detailed information about homicide cases (e.g., UCR or NIBRS); however, each has its limitations (Saggini & McLaughlin, 1999; Hirschel, 2009). If no such database exists, and the only available statistics include the number of homicides and the number of convictions, access to homicide case files is required to conduct proper research. This in turn is associated with a number of specific problems.

The Polish Police force, which is a centralized organization, does not maintain publicly available, detailed crime statistics. Data known to the public include clearance rates, the number of detected crimes, arrested perpetrators, and convictions. However, not much more information is available and the statistics lack methodological depth (e.g., there is no accepted definition of a ‘cleared case’). This forces the need to gain access to the case files in order to conduct proper homicide research. Polish case files themselves are not divided between the Court and the Prosecutor’s Office/Police force – they are uniform and stored either in the courthouse (when there was a trial) or at the Prosecutor’s

Office (when the case was discontinued or the offender was not detected). All this causes various methodological and practical problems which include difficulties in developing an appropriate research sample, determining where the case files are stored, and obtaining permission to gain access. This paper will cover the differences in conducting homicide related research in US and in Poland regarding the obstacles mentioned above.

Advances in Theory and Research

Panel Session #6

Recorder: Mindy Weller

Chair: Candice Batton

The Effect of Weapon, Offender, and Situational Characteristics on the Number of Deaths in Mass Murder Incidents

James McCutcheon

Sarah Ann Sacra

Lin Huff-Corzine

Jay Corzine

Mindy Weller: You mentioned it might be productive to apply routine activities theory (RAT) and said the keyword is the suitable target but don't you think it would be guardianship to stop the gunmen?

Jay Corzine: Tom Petee's classification. First, might be useful to look at the people who are killed to see if that's why they're chosen as target. The second category is that they fit in some demographic group where available targets and suitable targets are the same. Third category is "anybody." But for some workplace shootings there are specific.

Mindy: I agree but I might change definition of "target" from person to place. Example club where they get kicked out and then come back everyone there is a target.

Becky Block: 1) in response to story about data quality, I can tell you a lot more stories, including when NIBRS brought IL data collection to a stop. I want to find this salesperson of the software. But an actual suggestion – you're saying delving into other weapon category – is it possible to match SHR to other data sets and try to tease out what "other" consists of in that way.

Jay: IDK. Only a few that a read of the individual cases where I read them and think, well it would be hard to classify this. Hierarchy rule handgun precedes shotgun.

Becky: That often happens with arson and you find arson is there in combo with other weapons and it's not included in the discussion. Seems to me that one of your conclusions should be that increased attention to fire and explosives as important.

Jay: I agree and there have been some laws put in place.

Becky: It would be nice to have as much attention to this as to family annihilation. There are programs for young kids that set fire, etc.

Jay: From my perspective, a potential way for reducing the pool of motivated theories.

Lin: I think there may be some routines in which the context (someone lost a job, too much stress, etc.) and they tend to become disorganized in their reactions to the offender and you can kind of see a routine. Christine – the voice – Orlando – someone came in while she was signing autographs and shot and killed. Her guard was probably down because assume everyone coming in should be down.

Becky: Well you're talking about guardianship. Where is guardianship in arson? What is the guardian there? You know, fire is just a different type of thing.

James McCutcheon: It goes back to when the data is entered, as well. Could be that someone shot someone and then burned the place down.

Becky: It often happens. Killing and arson to cover it up.

Jay: It should be included as firearm if someone was shot and then fire to cover it up

Becky: Problematic on its own

Mindy: Depends when the data was entered. If they show up and it's a fire, may enter as fire before they see the firearm.

Becky: Issues with number of victims too because could be different causes of death for different victims

Dick Block: Seems to me that it is where RAT of the victims are really routine activities like going to a nightclub, being at work – that's what becomes newsworthy – because that's a routine activity that we do. But if you look at a family annihilation that isn't a routine activity. They are choosing a specific target. It's when the target isn't specific that's when it becomes newsworthy. Mass annihilation in a subway – they're going into their routine activity. If you look at RAT, based on idea of unspecified victim. The victims might gather someplace and the actual vic doesn't really matter.

Jay: In some cases though, sometimes it does.

Police Homicides

Panel Session #7

Chair: Jay Corzine
Recorder: Ashley Mancik

✚ Shoot to Kill: A Closer Look at the Police Killing of Civilians in 2015

Jolene Vincent, University of Central Florida
Lin Huff-Corzine, University of Central Florida

✚ Counting Police Homicides: What we Can Learn from the National Homicide Data Improvement Project (prepared as a power point presentation)

Wendy C. Regoeczi, Cleveland State University
Randolph Roth, Ohio State University
Rania Issa, University of Akron

**When the Blue Line is Crossed:
Justifiable Police Homicides in Florida**

Jolene Vincent & Lin Huff-Corzine
University of Central Florida

Police shootings and police distrust have remained prevalent in the media and a topic of debate over the past few years. Distrust in police and the criminal justice system is evident in our current society as evidenced by the Baltimore and Ferguson riots, campaigns, and movements to hold law enforcement officers and agencies responsible for their seemingly reckless actions and wrong killings of suspects, (National Police Accountability Project, 2016). The reasons behind such negative societal views of people who are employed to keep the streets safe, protect citizens, and enforce laws should be questioned because while police do have the right to shoot a suspect if they believe they are endangering their life or others' lives, it is imperative to analyze if and when this discretionary right is taken too far. That said, there may be problems related to officers' discretion, especially if it leads to, what seems to be, too many "justifiable" deaths. A focus on Florida indicates that at least 158 justifiable homicides by police officers occurred between 2011 and 2014. Thus, the decision by police to shoot their suspect and the specific elements related to these cases needs to be assessed.

Using Supplementary Homicide Reports data, the current research explores cases in which civilians were either injured or killed by police. The results of this study offer important policy implications for situations in which officers must make quick decisions to use or not to use deadly force.

Literature Review

According to Klinger (2004), a Federal law standard often referred to as the “defense of life doctrine” has allowed police officers to use deadly force against attacks that could kill or seriously injure themselves or others. Until about twenty years ago, police could also shoot suspects who attempted to flee if the officer believed that the suspect had killed a felony, but in 1985, the United States Supreme Court ruled in *Tennessee v. Garner* that it is unconstitutional for police to shoot alleged fleeing felons unless they are suspected of being involved in a violent crime (Klinger, 2004).

In addition to Federal Law, many police agencies have shooting policies, which provide further guidance concerning the use of lethal force and officers are trained to shoot only as long as the suspect continues to present an imminent threat. Once the threat has passed, officers are advised to stop shooting (Klinger, 2004). Still, police officers’ who are forced to make a split-second decision when determining if a criminal suspect is armed and dangerous, may make the wrong choice. It is approximated that as many as 40% of suspects shot by police officers were unarmed (Maskaly & Donner 2015). Based on prior research, media portrayals, e.g., *Washington Post*, 2016, and a common societal view, police are thought to use lethal violence against Blacks more than against Whites (Mekawi & Bresin, 2015; Ross, 2015). Finally, men are much more likely to be victims of police shootings than are women; a fact that may simply be a reflection of their relative involvement in criminal activity.

Current Study

The current study examines specific characteristics of police shootings defined as justifiable in recent Florida cases. This study is vital for many reasons. The state level of analysis allows for the results to be linked more easily to characteristics that would not be pinpointed if examined on a national level. In addition, any time that police use of force could end in a civilian death as it has in over 40 cases each year in Florida, we need to gain a more in depth understanding of these incidents.

Hypotheses

Based on past literature and media coverage, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1: Non-white civilians are significantly more likely than White civilians to be killed by police.

Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between race and the likelihood of being killed by the police.

Hypothesis 2: Men are significantly more likely than women to be killed by police.

Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between sex and the likelihood of being killed by the police.

Hypothesis 3: Armed civilians are significantly more likely to be killed by police.

Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between being armed and the likelihood of being killed by the police.

Description of Data

The current study analyzes Florida's justifiable police homicide cases contained in the "U.S. Police Shootings Data," which was drawn from the Supplementary Homicide Reports. The dataset consists of 1,997 justifiable police homicides occurring between 2011 and 2014 in Florida. These data were compiled from police reports on the incidents, which are written almost immediately following the incident. Thus, while these reports are typically accurate as they come directly from the police officers involved shortly after the incident, some information is missing or unknown at that time, such as the race of the victim or the presence of a weapon. The information for the specific cases included the state; county; and city where the incident occurred; the law enforcement agency that handled the incident; the victim's name, age, gender, race, and ethnicity; if shots were fired; if the victim was armed and if so; the weapon the victim possessed; a brief summary of the case; a media source link; and the name of the officer(s) involved in the case.

Description of Variables

Given the importance of civilian race sex, and possession of a weapon noted in the literature, the focus in this study is on the influence these variables have on the likelihood that a police shooting victim will die as a result.

The dependent variable in the current study is the likelihood of a justifiable police shooting ending in a civilian's injury or death in Florida between 2011 and 2014.

The independent variables are race, sex, and presence of a weapon. Because there were not enough cases to separate ethnicity from race for measurement purposes, race is measured as

White (0) and Non-White (1). Sex is measured as male (0) and female (1), and Possession of a Weapon equals (0) no weapon present and (1) if a weapon is present.

Analyses

As a first step, frequencies were obtained to provide a picture of the victims, who were shot by police. Then a logistic regression model was estimated where Race, Sex, and Possession of a Weapon were used to explore their relative influence on whether the victims who were shot were injured or killed.

Results

The descriptive statistics show that the majority of the victims were non-White (59.2%) men (90%), who were armed (77.2%). Of the suspects who were shot by police, almost 60% were killed, and the other 40% had non-lethal wounds.

Table 1: Frequencies for Variables in Model, N=158.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Valid Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Victim's Sex			
Male	135	85.4	90%
Female	15	9.5	10
Total	150	94.9	100
Missing	8	5.1	
Total	158	100	
Victim's Race			
White	49	31	40.8
Non-White	71	44.9	59.2
Total	120	75.9	100
Missing	38	24.1	
Total	158	100	
Victim Armed			
Armed	112	70.9	77.2

Not Armed	33	20.9	22.8
Total	145	91.8	100
Missing	13	8.2	
Total	158	100	
Killed or Hit			
Killed	90	57	59.2
Hit	62	39.2	40.8
Total	152	96.2	100
Missing	6	3.8	
Total	158	100	

Table 2 shows the results of the logistic regression where victim race, sex, and whether or not s/he was armed were examined for their influence on whether the victim, who was shot, was injured or died as a result.

Table 2: Logistic Regression Exploring Effects of Victim Race, Sex, & Possession of Weapons on Outcome of Police Shooting, 2011-2014.

Variable	β	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Race	.308	.433	.505	1	.477	1.360
Sex	-.918	.747	1.510	1	.219	.399
Armed	.412	.480	.738	1	.390	1.510
Constant	-.626	.374	2.806	1	.094	.535
Nagelkerke R²						.039

While none of the variables included reached significance in the model and none of the hypotheses were supported, the results are still very telling. According to our findings, police shootings in Florida between 2011 and 2014 do not appear to have been influenced by the person's race, sex, or possession of a weapon.

Strengths & Limitations

With police officers writing the reports that compile these databases, there should be standards that each department follows. Unfortunately, there are no national, state, or even departmental standards for police officers writing individual reports; it is based on the officers' discretions. The information in the dataset consists of the initial police report, therefore, any modifications, edits, or learned information from the investigation is not updated in the SHR. This causes noticeable issues when comparing state cases to one another, or media reports to national statistics.

Besides the above issues with the reporting processes of UCR and SHR in general, the dataset used in this study had numerous issues. For starters, many of the sections stated they were "missing," "unknown," or simply just left blank. Of the 158 Florida cases, at least one variable was missing in 87 cases. As mentioned previously, if the race of the victim and other missing information were not accurate or were judged wrong, then the race of the victim could have been mis-categorized.

On the other hand, this is one of the few datasets on police justifiable homicides, so it is a step in the right direction for future information on this subject to be gathered.

Future Research

In the future, we plan to expand this line of research to examine potential relationships in other states to compare regions, such as the North, South, and West and cities, suburban, and rural areas. Considering Mekawi & Bresin (2015) found that states with relatively lenient gun laws had a positive impact on shooting suspects when it was not justified, continuing the

examination of justifiable homicides, as well as comparing them with those deemed unjustified, will provide a more in depth understanding of police shootings. In turn, policies on the proper times to shoot civilians and protocols on handling dangerous incidents could also be assessed, compared, and updated to reflect the type of training needed to effectively respond while not resorting to the use of potentially lethal means unless absolutely necessary.

References

- Klinger, David. 2004. *Into The Kill Zone: a Cop's Eye View of Deadly Force*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Maskaly, Jon and Donner Christopher. 2015. "A Theoretical Integration of Social Learning Theory with Terror Management Theory: Towards an Explanation of Police Shootings of Unarmed Suspects." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 40(2): 205-224.
- Mekawi, Yara, and Konrad Bresin. 2015. "Is the Evidence From Racial Bias Shooting Task Studies a Smoking Gun? Results From A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 61: 120-130.
- National Police Accountability Project, 2016. Dedicated to Ending Police Abuse. Retrieved on March 26, 2016, from <http://www.nlg-npap.org>
- Ross, Cody. 2015. "A Multi-Level Bayesian Analysis of Racial Bias in Police Shootings the County-Level in the United States, 2011-2014." *Plos One* 10(10): 1-34.
- Washington Post. 2015. FBI to sharply expand system for tracking fatal police shootings. Retrieved on December 9, 2015, from *The Crime Report*, editors=thecrimereport.org@mail86.atl71.mcdlv.net

Counting Police Homicides:

What We Can Learn from the National Homicide Data Improvement Project

Wendy C. Regoeczi

Cleveland State University

Randolph Roth

Ohio State University

Rania Issa

University of Akron

The study of homicides by police has been hampered by significant problems with respect to the collection of data on this population of events. Prior studies have found that the FBI's Supplementary Homicide Reports, the National Center for Health Statistics' National Vital Statistics System, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics' Death in Custody Reporting Program suffer from substantial underreporting and lack sufficient detail of homicides committed by police. Using data from 1959 to 1988 from our Ohio pilot project, which seeks to improve the quality of homicide data in the nation, we compare the coding of police homicides across multiple data sources, including department-level police records, Ohio Department of Health records, the Supplementary Homicide Reports, the National Center for Health Statistics, and newspaper articles. We are creating a clustered random sample of homicides in 34 counties in Ohio, 1959-present, including police involved homicides and homicides of law enforcement officers. We present our preliminary results from the more than 400 such homicides from the first three decades of our study.

**Counting Police
Homicides: What We Can
Learn from the National
Homicide Data
Improvement Project**
Wendy C. Regoeczi
Randolph Roth
Rania Issa

**What is the National Homicide
Data Improvement Project?**

- Pilot project in Ohio to improve quality of homicide data in the U.S. from 1959 to the present.
- Funded by the National Science Foundation (Roth, Regoeczi, and Maltz).
- An ambitious (potentially life long!) endeavor.

Why Ohio?

- Open access laws.
- Cooperation of law enforcement agencies, county coroners, and medical examiners around the state.
- Ohio Historical Society and local libraries have done an excellent job of preserving complete runs of newspapers from around the state.
- We live here!

Ohio Pilot Study

- Clustered random sample of 24 counties, plus Franklin County (two-thirds of all homicides in Ohio)
- Detailed information collected on each suspected homicide
- Creation of a data file and individual narratives
- Integrating data from
 - Ohio Department of Health
 - National Center for Health Statistics
 - Supplementary Homicide Reports
 - Police Department homicide files and log books
 - Newspaper accounts

Examples of Matching SHR and ODH Records

1976-1988 Non-Urban Counties

- In both the SHR & ODH records: 286
- In the SHRs only: 36
- In the ODH records only: 228
- Cases in both SHR & ODH that were not homicides: 5
- Cases in SHR only that were not homicides: 7
- Cases in ODH only that were not homicides: 3
- Estimated number of homicides: 579

Examples of Matching SHR and ODH Records

1976-1988 Franklin County (Columbus, OH)

- In both the SHR & ODH records: 118
- In the SHRs only: 73
- In the ODH records only: 15
- Cases in both SHR & ODH that were not homicides: 1
- Cases in SHR only that were not homicides: 2
- Cases in ODH only that were not homicides: 6
- Estimated number of homicides: 215

Examples of Data Coding Problems

- Difficulties of matching SHRs even to the local law enforcement agencies that compiled them
 - SHRs contain numerous data entry errors
- Coding errors made by local departments of health and medical examiners
 - Accidents caused by negligence coded as homicides
 - Homicides coded as accidents, deaths from unknown causes, deaths from assaults of unknown intent
- Transposing of ages of victim and suspect
- Typographical errors in SHR geographical code
 - Piqua (5401) instead of Pomeroy (5301)

What Percentage of Homicides Show Up in Existing Databases?

	1976-1988	1976-1978
	Non-urban Ohio counties	Franklin County
Estimated # of homicides:	579	215
Percent in SHRs:	56%	89%
Percent in ODH records:	89%	62%
Percent in both SHR and ODH death records:	95%	96%

Homicides by Police in our Database, 1968-1978

Homicides by Law Enforcement Officers or Licensed Security Guards (“Legal Interventions”)

In our dataset: 223

In OHD records: 180

In NCHS records: 163

Homicides by Police in our Database, 1968-1978

Ohio Department of Health Records

- 177 Legal interventions correctly identified
- 3 not in ODH database
- 33 classified as homicides
- 5 classified as firearm accidents
- 5 classified as death from unknown cause

Homicides of Police in our Database, 1968-1978

Our database contains 40 police officers or licensed security guards as victims

Ohio Department of Health Records

- 32 classified as homicides
- 1 not in ODH database
- 2 classified as firearm accidents
- 3 classified as motor vehicle accidents
- 2 classified as deaths from natural causes

Homicides of Police in our Database, 1968-1978

Our database contains 40 police officers or licensed security guards as victims

National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) Records

- 26 classified as homicides
- 1 classified as legal intervention
- 12 not in NCHS database as homicides or legal interventions

Preliminary Conclusions

- Relying on one source of data may be problematic
- National databases like the NCHS appear to be missing a substantial number of homicides by and of police
- With homicides by police, there appears to be a lack of understanding of how to use the ICD coding system correctly
 - 960-969 codes are being used instead of 970s

Thank you!
Questions?

Panel Session #7 Recorder Notes: Police Homicides

Recorder: Ashley Mancik - Chair: Jay Corzine

Shoot to Kill: A Closer Look at the Police Killing of Civilians in 2015

Jolene Vincent & Lin Huff-Corzine

Jay Corzine: SHR extracted data set case numbers? If you can go back to SHR you can get more specific info on type of firearm. Not that difficult. Another thing that might be a problem, race is not coded consistently in Florida. Blacks/AA v. Whites/Hispanics. May be one reason race isn't showing up. Just hypothetical. Don't know how you'll check.

Dallas Drake: I wonder if we can start adding in the killing of pets? Basis may be a training question instead of a race question in terms of how officers are trained when how to use lethal force. Seems you can probably find it. When police animals are killed, it's a big deal.

Richard Hough: Pet killing and pet abuse in FL is covered in academy block of training on IPV and DV. Other comment – you won't find enough with tasers and then the escalation to use of force.

Lin Huff-Corzine: For U.S. it moved the number up by approx. 1/3 numbers. 2014 to 2015.

Jolene Vincent: Tased and died.

Richard: very small number

Becky Block: Might be a good idea to look at.

Richard: Fairly large lit on it already.

Jolene: Surprised how many incidents involved a taser.

Lin: Not only a taser. But not just tasers, but other uses of force. Arrested and in custody and die and looking at those reasons

Richard: All statewide use of force article with Kimberly about 4 years ago. Can send it to you. Use deadly force in instances when others' lives are in danger. Very handful of cases where someone was tased and had pre-existing heart condition.

Kim Davies: Age may play in too – whether they die may depend on age. The other thing is, do you think justifiable plays in?

Jolene: Mental illness is so common in these cases. I think that has a lot to do with it. Justifiable –we don't really know.

Lin: Way police force in that area is trained (or not). Those kinds of contextual variables may be important too. We're just out there trying to find out.

Dallas: The shootings you have – are they all justifiable homicides? Are they all police justifiable?

Jolene: Yes

Dallas: What I would suggest is comparing citizen v. police justifiable.

Lin: In 2015, after you accept all that were justifiable and look at what's left – still 77 blacks and 13 whites that would indicate race is an issue but it didn't come out to us yet.

Becky: Kind of confused about something. You said there were so few women that you took them out but you have sex.

Jolene: Oh, that was updated. The 5 pager was older.

Becky: One other thing. Circumstances variable. Whatever you can get. Mental health is a real biggie. Maybe number of people at the scene. You can get the number of victims & offenders, at minimum. Is it public or private.

Jolene: In new dataset, we have that and will be looking at it.

Dick Block: Technical question. 87 cases with missing data out of 158?

Jolene: It was originally 87 but then went back to social media to pull race variable. Got about 40 of them.

Dick: What did you do with the other 40 missing?

Jolene: we excluded them

Lin: What needs to be done next is imputation and see what happens.

Dick: The reason I'm saying that. Is you didn't have significance but you also had minimum number of cases.

Louis Aiken: Did you consider number of times person was shot. Officer trained to shoot twice and then stop and see what the suspect is doing.

Jolene: No, we didn't but that would be interesting. That's part of why we looked at FL specifically is because we're interested in training differences across locales.

Lin: In FL, training is to continue to shoot as long as person is a continued threat. Sometimes strange things happen and you get a lot of shooting

Shila Hawk: New data, with hand coding race did you have anyone else code? In the new data, community contentions – we know not just individual race but maybe community contextualization. There's some stuff on social and physical disorder and judging someone's look based on what they're wearing and the area.

Jolene: There's been some training on that with simulations and to see when cops shoot v. not shoot. But increased exposure to this program changes when people shoot.

Lin: Some have said it's presumptive to look at a picture to decide what the race is.

Shila: But it's based on the cop perception

Jay: Also in FL a significant number of people are likely to identify as more than 1 race.

Lin: It's a question I ask on my intro surveys. We get all kinds of people that mix all races.

Potpourri

Panel Session #8

Chair: Jolene Vincent

Recorder: James McCutcheon

 ***Making Public Service Announcements: Active Learning in a Murder Class II***

Kim Davies, Augusta State University

 ***Female Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence***

Alexis Yohros, University of Central Florida

Alec Szalewski, University of Central Florida

**Making Public Service Announcements:
Active Learning in a Murder Class Part II**

Kim Davies
Augusta University;
kdavies1@augusta.edu

Abstract

Research indicates that student learning outcomes are increased through student's active participation in their learning. When student's take ownership for a topic, they learn better than if an instructor simply relays the information from the front of a classroom or through assigned readings. In this presentation, I present a group project that requires students to develop a public service announcement about intimate partner violence. I use this assignment in a Sociology of Murder Class but it could be used in any course to help deepen students' understandings of the intimate partner violence and the warning signs for intimate partner homicide. In addition to sharing the assignment and a few examples of student work, I will provide suggestions on how to avoid some of the headaches involved in group work, and more importantly insights on what I have learned about giving students the reigns with a subject matter that can be traumatic for some students in our classes.

Experiential learning is not new. In fact, some have noted that the case for experiential learning can be dated as far back as Julius Caesar who said that "experience is the teacher of all things" (Augusta University Quality Enhancement Plan, 2016). Just as experiential learning is not new, the case for the benefits of learning by doing is also not new. The literature on experiential learning indicates that experiential learning helps students to make deeper connections to subject matter than can be made through reading and lectures alone (Wright,

2000). Those who use experiential learning assignments make the case that it helps students become more active in their own learning and that often it helps students develop closer working relationships (Wright, 2000). But also importantly, especially now when we are expected more than ever to show how we are preparing students for the workforce, experiential learning assignment can help facilitate the transition to the workforce by teaching skills students may use in the workplace including social skills (Wright, 2000).

However, many of us in sociology, criminology, psychology and the like, teach about topics that we do not actually want our students, or anyone for that matter, to experience. We teach about the painful realities of our world. We teach about murder, violence, and other crimes. However, we need our students to understand how these crimes happen because understanding may help to prevent such crimes and sometimes students who have careers in law enforcement may use such knowledge to solve crimes and to best interact with victims. But also, way too often, we have students in our classes who have been victims of crimes such as incest, child abuse, and intimate partner violence, so some of us may be hesitant (and probably we all should be hesitant) to involve students in experiential learning about such topics.

Research also indicates that working with peers in heterogeneous collaborative learning groups increases academic achievement, positive attitudes about learning and persistence in college (Colbeck, Campbell and Bjorklund, 2000). Moreover, Colbeck, Campbell and Bjorklund, 2000 found that students who participated in group projects reported that they improved their communication, problem solving, and conflict management skills. Still, in my nearly 30 years of teaching on top of my own experiences working on group projects, I know that group projects are not universally loved. The truth is, some students do more work than others and it is often very difficult for students to find time outside of class to work with other students.

In this paper, I briefly describe a group experiential learning assignment on a potentially sensitive topic that I have been assigning in my 3000 level Sociology of Murder course. I will give details about the class, the assignment, and how I avoid the headaches of students working in groups (for them and me) while at the same time, giving students the benefits of group and experiential learning with the added benefit of preparing them with practice in how to communicate about difficult and potentially sensitive topics with their colleagues in a professional manner.

My Course

The course I teach is Sociology of Murder. The semester course meets twice a week for 75 minutes at a time. It is a very popular course at my institution as “murder” courses are at most institutions. The last two years, I have I have had 90 and 70 students respectively. It is an elective 3 semester hour 3000 level course (SOC 3187) that sociology and criminal justice majors and minors can include as part of their required elective courses. However, the course, is open to any student who has taken Introduction to Sociology or Criminal Justice and the last term I offered the course, 27% of the students were majoring in Psychology, 23% in Criminal justice, 16% in Sociology, 7% in Political Science, 6% in Communication and the rest were a mixture of majors including mathematics, nursing, biology, accounting, social work, history and foreign language. The course is a lecture/discussion course with grades based upon a midterm, a final, various homework assignments, and a participation grade (which includes the public service announcement assignment I describe next).

Public Service Announcement Assignment

I have students read a chapter about intimate partner homicide that includes information about the warning signs for intimate partner homicide. I emphasize in advance how important it is they have this reading done before class as they will be working on a group assignment based on the chapter. They do seem to read it in advance but they are used to reading in advance by the time in the term we do this assignment as it is the second small group and third group activity they do in this course tied to chapters they have read.

Once they show up in class, I begin by talking about how serious the topic we are working on is and that there are definitely individuals in the class who have experienced intimate partner violence and/or who have witnessed it. I share a personal story about my mother who was abused by one of her partners and how that impacted me. I tell them how every term I teach about IPV, I have students who share their stories with me. I am very forthright in telling them that the reason I share this is because I want them to know how pervasive IPV is and I want them to take it very seriously and for them to think about how what they say in jest during our class may affect someone who is trying to escape a violent relationship or who has survived one. I also note that they may one day have careers/jobs in which they will interact with survivors and it is important for them to think about this. I also tell them that seeing their classmates in films may be funny and if someone does laugh, it is not likely about the message but about seeing their friends acting so all should be aware and ready for that also. All of this preamble takes time but I am sincere and they listen. I have learned over years of teaching that it precludes hurt feelings and it helps students to really focus and think about the seriousness of what we are talking about.

Then I tell them about the assignment which is to make public service announcement (PSA) about intimate partner violence or intimate partner homicide. They must use information

from the chapter they read but they may bring in other information. And they can aim the public service announcement at (1) young people who are newer to having relationship; (2) the public who may not know much about intimate partner violence; (3) abusers; or (4) those who are being abused. They can film videos or they may make a video of still film shots or they can make videos from PowerPoints slides. Luckily the class meets next the Educational Technology Center on our campus where students can borrow cameras and many do this but they can also use their phones. When the PSAs are complete, we have a film showing and we vote for the best PSAs and I give prizes for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place. Here are examples including a film, still shots, and PowerPoint slides:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pk_cMSfIoo0

<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLumoJtKQhULMeuboAgb35QFp6RusbIbCT>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R0ro4rWHWQ0&feature=youtu.be>.

Avoid headaches of students working in groups (for them and me)

In order to avoid problems caused for students by group work, I give them class days to work on this. They have the rest of the day that I assign it to make plans and then the next 2-3 days to work during the class time. I explain to them that I give them class time so that they will not have to meet outside contributing to the project. I make them come to class each day and sign in and then tell me where in the building or outside they will be working so I can check on them and answer.

The way I make my life easier, is by giving them class time to work on this assignment so they have time to work together and produce good work. But also, and this may seem radical, I don't actually grade the assignments. The students simply get participation points for each day they are in class working on this assignment. This last term, they each received 5 points for each

of four days they worked on the project and this ended up being a third of the participation points for the term. If a student missed a day and thus worked on the project less than another, they earned fewer participation points. For the most part, I have found all of the projects are very well done. The top three groups get bonus participation points as the prize and the whole class votes on best videos and the last two years that I have done this with voting, I have agreed with the voting results.

One final thought, I make it clear to the students that I spend class time on this assignment for many reasons. First, they learn about Intimate Partner Violence which will be valuable to many of them in their careers and to far too many of them in their personal lives (including their friends and family). Second, working in a group they are honing their skills in communication, problem solving, and conflict management. Third, creativity is something that we need to nurture and I'm hoping this project helps with that. Fourth, they should take the time to use this project to learn or sharpen skills in making films or PowerPoint presentations. Fifth, they are learning how to communicate about a difficult or challenging subject with different audiences. All of this is building their resumes, or their tool boxes, or their skills for their futures and they should take note.

References

- Augusta University. 2016. "Quality Enhancement Plan: Learning by Doing: Discover, Engage, Reflect, Lead." Available at <http://www.augusta.edu/qep/documents/augusta-university-qep-learning-by-doing.pdf>
- Colbeck, Carol L., Susan E. Campbell, and Stefani A. Bjorklund. "Grouping in the Dark: What College Students Learn from Group Projects." *The Journal of Higher Education*. 71(1): 60-83.
- Davies, Kim. 2008. *The Murder Book: Examining Homicide*. New Jersey: Pearson Press.
- Wright, Mary C., 2000. "Getting More Out of Less: The Benefits of Short-Term Experiential Learning in Undergraduate Sociology Courses." *Teaching Sociology* 28(2): 116-126.

**Female & Male Offenders of Intimate Partner Homicide:
Applying General Strain Theory**

Alexis Yohros
&
Alec Szalewski
University of Central Florida

In the United States, nearly one in five murder victims are killed by an intimate partner (Cooper, Smith, & Erica, 2011). It is well documented that menⁱ both commit and are victims of homicides at much higher rates than women; men commit approximately 80 percent of all homicides in the United States today (Fox, Levin, & Quinet, 2012; Goetting, 1988). This means that research on homicide primarily focuses on men and that the circumstances that characterize homicides by women, in particular those that involve the killing of a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend, are very few (Goetting, A. 1988). Consequently, it creates a gap in research in regard to intimate partner homicide, where there is significantly less gender disparity (Swatt, & He, 2006). When women did commit homicide, they most likely killed an intimate partner (up to 44% of the time); whereas, male homicide offenders killed a female intimate around 7% of the time (Jordan, Clark, Pritchard, & Charnigo, 2012). The focus and disproportionate attention placed on males as perpetrators limits knowledge on the variety of characteristics and circumstances surrounding events in which women commit homicide, especially intimate partner homicide.

Research has also demonstrated that intimate partner homicide is gendered with men and women having distinctly different motives for killing their significant other (Felson & Messner, 1998). Men's motives for killing include jealousy, need for extreme control over the victim, and

retaliation when a woman tries to leave a relationship. In contrast, women are more likely to kill intimate partners in self-defense, self-protection, or when there is no other way to protect herself and/or her children (Jordan et al. 2012). One of the main differences between homicides committed by women is also that, unlike their male counterparts, they have previously experienced a long history of violent behavior at the hands of their partner (Goetting, 1988).

To better understand the gendered effects of intimate partner homicide, we applied Agnew's General Strain Theory. Agnew's theory states that people engage in crime because they experience conditions that are stressful and with which the eventual offender does not have the ability to cope in a legitimate manner (Agnew, 2006). These strains lead to negative emotions such as anger, frustration, jealousy, depression, and fear, which may then lead to their explosive criminal behavior as a coping mechanism. When the potential offender lacks the ability to cope with the strains in a legal manner, when the offender perceives the costs of criminal coping as low and they are predisposed to commit crime.

Using Agnew's theory to explain gendered characteristics of intimate partner homicide, the purpose of this study is to provide more information on the characteristics of female perpetrators and to compare their characteristics with those of male offenders. Thus this study will add to the existing literature by shifting the focus on intimate partner homicide toward women offenders, to gain insight into how factors and circumstances surrounding intimate partner homicide vary by gender.

Using the framework suggested by Agnew, we derive the following hypotheses. Due, in part to men's externalization of blame, the rates of intimate partner homicide are expected to be higher among males than females. We predict that the ex-spouse victim-offender relationship will have the highest rate of intimate partner homicide, among men due to the strain of

separation and loss of control. We hypothesize that the spouse is the more common victim among female offenders if there is a high magnitude and duration of abuse as a source of strain. In terms of weapon type, we expect males will be more likely to use weapons such as firearms or blunt force/personal contact, which is more common among men with emotions such as rage. We also predict females will be more likely to use knives or weapons found in the home as items of self-defense. We expect southern residence rates of intimate partner homicide to be higher due to the subculture of violence and availability of guns that may also serve as conditioning factors

Methods & Data

This quantitative study uses and will use data from the Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR) encompassing the years 2005-2013. The SHR is a secondary data source compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that provides detailed information on criminal homicides reported to the police in the United States. These homicides consist of murders; non-negligent killings also called non-negligent manslaughter; and justifiable homicides. The dataset is maintained and distributed by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) and includes 152 variables.

For the purpose of this study, the cases were filtered out to only include female and male homicide offenders and murder and non-negligent manslaughter. Cases were also filtered out to only include the following offender relationships to the victim: husband, ex-husband, wife, ex-wife, boyfriend, and girlfriend. Homosexual relationship was not included in the study, as it was not reported consistently until recent years.

Association Variables Used in Chi-Square

The variable of interest in this study is the sex/gender of the offender and is a character variable in the SHR. Offender sex is a dichotomous variable and was recoded with Females coded as 1 and Males as 2. Offenders in which the sex is unknown will be omitted from the study.

The associated variables to sex/gender in the study are the offender characteristics in the SHR. The ones that will be used for this study are: Offender Relationship, Weapon Use, and Census Region.

Offender relationship to the first victim will be used to see if males and females differ in homicides in terms of a particular offender/victim relationship. Offender relationship is a numeric variable in the SHR, and the categories were recoded to include, (1) Spouse, (2) Ex-Spouse, (3) Dating and (4) Cohabiting.

Offender Weapon is a categorical variable with seventeen original weapon categories provided in the SHR data set but will be recoded into seven distinct categories. These variables are categorized by numerical type values. For the purpose of this study, all firearms will be placed under one category Firearm (1). Knife (2) is comprised of knife or cutting instrument. Blunt object (3) is the next category and is the category labeled as “Blunt object - hammer, club, etc.” in the original SHR data. The category Personal Contact Weapon (4) includes all weapons that represent the use of a body part as the method of murder, as well as those weapons comprised of a noose or ligature used in strangulation and gas in asphyxiations. Drowning is also included in Personal Contact Weapon (4)ⁱⁱ. The category of Chemical Substance (5) includes poison and narcotics, as this is different than the other types of murder. The category of Incendiary Weapon (6) is indicative of a method utilizing fire and/or explosives (Fox et al.,

2012). The last category, Other or Type Unknown (7), includes all weapons that were not or could not be identified within the sample.

Geographical divisions are numeric variables that will be included to look at the association between census regions and gender in a series of chi square tests. The SHR divides the data into ten geographical regions. To simplify this for the purposes of the study, we recoded the data using the census regions as designated by the Uniform Crime Reports. These include (1) Northeast, (2) South, (3) Midwest, and (4) West. Possessions were omitted from the study, as they only constituted .01% of cases.

Analytic Strategy

The analytic strategy in this study will be a series of bivariate tests, more specifically chi-square's. Chi-square is used because the variables are primarily categorical. In addition, chi-square was chosen as a starting point to determine if there are any significant relationships among the characteristics and the offender sex. If significance is determined, a future step will incorporate the proper regression analysis. Tables will include section comparisons of the results for women and men.

Analysis/Results

Table one shows frequencies and valid percentages for all the categorical variables. Offender sex had 1359 female offenders of intimate partner homicide at 21.2% of the sample with 5044 male offenders of intimate partner homicide at 78.8% of the sample. This shows that the majority of the sample consists of male intimate partner homicide perpetrators. Within offender weapon, firearm had a count of 3327 at 51.9%, knife had a count of 1581 at 24.7%, blunt object had a count of 297 at 4.6%, personal contact had a count of 675 at 10.5%, chemical substance had a count of 47 at 0.7%, incendiary had a count of 43 at 0.7%, and other had a count

of 435 at 6.8%. This shows that the majority of weapons used were firearms at over half the time and knife at almost another quarter of the time. Victim offender relationship showed 2714 victims were spouses to the offender at 43.4%, 241 were ex-spouses at 3.8%, 3082 were dating at 49.2%, and 233 were cohabiting at 3.6%. This shows that nearly all of the victims were either a spouse of their offender or dating their offender. Census regions show that 968 intimate partner homicides were committed in the Northeast at 15.1%, 2795 in the South at 43.7%, 1099 in the Midwest at 17.2%, and 1536 in the West at 24.0%. This indicates that nearing half the intimate partner homicide cases were located in the South, while almost another quarter were located in the West. The Northeast and Midwest seem to be pretty similar to one another.

(Table 1 about here)

Table two shows chi-square and crosstab information between different intimate partner homicide characteristics and sex. The first chi-square is between victim offender relationship and offender sex. The crosstabs show females killed a spouse 446 times, an ex-spouse 38 times, a dating relationship 786 times, and a cohabitation relationship 62 times. This shows that most females either killed a dating relationship or a spouse. The crosstabs show males killed a spouse 2267 times, an ex-spouse 203 times, a dating relationship 2295 times, and a cohabitation relationship 161 times. This shows that males, like females, killed a spouse or dating relationship most often, but males were more prevalent in killing an intimate across all categories. The Pearson chi-square was 80.898 with a significance level of .000. This shows that there is a significant association between victim offender relationship and offender sex.

The second chi-square is between offender weapon and offender sex. The crosstabs show that females used a firearm 593 times, a knife, 560 times, a blunt object 53 times, personal contact 37 times, chemical substance 23 times, incendiary 13 times, and other 80 times. This

shows that females tend to use a firearm or knife most often with firearm being the highest number. The crosstabs show that males used a firearm 2733 times, a knife 1020 times, a blunt object 244 times, a personal contact 638 times, a chemical substance 24 times, incendiary 30 times, and other 355 times. This shows that males are most likely to use a firearm with a knife and personal contact being second and third. Every male weapon category was much larger than the female counterparts except chemical substance which was only one higher for males. The Pearson chi-square was 341.829 with a significance level of .000, which shows offender weapon and offender sex are significantly associated.

The third chi square was between census region and offender sex. The crosstabs show females killed an intimate partner in the Northeast 169 times, in the South 660 times, in the Midwest 260 times, and in the West 269 times. This shows that the majority of females killed in the South, while the Midwest and West were nearly identical in number. The crosstabs show males killed an intimate partner in the Northeast 798 times, the South 2135 times, the Midwest 839 times, and the West 1266 times. This shows that males were also most likely to kill in the South. For both males and females, the order from highest to lowest in intimate partner kills by region was South, West, Midwest, Northeast, even though males had higher intimate partner kill counts in all the regions. The Pearson chi-square was 34.117 with a significance of .000, which shows there is a significant association between census region and offender sex.

(Table 2 about here)

Discussion

Some of the results are supportive of our predictions using the general strain theory framework of intimate partner homicide. Overall, rates were significantly higher for males than

females, which goes back to the possibility of externalization of anger, different coping strategies and types of strain for males. For both females and males, dating partners and spouses were the two main victims of intimate partner homicide. Although this goes against our predictions, more research should look into whether the strain of separation occurs towards the end of the relationship or after legal separation/divorce has taken place, which would therefore account for the difference between ex-spouses and spouses. At the same time, if a separation occurred, it may not be known, and the time between leaving a divorce is especially dangerous for potential victims. In terms of weapon use, females used knives and firearms at very similar rates, going back to the idea that they use weapons of self-defense found in the home. Females were significantly less likely to use a blunt object or a personal contact weapon, which may be due to their physical size against their intimate partner. This also shows that females are, in fact, more likely to use firearms as the most common weapon in intimate partner homicide. Males, however, were more than twice as likely to use firearms as knives and even more so than any other weapon choice in the study. This is supportive of our hypothesis, although it was surprising to see that the second most common weapon type used was a knife. For region, the large majority of male and female intimate partner homicide occurred in the south. Previous research indicates that this may be due to a subculture of violence, vast availability of guns (number one weapon choice), and fewer resources in terms of mental health and domestic violence. These can all serve as conditioning factors for intimate partner homicide and make it more difficult to find legitimate coping strategies, making crime more favorable. The majority of offenders for both males and females were white.

Limitations

The study has a few limitations, one being the overall representativeness of the SHR data. Although representative for the most part and in comparison to other datasets, reporting is not mandatory, so not all jurisdictions report to the SHR every year. In addition, ex-boyfriends and ex-girlfriends are not included in the SHR, so it is a relationship that cannot be examined. Other demographic factors not included that could serve as control variables include: income, education, and employment information. More importantly, motive and emotional state cannot be determined using the SHR, which would be useful in analyzing intimate partner homicide using the general strain theory framework. Chi-square can only show association and cannot direct to causal relations. Further, sometimes one may be unsure of what the exact association is; all that can be told is whether or not an association exists. For this reason, this first step will help lead the paper toward the proper regression analysis.

Future Research

Future research will use the proper regression analysis to find causal effects between this gendered phenomena. Further, future research will look at child victims of intimate partner homicide, although preliminary analysis shows that male offenders are more likely to have children victims in such an incident. Overall, the results were somewhat supportive of our research questions using this particular framework. However, with motive and negative emotions unavailable in the SHR, we are making conclusions based on quantitative results, without the ability to look at these factors on a case-by-case basis.

References

- Agnew, R. (2006b). *Pressured into crime: An overview of general strain theory*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Cooper, A., & Smith, E. L. (2011). Homicide trends in the United States, 1980-2008 annual rates for 2009 and 2010. United States Department of Justice.
- Eriksson, L., & Mazerolle, P. (2013). A general strain theory of intimate partner homicide. *Aggression & Violent Behavior, 18*(5), 462-470 9p. DOI:10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.002
- Felson, R. B., & Messner, S. F. (1998). Disentangling the effects of gender and intimacy on victim precipitation in homicide. *Criminology, 36*(2), 405-423.
- Fox, J. A., Levin, J., & Quinet, K. (2012). *The will to kill: Making sense of senseless murder* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson.
- Goetting, A. (1988). Patterns of homicide among women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3*(1), p. 3-20.
- Jordan, C., Clark, J., Pritchard, A., & Charnigo, R. (2012). Lethal and other serious assaults: Disentangling gender and context. *Crime & Delinquency, 58*(3), 425-455.
- Swatt, M., & He, N. (2006). Exploring the difference between male and female intimate partner homicides - Revisiting the concept of situated transactions. *Homicide Studies, 10*(4), 279-292

Table 1: Frequency and Valid Percent for Male and Female Intimate Partner Homicide Perpetrators Characteristics, N=6403.

	Frequency	Valid Percent
<hr/>		
Offender SEX		
Female	1359	21.2
Male	5044	78.8
Total	6403	100.0
Offender WEAPON		
Firearm	3327	51.9
Knife	1581	24.7
Blunt Object	297	4.6
Personal Contact	675	10.5
Chemical Substance	47	0.7
Incendiary	43	0.7
Other	435	6.8
Total	6405	100.0
Victim-Offender Relationship		
Spouse	2714	43.4
Ex-Souse	241	3.8
Dating	3082	49.2
Cohabitation	223	3.6
Total	6260	100.0
Census Region		
Northeast	968	15.1
South	2795	43.7
Midwest	1099	17.2
West	1536	24.0
Total	6398	100.0

Table 2: Chi-Square and Crosstabs between Intimate Partner Homicide Characteristics and Sex

	Female	Male	N
Victim-Offender Relationship			
Spouse	446	2267	2713
Ex-Spouse	38	203	241
Dating	786	2295	3081
Cohabiting	62	161	223
Total	1332	4926	6258
Pearson Chi-Square			80.898***
Offender WEAPON			
Firearm	593	2733	3326
Knife	560	1020	1580
Blunt Object	53	244	297
Personal Contact	37	683	697
Chemical Substance	23	24	47
Incendiary	13	30	43
Other	80	355	435
Total	1359	5044	6403
Person Chi-Square			341.829***
Census Region			
Northeast	169	798	967
South	660	2135	2795
Midwest	260	839	1099
West	269	1266	1535
Total	1358	5038	6396
Pearson Chi-Square			34.117***

***p < .001

ⁱ We understand there is a difference between sex and gender, but the terms associated with sex and gender will be used interchangeably.

ⁱⁱ We understand that a noose or ligature used in strangulation, gas in asphyxiations, and drowning are not typically looked at as personal contact weapons, but they were included here until a better category can be determined.

Panel Session #8 Recorder Notes: Potpourri

Recorder: James McCutcheon – Chair: Jolene Vincent

 ***Making Public Service Announcements: Active Learning in a Murder Class II***

Kim Davies, Augusta State University

Lin Huff-Corzine-What type of equipment do you need?

Kim- Sometimes they use iPhones, cameras, power points and put music in them

Dick Block- One of the reasons I retired was because I had difficulty dealing with empathy toward students who have been victims of violence, a sister of John Gacy, students whose family has been killed and domestic violence. I found it difficult dealing with that. Requiring students to do a PSA seems like it would be a difficult thing

Some were more discrete so sometimes it is hard to tell if they are having a difficult time.

Kim-One student has said this was too difficult, I worked with her through that. I have others who say that this is good.

Greg Weaver-I taught a sex crimes course. My policy is if there is anything you are uncomfortable with then leave. I've had victims & offenders in my class. And it is difficult.

Kim-That is why you have to careful

Becky Block-Dick always had material on his desk for support services. Do you do that?

Kim-It might be good to have some material with me at class.

Lin Huff-Corzine-I do similar things, you hear the information and then navigate them to counseling. That can be beneficial. There are a lot of reasons why some can't stay in the class. People with PTSD from service, once they come to class sometimes things get difficult. You hope they are in a better place by the end. If I see improvement that's a good thing. The PTSD student, who for the first time could present to the class; the football player, who froze at the podium, but after a walk in the hall working on breathing actually gave his presentation; the student, who had a panic attack, but came back after a few minutes & a bag to breath into & returned to be a participant on her debate team. I could go on & on, but these are successes.

Dallas Drake-Everyday can be different. Some days are worse than others. The fact that they didn't pick it up right away, doesn't mean they won't. It can also be during the course too.

Shila Hawk-If you put it on the syllabus maybe that is a good place that can help them.

Kim-On D2Ls too.

Female Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence

Alexis Yohros and Alec's Szalewski's Presentation

Stephen Watts-Percentages should be included in the table. You framed by GST you are not testing the hypothesis. You do not have the data to test the hypothesis. A framing mechanism is more appropriate.

Becky-Why should Strain theory predict difference by region? Talk about that! It's not that it could be incorrect but explain why.

Stephen Watts- since you are not able to tap theoretical data, you should look at region, but you are there justified there it is not a theoretical frame. Since you can't tap those variables, it makes you wonder why that was brought up.

Becky-How is strain impact gender you never explain that.

Stephen-It's interesting enough to look at difference between genders but it should not be done in the context of strain.

Becky Chicago Women's Health Data might be worth looking at.

Dallas-Female and male, doesn't say whether they are victims or offender. Wolfgang said this before 1958 we are not sure.

Stephen- Homosexual relationships are coded or not? Female and male IPH is the focus. Don't throw out the homosexual cases.

Homicide Research Working Group 2016-17 Committee List

Steering Committee

Greg Weaver (President)
Lin Huff-Corzine (Vice President)
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller (Treasurer)
Dallas Drake (Secretary)
Kim Davies (Membership Coordinator)
James McCutcheon (2017 Program Co-chair**)
Tom McEwen (2017 Program Co-Chair)
Lynn Addington (Homicide Studies Editor)
Jolene Vincent (Marketing Coordinator and Chair)

Publications

Lin Huff-Corzine (Chair & HRWG Proceedings Editor)
Wendy Regoeczi
Richard Hough
Jolene Vincent (HRWG Proceedings Editor)
Jaclyn Schildkraut (Website Liaison)

Site Selection

Jay Corzine (Chair)
Candice Batton
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller

Nominations and Elections

James McCutcheon (Chair)
Dallas Drake
Amber Scherer
Stephen Watts

Membership

Kim Davies (Coordinator and Chair)

Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller*
Dick Block (Listserv)*
T.J. Taylor

Richard Block Award

Wendy Regoeczi (Chair)
Christian Bolden
John Jarvis
Ashley Mancik
Tom McEwen

2017 Annual Program

James McCutcheon (Co-Chair)
Tom McEwen (Co-Chair)
Shila Hawk
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller

ASC Coordination

Greg Weaver (Chair)
Lynn Addington
Jay Corzine

Communications

Dallas Drake (Chair)*
Richard Block (Listserv)
Jackie Schildkraut (Website Liaison)
Piotr Karasek

Marketing

Jolene Vincent (Chair)
Ashley Mancik
Lin Huff-Corzine
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller
Mindy Weller

Carolyn Rebecca Block Award

Dallas Drake (Chair)
Becky Block
Kathleen Heide
John Jarvis
Tom McEwen

Practitioners

Amber Scherer (Chair)
Becky Block
Richard Hough
Tim Keel

Other Positions:

Bylaws Revisions

Chris Rasche (Chair)
Roland Chilton

IACP Research Advisory Committee Member

Tom McEwen

Homicide Studies Book Review Editor

Jeff Osborne

* Per HRWG Bylaws

** Also Chair, Nominations and Elections Committee

2016 HRWG Participants

Name	Email address
Lynn Addington	adding@american.edu
Candice Batton	cbatton@unomaha.edu
Becky Block	crblock@rcn.com
Dick Block	crblock@rcn.com
Jay Corzine	jay.corzine@ucf.edu
Sarah Craun	Sarah.Craun@ic.fbi.gov
Kim Davies	kdavies1@augusta.edu
Mike Deckard	mjdcm3@mail.umsl.edu
Tom Dover	Thomas.Dover@ic.fbi.gov
Dallas Drake	dallas.drake@homicidecenter.org
Cherrell Green	cg9qd@mail.umsl.edu
Shila Hawk	shawk@ars.corp.com
Richard Hough	rrough@uwf.edu
Lin Huff-Corzine	Lin.Huff-Corzine@ucf.edu
Rania Issa	Rnil@zips.uakron.edu
John Jarvis	john.jarvis@ic.fbi.gov
Maria Jovanovski	jovanovski@gmail.com
Piotr Karasek	p.karasek@wpia.uw.edu.pl
Tim Keel	timothy.keeI@ic.fbi.gov
Dianne Layden	dlayden@earthlink.net
Ashley Mancik	amancik@udel.edu
James McCutcheon	jcmctch@memphis.edu

Isabel Osgood	belosgood@Smail.com
Jordan Pickering	jcpwx3@mail.umsl.edu
Wendy Regoeczi	w.regoeczi@csuohio.edu
Maribeth Rezey	mirmvS@mail.umsl.edu
Marc Riedel	marcriedel2@charter.net
Dana Rosenfeld	danarosenfeld@knights.ucf.edu
Randolph Roth	Roth5@osu.edu
Amber Scherer	amber.scherer@gmail.com
Sarah Ann Sacra	Sarah.Ann.Sacra@knights.ucf.edu
Mark Safarik	msafarik@FBSinternational.com
Darrell Steffensmeier	d4s@psu.edu
Alec Szalewski	alecszalewski@knights.ucf.edu
Terrance Taylor	taylorjt@umsl.edu
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller	MBEMILLER@augusta.edu
Jolene Vincent	jolenevincent@knights.ucf.edu
Jeff Walsh	jawalsh@ilstu.edu
Pawel Waszkiewicz	p.waszkiewicz@wpia.uw.edu.pl
Stephen Watts	sjwatts@memphis.edu
Greg Weaver	weavegs@knights.ucf.edu
Mindy Weller	mweller@knights.ucf.edu
D. J. Williams	willdj@isu.edu
Alexis Yohros	ay11@Knights.ucf.edu