2019 Annual Meeting

Homicide Research Working Group

29 May – 01 June

Clearwater Beach FL

2019 Program Committee:

Jay Corzine, Shila Hawk, Jesenia Pizarro, and Greg Weaver

2019 Local Arrangements Chair:

Dwayne Smith

Program Overview

29 May (Wednesday)

1:00-4:00 p.m.	Pre-conference Workshop Developing a Computational Toolkit for Homicide Researchers Kat Albrecht, Northwestern University Location: TBA to registrants
6:00-9:00 p.m.	Opening Reception and Session (Pool Deck) Welcome and Opening Remarks: Kim Davies, HRWG President Jay Corzine and Greg Weaver, Program Committee Co-chairs Dwayne Smith, Local Arrangements Opening Session (7:00-8:00 p.m.): Remembering the Life and Work of Christine Rasche (Island 1 Room) Moderators: Carolyn and Richard Block

30 May (Thursday)

7:30-8:30 a.m.	Breakfast
8:30-9:00 a.m.	Announcements and Introductions (Island 1 Room)
9:00-10:15 a.m.	Panel Discussion: Combatting Drug-related Homicide and Violence: A HIDTA Perspective Facilitator/Discussant: Amber Scherer
10:15-10:30 a.m.	Break
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Session 1

James Alan Fox. "Rampage Shootings at Schools, Clubs, Hospitals, and Other Public Places: Epidemic or Failure?"

Vanessa Leggett. "School Shootings and the Role of Psychotropic Medication: A Retrospective Analysis."

James McCutcheon. "Lessons Learned: Preventing Violent Crime and Homicide through the Utilization of Technology."

Jesenia M. Pizarro, Karen Holt, and April Zeoli. "An Examination of the Situational Dynamics of Multiple Victim Homicides."

12:00-1:00 p.m.	Lunch (Sand Key Room)
1:00-2:00 p.m.	Business Meeting 1
2:00-2:15 p.m.	Break
2:15-3:3:45 p.m.	Session 2

Bre Butler, Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller, and Kim Davies. "Transgender Murder: Does Race Matter?"

Pawel Waszkiewicz. "Public Place, Public Figures, and Public Opinion: The Murders of Paweł Adamowicz (Mayor of Gdańsk (2019)) and Gabriel Narutowicz (President of Poland (1922))."

Traccy Martins. "Overkill: A First Run Definition."

Mark A. Winton. "Rapid Onset of the Violentization Process: A Case Study of Serial and Mass Murder During Genocide."

3:45-4:00 p.m.	Announcements
5:30 p.m.	Group Dinner, Columbia Restaurant

31 May (Friday)

7:30-8:30 a.m.	Breakfast
8:30-10:00 a.m.	Session 3 (Island 1 Room)

James Hubbell, Kathleen M. Heide, and Norair Khachatryan. "Children Who Kill Their Adoptive Parents: Case Characteristics and Illustrations."

Sonya Spence. "Murdered While Pregnant: An Analysis of Florida's Maternal Homicides."

Kathleen M. Heide, Rachel Condry, Caroline Miles, and Kate Fitz-Gibbon. "Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Parricide."

Ina Kelleher. "Grieving Labor: Race, Gender and Public Memory in the Aftermath of Youth Violence."

10:00-10:15 a.m.	Break

10:15-11:45 a.m.   Session 4

Michael Planty. "Examining the Distribution of Homicide Across Law Enforcement Agencies."

Wendy Regoeczi and Tom McEwen. "Exploring Neighborhood Variation in the Influence of Forensic and Incident Characteristics on Time to Homicide Clearance."

M. Dwayne Smith, Sondra J. Fogel, and Beth Bjerregaard. "Criminal Justice Outcomes for Offenders Involved in the Killing of Law Enforcement Officers."

William Terrill. "Is There Evidence of Racial Disparity in Police Use of Deadly Force? Analyses of Officer-Involved Fatal Shootings in 2015-2016."

11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.   Lunch (Island 1 Room)

1:00-2:30 p.m.   Panel Discussion
                                 Homicide Crime Scenes: A Focus on the Responder

                                 Facilitator/Discussant: Amber Scherer

2:30-2:45 p.m.   Break

2:45-4:15 p.m.   Session 5

Donna J. King, Courtney Kalmanson, and Lin Huff-Corzine. "Coercive Control: Legislation against Non-Violent Forms of Domestic Violence."

Jeanna M. Mastrocinque. "Considerations When Doing Research with Families and Friends of Homicide Victims."

Matthew Segal. "Bloodshed in Cyber City."

4:15-4:30 p.m.   Break
4:30-5:00 p.m.   Poster Session
                                 HRWG Committees

01 June (Saturday)

7:30-8:30 a.m.   Breakfast

8:30-9:30 a.m.   Session 6 (Island 1 Room)

Lin Huff-Corzine and Kayla R. Toohy. "New Discoveries from the Past: A Report on the Translation of Dr. Pauline Tarnowsky's 1908 Book, *Les Femmes Homicide*."

Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller. "A Neighborhood in Need: A Descriptive Analysis of Child Abuse and Lethality in the Central Savannah River Area."

9:30-9:45 a.m.   Break

9:45-11:00 a.m.   Business Meeting 2
                                Final Announcements/Remarks

Rampage Shootings at Schools, Clubs, Hospitals, and Other Public Places: Epidemic or Panic?

James Alan Fox

Among all forms of multiple homicide, public shootings are the rarest though the scariest. Unlike family massacres, for example, which constitute roughly half of all mass killings, public rampage shootings can victimize anyone, at any time, and at any place, without any warning.

Based on its annual survey of journalists, the Associated Press placed public mass killings twice in its list of the Top 10 news stories of 2018, with the Parkland school shooting as Number One and several others collectively as Number Four. The intense focus on rampage shootings is hardly new, as Americans have long and repeatedly been shocked and outraged over these senseless acts of carnage.

The widespread fear that public mass shootings are on the rise has encouraged a number of policy proposals—some worthwhile yet others ill-advised—that are largely based on a distorted view of risk. This presentation attempts to add some needed perspective to this kind of epidemic thinking, critically assessing the various definitions and data sources that are widely misunderstood. Finally, it will also consider strategies that may reduce the level of anxiety surrounding this extremely rare but extremely horrific form of homicide.

Outline

1. An indisputable "hot topic" and climate of fear
   a. A recurring top news story
   b. Epidemic thinking
   c. Gallup poll of perceived risk of mass shooting victimization
   d. Pew survey of students about school shootings
2. A disputable claim of out of control increase
   a. AP/USAT/NU update
      i. A very recent spike in incidents and victims of mass shootings may not last
      ii. Fingers crossed: 2019 relatively quiet through mid-May
3. Why the discordance of various databases (see table below)
   a. Illegal shift: How Mother Jones's revised threshold for mass shooting created the illusion of a surge since 2013.
   b. A big deal out of small numbers: Klarevas's trend line based on mass shootings with 6+ victims
   c. A myopic look back: Stanford's attempt to build a dataset retrospectively produced a recent spike
   d. Misleading by example: FBI active shooter report case examples
   e. Death is different: How the Gun Violence Archive's data on mass shootings with just a few if any deaths confused the issue

  f. Domestic violence as a spurious red flag: Everytown for Gun Safety report on correlates of mass shootings

  g. Mixing watermelon and grapes: Everytown for Gun Safety reports of school shootings

  h. Redefining victimization: Washington Post's exaggerated measure of the impact of school shootings

4. Best practice or bad idea?
  a. Strategic seating in classrooms
  b. Active shooter drills
  c. Locked classroom doors
  d. Hear something, shout something: The girl who cried fox

5. No notoriety campaign: Media restraint or muzzling

Comparison of Rampage Shooting Databases

Source	Definition	Range of Years Included	Incident Total	Victim Total
AP/USA Today/NU	4+ victims killed by gunfire	2006-2018	292	1,601
Grant Duwe	4+ vicitms killed by gunfire in a public place excluding felony-related incidents	1900-2018	193	1,380
Washington Post	4+ vicitms killed by gunfire in a public place excluding felony-related incidents	1966-2018	160	1,143
Stanford University	3+ victims killed or injured by gunfire exluding felony-related incidents	1966-2016	307	1,237
Mother Jones	4+ vicitms (3+ since 2013) killed by gunfire in a public place excluding domestic and felony-related incidents	1982-2018	107	875
Congressional Research Service	4+ victims killed by gunfire	1997-2016	423	2,104
Everytown for Gun Safety	4+ victims killed by gunfire	2009-2017	173	1,001
Louis Klarevas	6+ victims killed by gunfire	1966-2015	111	901
Supplementary Homicide Reports	4+ victims killed by gunfire	1976-2017	785	3,735
Gun Violence Archive	4+ vicitms killed or injured by gunfire	2014-2018	1673	1,899
FBI Active Shooters	Killing or attempt to kill people in a confined and populated area with gunfire	2000-2017	250	799

Lessons Learned: Preventing Violent Crime and Homicide through the Utilization of Technology

James C. McCutcheon, Bert Burraston, Angela Madden, Stephen Watts, and Max Helms

Introduction

The following study is through a consolation of effort between the Memphis Police Department (MPD) and the University of Memphis (UofM). The purpose of this effort is to study the effectiveness of Mobile/Pole License Plater Reader (LPR) and auditory Gunshot Detection (GSD) technology on impacting firearm related violent crime. Specifically, LPR technology scans license plates and runs the data through a hotlist of various crimes or criminal activity. Auditory GSD is a camera programmed to pan to the location in which a gunshot occurred. Practically, if all the technology were used together on the same incident the auditory GSD would alert officers that a shooting occurred and once an individual in vehicle leaves the scene the LPR would scan the license for investigation or simultaneous pursuit using mobile LPR scanning technology to ease locating the suspect. Since the beginning of the implementation of this project early in 2016 both MPD and UofM have been coordinating, sharing data, and analyses in a weekly meeting. UofM using GIS and other statistical methods determined the target blocks using MPD call for service data. License Plate Recognition (LPR)

Lum et al. (2011) findings indicate when small numbers of License Plate Recognition (LPR) patrols are used in crime hot spots fail to produce any deterrent effect (General or Specific). The authors suggest that already acquired LPRs can be used in ways that might increase their effectiveness in hot spot areas such as carefully conceptualizing ways to enhance police technology, more comprehensive data supporting LPR units, and using LPR systems as a form of proactive policing. Merola et al. (2019) discovered the implementation of LPR systems might have unintended consequences for law enforcement agencies. Most respondents in the study were uninformed about police usage of LPR while those knew about the system expressed cynicism towards police. Fundamentally, LPR usage negatively affected police-community relations as residents tended to have low trust and confidence in police.

Koper & Lum (2019) expands on evidence-based research on LPRs by assessing the utilization of a macro-level fixed LPR network in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina Police Department (CMPD). Robbery investigations, auto thefts, and theft vehicle parts were the focus of the research, crimes for which CMPD detectives most likely utilize LPRs. The probability and timing of clearances for robbery and vehicle theft improved after the establishment of the CMPD's LPR network, especially in areas where LPRs were concentrated. For auto burglary cases, improvements were generally evident for long-term clearances. Both short and long-term clearances improved for cases that required additional investigations to thefts.

Gunshot Detection Technology

Ratcliffe et al. (2018) discovered the Acoustic Gunshot Detection Systems (AGDS) had no significant effect on the number of confirmed shootings. The AGDS did, however, increase the workload of police officers in which there was no evidence of a confirmed shooting. Lawrence et al. (2018) describe lessons learned and experiences with gunshot detection technology (GDT) in Richmond, CA; Milwaukee, WI; and Denver, CO. Generally, the agencies in the study believed that GDT was a useful tool during investigations. Examinations of case file audits affirm that finding, recommending that GDT improves analytical efforts through increased recuperation of bullet shell casing, especially those related with murders and thefts, which can be connected to different crimes and weapons (Lawrence et al., 2018). Additionally, findings indicate that officer compliance regarding the usage of GDT is high, stakeholders felt GDT produced valuable information, and individuals within the community with minimal confidence and reliance in law enforcement approved of GDT.

Methodology

A total of 20 blocks were included through stratified random sampling of the top 50 blocks for call for services related to shootings. The blocks were then randomly assigned into experimental and control groups. All experimental blocks receive a pole mounted LPR and GSD camera. Additionally, each block receives one mobile LPR vehicle unit. Officers who operate the vehicles are trained on LPR usage. LPR hits for both vehicles and pole cameras have been recorded in data by MPD and shared with UofM evaluators.

Three periods are subject to analysis pre-test, pilot, and post-test. All data were taken from October 27, 2016 until February 28, 2019. Training and technology acquisition took place from October 2016-October, 28 2017, additionally both experimental and control groups were chosen during this time. There are three time periods in this analysis, the pre-test (October 27, 2016-October 27, 2017), the pilot period (October 28, 2017-February 28, 2018), and the post-test (March 1, 2018-February 28, 2019).

Data were shared from the MPD data portal MDSAS for Intel Mapping. Murder incidents were the only data included in this analysis, this excludes justifiable homicide, and manslaughter. As there is one set of coordinates for each murder incident, this only counts the incident and not any additional murder victims per incident. Specifically, a murder incident regardless of the number of victims will count as one in the data. Lastly, a few cases were lost due to having undefined geocoding coordinates.

Results

For the full-time (pre-test/post-test) the control group experienced two murder incidents in four total control groups. Seven total murder incidents occurred in the experimental group during this time, four of which in one block.

For the control areas before implementation (October 27, 2016-October 27, 2017) of the technology there were no murders that occurred. For the pilot period there was one murder incident. For the post-test period there was an additional murder in the control group. During the pre-test period one murder incident occurred in the experimental group. During the post-test a total of five murder incidents occurred. Three murder incidents took place in one block that had the highest number of murders in the pre-test. The fourth incident occurred outside of the apartment complex where the technology was implemented and was not at all visible by the camera and beyond a 500 foot area in relation to GSD technology. The final murder incident occurred at another apartment complex.

As table 1 demonstrates one of the seven homicides was recorded with GSD technology. However, the auditory function for GSD was not effective. Video was still able to record the incident. Additionally, during the post-test there were 970 total GSD alerts that were verified to have functioned correctly, meaning the technology alerted officers of gunshot occurred, panned and tilted to the proper location and recorded evidence of the event. The 970 alerts did not include cases where weather and fireworks contributed to the number of alerts. On July 4th, 2018 there were over 10,000 GSD alerts triggered at Memphis Real Time Crime Center.

For mobile LPR technology during this time there a total 6,909 hits (the number any license scanned that was associated with a suspect of crime). Eleven percent of those hits were enforced. As it comes to the goal of grant (decreasing firearm violence) there was no verified record of any mobile LPR enforced hit that led to a recovery of a firearm. The majority of cases as shared by LPR trained officers were related to warrants and stolen vehicles. The most significant concerns those officers listed were related to logistics, such as angle of the LPR unit on their vehicle. They also stated the number of alerts they received was challenging as balance with other responsibilities. Lastly, all pole mounted LPR successes were tied to stolen vehicles and warrants.

References

Koper, C. S., & Lum, C. (2019). The impacts of large-scale license plate reader deployment on criminal investigations. *Police Quarterly*, 1098611119828039.

Lawrence, D. S., La Vigne, N. G., Goff, M., & Thompson, P. S. (2018). Lessons learned implementing gunshot detection technology: Results of a process evaluation in three major cities. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, 1(2), 109-129.

Lum, C., Hibdon, J., Cave, B., Koper, C. S., & Merola, L. (2011). License plate reader (LPR) police patrols in crime hot spots: An experimental evaluation in two adjacent jurisdictions. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(4), 321-345.

Merola, L. M., Lum, C., & Murphy, R. P. (2019). The impact of license plate recognition technology (LPR) on trust in law enforcement: a survey-experiment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 15(1), 55-66.

Ratcliffe, J. H., Lattanzio, M., Kikuchi, G., & Thomas, K. (2019). A partially randomized field experiment on the effect of an acoustic gunshot detection system on police incident reports. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 67-76.

An Examination of the Situational Dynamics of Multiple Victim Homicides

Jesenia M. Pizarro, Karen Holt, April M. Zeoli, and Karissa R. Pelletier

Multicide, or homicide with multiple victims, has garnered increased attention from academics and policy makers. Recent events such as mass shootings with high victim counts have received extensive media coverage, alarming the public and generating specific criminal justice problems regarding prevention. Despite this increased attention, there is little systematic empirical research on this topic. Moreover, the research that does exist tend to focus on mass murder incidents with 4 or more victims, and often excludes the most commonly occurring events that result in 2 to 3 fatalities. Consequently, the objective of this study is to examine the transactions of homicides, and how those transactions differ based on victim count. One research question is examined: Do the situational dynamics of single victim and multicides differ from one another? We define multicides as homicide incidents with two to four fatalities.

The Newark Homicide Project is employed to answer this research question. The dataset includes all of the incidents that occurred and were investigated by the Newark Police Department from January 1, 1999 to December 31, 2007. Data were primarily collected from the investigation files of homicide detectives investigating the incidents. The investigation files contained detailed victim and offender demographic and lifestyle information as well as notes on the investigation details. The files also contained witness statements, the statements of other parties who assisted in the investigation, and sometimes victim and offender statements. This allowed for the creation of a timeline of the homicide event, and a detailed description of the transactions that culminated in the lethal act.

A data collection protocol and instrument helped ensure that researchers captured information in the homicide investigation files in a consistent manner. Most of the information extracted from the homicide files was objective in nature (e.g., gender, ethnicity, incident location, and weapon), so the researchers copied that data directly from the files. A second portion of the data collection involved the creation of narratives describing the incident based on the investigator reports and witnesses statements. The narratives include accounts for each incident describing the circumstances that led to the homicide, detailing how it occurred, and providing information on the victim(s) and suspect(s). These narratives were then used to code variables such as victim offender relationship, offender intent, and how the murder was carried out. The researchers used a codebook, compiled by the lead researcher, which provide definitions and examples of what each variable and category within the variable entailed, during the coding.

In total 705 homicide incidents were examined in this study. Of these, 675 were single victim incidents, while 30 were multicides with two to four fatalities. Twenty-six of the multicide cases were double homicides (86.7%), 3 were triple homicides (10%), and 1 was a quadruple homicide (3.3%). These 705 homicide incidents yielded a total of 740 victims (675 being single victim and 65 being victims in a multicide). Additionally, 629 offenders were arrested and charged. To be clear, law enforcement identified, arrested, and charged (i.e., cleared the investigation) one or more offenders in 444 of the 705 incidents (63%). Of the 444 cleared

cases, one offender was arrested and charged in 418 of the incidents (94.1%), 2 in 22 of the incidents (5%), 3 in 3 of the incidents (.7%), and 4 in one of the incidents (.2%).

Three sets of quantitative analyses were undertaking based on the distinct units of analyses – incident, victim, and offender. The analyses focused on uncovering the similarities and differences between single victim and multicide incidents. In doing so, we relied on descriptive frequencies, bivariate Chi-Square tests of independence, and comparison of means. Seven incident variables were examined: clearance, weapon, location, mode, victim offender relationship, motive, and planned aggression. The victim and offender analyses focused on gender, race/ethnicity, age, drug dealing, gang membership, prior felonies, history of violent, weapon, drug, and property crimes. The offender analysis also examined whether the offender had a history of prior homicides.

The quantitative analyses were supplemented by a qualitative analysis of the multicide cases in order to illustrate the variable findings. The qualitative analysis was facilitated through the use of NVivo, a qualitative software program that allows the researcher to manage, extract, compare, explore, and reassemble meaningful pieces of information from large amounts of rich and descriptive text in a rigorous and systematic way. All homicide incidents classified as multicides were included in the qualitative analysis, which resulted in a total of 30 incidents.

As illustrated in table 1, the quantitative analyses shows that the incident characteristics of single victim and multicides were very similar. Indeed, only case status and motive have statistically significant differences. Multicides have higher clearance rates than single victim cases. Multicide incidents were also more likely to be instrumental and involve predatory behaviors motivated by family abuse, deviant lifestyles related to gangs, drugs, robberies, and witness tampering. Despite these differences, multicide and single victim homicides were committed with similar weapons (i.e., the bulk were committed with a firearm), occur in public streets, and were carried out in a face to face manner.

Qualitatively three main themes emerged that illustrate the quantitative incident results. These are hedonistic lethality, predatory revenge, instrumental solutions. The hedonistic lethality theme involved multicides where offenders were engaged in recreational activities, such as alcohol use, and often in public locations where there were large groups of individuals. In these cases, offenders most often were responding to what they interpreted as slights or disrespect, most often within the confines of their family and intimates. Firearms were used in most cases and while they had an intended target, in these cases members of the crowd where unintentionally injured or killed. For most of the sample, female victims fell into the unintentionally injured and killed category. These events were spontaneous and transactions typically occurred quickly and impulsively. The bulk of these incidents were motivated by escalating disputes and intimate/family issues.

Predatory revenge events also were the result of interactions considered slights or disrespect, but these cases evidenced a cooling off period between when the event occurred and when the homicide took place. An initial interaction with the victim resulted in a threat to the offender's status, and the offender(s) returned to the victim at a later point in time to carry

out revenge. In these cases, firearms were most often used and offenders and victims were males. This type of multicide often involved criminal activity on both the part of the victim and offenders, so more gang activity occurred in this theme. While one victim may have been the intended target, all victims were seen as symbolic of the perceived disrespect and so were eliminated in the symbolic act. The bulk of these incidents were coded as drug/gang motive. Lastly, instrumental solutions were multicides where victims were eliminated simply as a solution to a problem or as a final attempt to resolve the situation. In this category, offender(s) may have been involved in some kind of illegal activity and eliminated witnesses or police officers in order to avoid detection or apprehension. These cases most often involved a firearm and occurred in public locations. Victims were representative of the inevitable future closing in on the offender(s) and were indiscriminately killed in an attempt to salvage freedom and autonomy. Robbery and other motives (particularly witness tampering) are over represented in this category.

Table 2 presents the demographic and lifestyle characteristics of victim for both types of homicides. Although the bulk of victims were male and African American in both types of incidents, multicide has a greater percentage of females and Latino victims. The victims of multicide were also slightly older than those of single victim incidents. They also appear to be less criminally inclined than those of single victim cases. Specifically, multicide victims have less felonies, violent crime charges, weapon charges, drug charges, and property crime charges. These findings might be a product of more victims of robbery and intimate/domestic homicides being in this group.

The qualitative analyses offers further insight into the characteristics of the victims. Two types of victims emerged in the qualitative analysis. The first is the non-criminally involved, which comprises the bulk of multicide victims. These victims did not have a prior criminal history, were not gang members, drug dealers, or were involved in any criminal lifestyles. They were either targeted due to estranged relationships, robberies, or were simply in the wrong place at the wrong time and were not the target of the homicide event. These types of victims are over represented in hedonistic lethality and instrumental solutions homicides. The second type, the criminally inclined victim, on the other hand, were often gang members, had a prior criminal history, and a higher prevalence of weapon and drug prior offenses. These victims are most often represented in predatory revenge homicides.

Table 3 presents offender characteristics. Unlike the victims of multicide, the offenders appear to be more criminally inclined than those of single case victims. Multicide offenders were more likely to be gang members and had more prior felony convictions. Moreover, they were more likely to have a prior charge and arrest for homicide than single victim offenders. Multicide offenders were also slightly younger, and more likely to carry out the multicide in a group. While there is a higher prevalence of female victims in multicides, the opposite pattern emerges in terms of offending, with the bulk of females offending in single victim cases. Finally, although the bulk of offenders in both types of incidents were Black, multicide offenders have higher percentages of Latinos.

Two groups also emerge with offenders qualitatively; however, while the first group is not heavily enmeshed in crime, they are still marginally engaged in deviant and criminal

lifestyles. That is, they have a prior criminal history, most involving drug and property offenses, however, they were not gang members or had a prior history of homicide. This is the least prevalent of the two groups. Group two, the highly criminally involved group, comprises the bulk of offenders in multicides. These offenders have a higher prevalence of gang membership, drug dealing, and more serious prior criminal histories, which include prior arrests for homicides.

In conclusion, the findings presented here suggest that the etiology and aftermath of multicides differs from that of single victim homicides. Multicides have higher clearance rates. Moreover, the motives, victim, and offender characteristics also differentiate these homicides. Indeed, there's a higher prevalence of drug/gang, other instrumental (i.e., witness tampering), and robbery cases in the multicide events. The victims in these homicides are less criminally inclined, while the offenders are more inclined. The notable differences in offender characteristics present avenues for prevention. These as well as the theoretical and methodological implications of these findings will be discussed in the presentation.

Transgender Murder -- Does Race Matter?

Bre Butler, Melissa J. Tetzlaff-Bemiller, and Kim Davies

While homicide is a major area of violence-focused research, one area that is understudied is the homicide of transgendered individuals. Unfortunately, we have seen a recent increase, or at least more media attention, in this type of murder. Many authors are astute enough to point out that it is unclear whether the murder rate is really increasing or if with the greater awareness and in some places, acceptance of transgender people, we might be getting better at identifying transgender killings. Either way, transgender people feel under attack and LGBTQ+ Leaders such as Chad Griffin of the Human Rights Campaign have called anti-transgender violence an "urgent crisis for our country" and have asked for elected leaders, the media, and the LGBTQ+ community to address the epidemic of violence (Allen 2017). While many who identify as transgender experience higher amounts of discrimination solely because of their gender identity, transgender people of color experience even more discrimination (Kattari, Walls, Whitfield, & Magruder, 2017) as they are considered a double minority.

Not surprisingly, there has been little published on trans murders, especially dealing with trans murder in the United States. One of the first studies to study the murder of transgender people was completed by Prunas and colleagues (2015). Here Prunas et al. (2015) focused on 20 murders of transwomen in Milan from 1993 to 2012. This was largely a descriptive study, finding that most of the victims were immigrants and 19 were sex workers, 13 of the offenders were identified with all being males aged 17-63, 12 were sole offenders, and five of the cases were considered intimate partner violence (Prunas et al., 2015). It is notable that all cases are of transwomen and that many of the women were immigrants and sex workers, thus at the margins of society and not just due to their gender status, which likely could have increased their risk for homicide. The women were described as biological males presenting as women with varying degrees of "feminization" (Pruna et al., 2015). Further, Dinno (2017) estimated that within the trans community transwomen were more likely to be murdered than transmen, Black and Latino transwomen were more likely to be murdered than their white transwomen, and that sex work may be strongly related to both findings.

Kelley and Gruenewald (2015) work is important on its own and relevant to ours in that they make a case for using open-source data. Rather than relying on official data sources such as the Supplementary Homicide Reports or NIBRS that may miss cases of LGBT murders, Gruenewald relied on a systematic search of sources such as advocacy group reports (Human Rights Campaign, National Gay & Lesbian Task Force, and Southern Poverty Law Center); and printed news sources using Lexis Nexis. Gruenewald makes the case that this is the best way to make sure that cases involving LGBT people are included. This sentiment is further acknowledged by Taluson (2016) who suggests that there is not a "was transgendered" box to check in official data.

With previous studies indicating that minority groups appear to be overrepresented in trans murder cases, we find that this is an area in need of focus. This study serves as a descriptive analyses of transgender homicide; paying special attention to race. Gathering data from

media coverage and Mic's Editorial Manifesto, we present a descriptive analyses of the characteristics of homicide in which the victim is a transgender person with a special focus on race. We include data about the victim-offender relationships, the circumstances, and information about the victims and offenders.

References

Allen, S. (2017). Why Have There Been So Many Trans Murders This Year? March 4, 2017. *Daily Beast* Website. Retrieved from http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/03/04/why-have-there-been-so-many-trans-murders-this-year.

Dinno, A. (2017). Homicide rates of transgender individuals in the United States: 2010-2014. *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(9), 1441-1447.

Kattari, S. K., Walls, E. N., Whitfield, D. L., & Magruder, L. L. (2017). Racial and ethnic differences in experiences of discrimination in accessing social services among transgender/gender-nonconforming people. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work: Innovation in Theory, Research & Practice*, 26(3), 217-235.

Kelley, K. & Gruenewald, J. (2015). Accomplishing masculinity through anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender homicide: A comparative case study approach. *Men and Masculinities*, 18(1), 3-29.

Prunas A., Clerici C. A., Gentile G., Muccino E., Veneroni L., & Zoja R. (2015). Transphobic murders in Italy: An overview of homicides in Milan (Italy) in the past two decades (1993-2012). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 30(16), 2872–2885.

Talusan M. (2017). *Unerased: counting transgender lives*. Retrieved from https://unerased.mic.com/.

New Discoveries from the Past: A Report on the Translation of Dr. Pauline Tarnowsky's 1908 Book, *Les Femmes Homicide*

Lin Huff-Corzine and Kayla R. Toohy

Abstract

Dr. Pauline Tarnowsky, a star student of Dr. Cesare Lombroso, could be considered the woman criminologist during the early days of criminology. Like Lombroso, Tarnowsky was convinced that the "born criminal" could be identified based on physical characteristics. Using her "sophisticated," state-of-the-art instruments, Tarnowsky measured over 30 anatomical parts of the Russian women prisoners to which she had access as the prison physician. In her 1908 book, Les femmes homicide, first written in Russian and translated the following year to French, she describes her work with the women who were in prison for murder. Each woman was subjected to a series of measurements as Tarnowsky searched for what she, like Lombroso, hypothesized was the born criminal. Indicated by their atavistic characteristics, these individuals would be more likely to commit violent acts. She, similar to Lombroso, finds a mix of reasons for why these women murdered their spouses. In this paper we give voice to some of the women who killed their spouses, usually peasant women, who Tarnowsky often considered atavistic regressives or throwbacks to an earlier time.

Madame Praskov'ia Tarnovskaia, AKA Pauline Tarnowsky, MD, was a star student of Dr. Cesare Lombroso and a star in her own right even though many criminologists have either not heard her name or heard it only in passing. Yet, it was her work with women offenders that produced the plates (pictures) of women prostitutes that appeared in Lombroso and Ferrero's 1893 book, *The Female Offender*. She frequently traveled to Italy to work with Lombroso; time spent working on research related to the imprisoned women from whom she gathered data to study the biological differences she thought would exist among professional prostitutes, thieves, and homicidal women compared to "normal" women. Her work on prostitutes and thieves was published as An Anthropological Study of Prostitutes and Female Thieves in 1889. Then, in 1908 her work culminated in *Les Femmes Homicides*, or written in English, *Women Who Kill*. Tarnowsky's book was translated from Russian to French in 1909, but until now it has never been translated to English.

Whether Dr. Tarnowsky considered herself a groundbreaker for other women to follow or not, she was, in fact, acknowledged as a leading Russian criminal anthropologist whose work was well-known in the West (White, 1965). According to the obituary that appeared in the *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, she was the "leading woman criminologist of Europe" and as such, they had lost one of their "most distinguished scholars" (J.W.G. 2011, p. 270). Despite her contributions to the discipline of criminology, Tarnowsky's work was rarely mentioned in text with the exception of Imogene Moyer's book *Criminological Theories*. Very few criminologists have been exposed to her work and the contributions she has made within the field of criminology, which we are hoping to rectify by translating her work in English.

Tarnowsky, like Lombroso, was seeking the biological causes of criminal behavior; or the psychological and physical characteristics that combined to form the "born" criminal. The belief that specific characteristics could be ascertained to identify individuals predisposed to criminal behavior guided her research efforts. Sophisticated measurements used to record physical attributes derived from the work Tarnowsky completed with Lombroso, were expanded upon and improved on in her work with female offenders. Her attempts to find born criminals among prostitutes, thieves, and homicidal women demanded perfection in each physical measurement she took of the women under study. Tarnowsky argued that a population of women who had committed homicide were the perfect research group to conduct a study over while employing her newly developed, increasingly precise measurement tools. In her book *Les Femmes Homicides*, Tarnowsky begins by outlining her research methods, what she defines as "signs of physical degeneration", and heredity. She then goes into further detail on biological applications that had been conducted to study the anthropologic criminal originating from the work of Lombroso, and the ways in which she grouped each woman based on the motives of their crime. Tarnowsky provides detailed, rich data on each of these women in case studies that outline many aspects of the women's lives and their criminal actions.

In Chapter I of *Les Femmes Homicides*, Tarnowsky asserts that because the sample is comprised of rural peasant women, women who she views as more primitive, they offer excellent data to test the born criminal theory. Tarnowsky and colleagues believed that these rural peasant women were preferable to urban female residents as a study population because they had been observed to commit crime more frequently. Additionally, the crimes that rural women and urban women committed were observed by the researchers to be fairly different in nature. Tarnowsky and colleagues used only women with 100% Russian blood to ensure racial homogeneity in her studies of homicidal women.

Due to the nature of her research and strict limitations imposed on who could be included within the study, Tarnowsky included 160 observations of Russian women who had committed homicide. Once they were chosen to represent "normal" homicidal peasant women, they were subjected to over 30 measurements of their heads, arms, legs, and torso using the special tools that Tarnowsky maintained were the very best available. In addition, she insisted that all measurements had to be done by the same person in the same way, ensuring that less bias would be present in the measurements taken on each woman. She viewed the consistency of the instruments and personnel as absolutely necessary for the data collected from the homicidal women to be clean enough for meaningful comparisons in order to test the born criminal theory. A comparison group of 150 "normal" peasants were submitted to similar examinations as those who were categorized "normal" homicidal peasant women. The inclusion of this comparison group made it possible for observations between groups to be derived at the conclusion of Tarnowsky's study.

Along with the multiple measurements taken for each woman, Tarnowsky interviewed each of the 160 study subjects in depth about her childhood, her most recent living conditions, and why she committed the murder for which she was currently serving time. These interviews included documentation on any physical ailments that were present in the women's families, including afflictions of the parents and what had been determined as their cause of death, if

this information was available. Additionally, Tarnowsky wrote about any alcohol or drug habits of the parents and family mentioned in these interviews to create the most comprehensive history of their heredity possible. Many additional aspects of the homicidal women and their behaviors were contained within the case studies including their level of literacy, motivation to kill, and method of murder. Tarnowsky used these motivations and murder methods to classify homicidal women into categories based on the characteristics of the individual and their circumstances. Tarnowsky discusses elements of romantic relationships, maternal influences, morals, biological reproductive influences, and psychological maladies as well as other characteristics to define the categories of homicidal women. All of this information increases the complexity and multi-faceted nature of her work culminating in an incredible early contribution to the discipline's understanding of biologically situated aspects of criminology.

At the end of her elaborate study, Tarnowsky states that we cannot "judge the criminality of an individual based only on anatomical data or congenital moral deviation. Interpreted in that sense, the old type of Lombroso's born-criminal cannot be accepted" (Chapter 1, p. 1). As she examines the data she has so carefully collected, Tarnowsky states that what she has now on "crime genesis indicate clearly that criminal acts do not result from unique random causes; it is engendered under the combined influence of very complex and multiple factors" (Chapter 1, p. 1). Tarnowsky states in her conclusion that biological differences do exist between criminal women and non-criminal women. She also indicates the importance of heredity and the role of parents in the criminality of their children. These multiple factors all contribute to the expression of criminal behavior based on the homogenous groupings of Tarnowsky's Russian prisoners. By encompassing these elements of the social environment, Tarnowsky expands upon the previously existing work regarding biological aspects of criminality.

Tarnowsky goes further in saying, "To attribute criminality to exclusively social influence or to native organic properties only, it is proving insufficient and a narrow minded view. Therefore, in the analysis of the condition or situation producing crimes, the distinction to make between principal essential factors, secondary, occasional or random is very important; it is more than a necessity" (Chapter 1, p. 1). Her study moves beyond her original intention in deciphering the biological indicators that are regularly found in the "born criminal" and extends to include situational factors, such as family life and psychological conditions that may play a role in criminality. Her novel work during the early 1900s begins this exploration by opening the door for criminologists to consider the path of heredity in criminality.

Tarnowsky continues to argue that though it is not solely the biological factors, to make a "claim for only social factors, or for only the congenital organization of vices playing an exclusive role in the production of crime, that is a discussion that seems useless to further in the way that it is sterile by its exclusivism." (Chapter 1, p. 1). These assertions highlight the importance she indicates in including multiple factors in the study of criminology. On the last page of her book, Tarnowsky calls for the expansion of Criminal Anthropology. She writes, "Its ultimate goal at last is to study all the measures, all the means that can deter that tendency to crime; its principal goal is the prophylaxis of criminality" (Chapter 12, p. 541). Tarnowsky identifies important areas of expansion into Criminal Anthropology including

studies of heredity and other environmental factors that would aide in the deterrence of criminality and rehabilitation of those who are labeled as criminal.

A more complete understanding of Tarnowsky's work will be garnered after concluding work on the English translation of *Les Femmes Homicides*. Her progression from the original endeavor of identifying born criminals based on physical "adativistic characteristics" to the assertions she makes on the influences of biological and social factors are far progressed for her time and an important contribution to the development of the discipline. Her meticulous methodological considerations regarding the intersections of her criminal population (i.e. race, environment, time, place, unity, and other social conditions) make this one of the first comprehensive studies on female offenders to make comparisons among consistently homogenous criminal and non-criminal populations.

References

Lombroso, C. and G. Ferrero. 2011. Death of Madame Pauline Tarnowsky. *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 2, 270-271.

Lombroso, C. and G. Ferrero. 1893. *The Female Offender*. New York:

Tarnowsky, P. 1889. *An Anthropological Study of Prostitutes and Female Thieves*. Paris: Progrés Médical.

Tarnowsky, P. 1908*. Les Femmes Homicides*. Paris: F. Alcan.

White, F. 1965. Influence on Cesare Lombroso's *Criminal Woman*.

Overkill: A First Run Definition

Traccy Martins

Abstract

Although homicide is a major social issue, researchers have generally overlooked cases characterized by wounds that are excessive to killing an individual. A term referred to as overkill. Overkill has been observed in a variety of incidents, but it has not been systematically defined or examined in literature in regard to why it occurs. This study aims to define "overkill" based on the number and extent of injuries for LGBT homicides between the years 1969 to 2018 and, in doing so, develop a classification of characteristics of overkill. The purpose of this research is to gather information from literature and exemplary cases, which imply excessive wound infliction and may aid in defining and analyzing data on overkill. Discovering a definition can help facilitate examinations of certain incidents and encourage the exploration of the relationship overkill has to an individual person's death. This study will discover cut-off points per category (firearm, sharp instruments, and blunt force trauma) of the number of wounds that are to be labeled as overkill. Analyses will consist of variables that will be used in relation to overkill and be utilized to support the outcome of a definition.

Introduction

Homicide is universal and has been a part of society for centuries. Reasons for committing homicide have been analyzed by many researchers, yet the number of wounds and other inflictions on a victim during an incident has received little, if any, recognition. The number of wounds have become excessive to where more information is needed in relation to expanding homicide literature. A term used to express excessive and multiple wounds is often referred to as overkill. Overkill is homicide magnified in some way beyond what is necessary to kill. Excessive and multiple wound infliction has been presented in descriptions of a variety of cases, but it has not been properly analyzed, defined, or further studied to aid our understanding of overkill and/or to produce new knowledge related to the uniqueness of this concept.

This paper aims to systematically define the term "overkill" and determine a level of excessiveness. Although the number of wounds needed to kill differs by individual, some cases are seen to be pushed to an extent where there is no need to continue to do further harm. A cut off point will aid in the examinations of the characteristics of overkill. Thus, a limit for the number of wounds inflicted is necessary for the definition, and other factors playing a part during the incident should also be considered. Due to the complexity of overkill, this is an exploratory study that will look at patterns of overkill and will add other necessary factors in the future. At this stage, the number of wounds and the extent in which the wounds are inflicted are important as it demonstrates "out of control," reckless conduct, and/or expressive quantities. The purpose of this research is to collect and analyze data that can aid in the first step of defining overkill and determine explanations for its existence.

Literature Review

Literature on overkill is limited. This may be due to opinions, such as Bell and Vila (1996) suggesting that it is difficult to identify a cutoff point between what is or is not necessary to kill a victim and it is also arduous to recognize the offender's subjective awareness of the wounds they are inflicting. These complications have restricted the presentation of an objective and quantitative cutoff point. To begin, the broad definition from Nikolic and Zivkovic (2015) that states that "the infliction of massive injuries by a perpetrator by far exceeding the extent necessary to kill the victim" (p. 498). Using this definition could vary in the number of wounds researchers consider overkill. Other researchers, such as Douglas et al. (1992) focus on overkill as ante or perimortem injuries that are in excess of what is necessary to cause death. This creates a debate whether or not cases of postmortem injuries should be considered overkill. Interestingly, in the forensic literature, Henderson et al. (2005) have used the term "overkill syndrome," stating in other words, "frenzied attacks with loss of self-control" (p.131). This definition leaves the reader with the idea that the perpetrator must lose self- control, a requirement that goes beyond that needed to define overkill.

A definition and further examination of overkill cases are necessary for our understanding of homicide to expand. The lack of a comprehensive definition has potentially disrupted the investigation process and led prevention techniques in the wrong direction. For the most part, researchers tend to ignore the importance of overkill. If law enforcement personnel downplay the elements of the attack, they may overlook details of the crime that may lead to the offender, specifically the possible offender's relationship to the victim.
Injury severity patterns and their measurement are important for understanding the dynamics of the behavior that occurred in these events. Who kills the victim with little or no external or excessive injury and another who spends considerable time and effort inflicting excessive injury involving multiple cause of death… Specifically, the number, severity, location, and nature of the injuries and their relationship to cause of death need to be evaluated (Safarik and Jarvis 2005:189).

In cases of overkill, it is generally evident that there is a point of excessive wound infliction that is "too much. Bell and Vila (1996) noticed that the number of injuries on homosexual victims was greater than heterosexual ones. This discovery may result in different findings due to the complexities of the cases themselves, but should not skew a definition for the general population.

Characteristics

Overkill is often seen as a product of expressive aggression. Radojevic et al. (2013), Last and Fritzon (2005), Laajasalo and Hakkanen (2006), Kennedy et al. (1992), and Buchanan et al. (1993) agree that multiple wound infliction is the result of negative emotional intensity, which may include jealousy and distress, such as anger, anxiety or fear. Many individuals experience distress, and further inspection would aim to identify factors that set aside individuals who participate in overkill from other homicide incidents. Different circumstances may have impacted results. These circumstances may include a discovery by

Laajasalo and Hakkanen (2006) that there were multiple wounds because there were multiple perpetrators. Characteristics of the incident may also influence the number of wounds.

In many of these cases, regardless of method, there is an inclusion of a single additional wound inflicted for the perpetrators' reassurance of death. This was revealed by Keppel (2000) when examining firearm wounds. Combined homicides, defined as "combination of two or more different modes of killing" (Slovic et al., 2017:47), are also necessary in the debate of overkill as they are seen to be used to accelerate the killing of a victim or to guarantee a fatal outcome. According to Block and Block (1992), multiple killing modes or weapons are more obvious in instrumental homicides. The authors also observed that the usage of a single weapon is more prevalent in expressive homicide. The number of wounds may be impacted by the number of weapons used.

Weapon

Weapons have different implications that can be informative in the intentions of the crime and the type of relationship the offender and victim may have. According to Last and Fritzon (2005), using a weapon found at the scene of a crime implies that the act was impulsive and unplanned (expressive aggression), while bringing a weapon to the scene suggests that an individual was expecting a confrontation or has experienced previous violent confrontations. Additionally, "the use of manual weapons or blunt force represents a reactive, nonplanned homicide, which [has been] associate with more intense primary relationships" (Last and Fritzon 2005:180-181). Whether or not a weapon is brought to the scene may also aid in legal preceding's explanations of motives and influence the sentencing of the offender(s). According to Slovic, Vitosevic, Zivkovic-Zaric, Mladjenovic, and Todorovic (2017), the choice of weapon point to the motive and the connection between a killer and a victim. The type of weapons can most likely lead to more fatal injuries, influencing the number of wounds inflicted on the victim. Ericsson and Thiblin (2002) concluded that homicides primarily involve lethal shootings, followed by sharp object violence, blunt force trauma, and asphyxiation.

Data

This study analyses cases from the GLBT National Dataset. The GLBT dataset is an ongoing database for homicides related to the LGBTQIA+ community. This means that the victim, offender, and incident itself could have LGTBQIA+ involvement. Currently the dataset includes 3590 cases but the number continues to increase. The cases are dated from 1969 to present and were provided by Dallas Drake, the co-founder and president researcher for the Center for Homicide Research.

References

Bell, M. D., and R.I. Vila. 1996. "Homicide in Homosexual Victims: A Study of 67 Cases from The Broward County, Florida, Medical Examiner's Office (1982-1992), With Special Emphasis on "Overkill"." *American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology,*17(1), 65-69.

Block, Richard, and Carolyn Rebecca Block. 1992. "Homicide Syndromes and Vulnerability: Violence in Chicago's Community Areas over 25 years." *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention,* 1(1), 61-87.

Buchanan, A, A Reed, S Wessley, P Garety, P Taylor, D Grubin, and G Dunn. 1993. "Acting on Delusions, II: The Phenomenological Correlates of Acting on Delusions.*" British Journal of Psychiatry,* 163(1), 77-81.

Douglas, J.E., Ann W. Burgess, Allen G. Burgess, and Robert K. Ressler. 1992. *Crime Classification Manual: A Standard system for Investigating and Classifying Violent Crimes.* 1st ed. New York, NY: Lexington Books.

Ericsson, Anders, and Ingemar Thiblin. 2002. "Injuries Inflicted on Homicide Victims. A Longitudinal Victiminologic Study of Lethal Violence." *Forensic Science International,* 130(2), 133–139.

Henderson, J.P., S.E Morgan, F. Patel, and M.E. Tiplady. 2005. "Patterns of Non-firearm Homicide." *Journal of Clinical Forensic Medicine,* 12(3), 128-132.

Kennedy, H, L Kemp, and D Dyer. 1992. "Fear and Anger in Delusional (Paraniod) Disorder: The Association with Violence." *British Journal of Psychiatry,* 160(1), 488-492.

Keppel, Robert D. 2000. "Signature Murders: A Report of the 1984 Cranbook, British Columbia Cases." *Journal of Forensic Science,* 45(2), 500-503.

Laajasalo, Taina, and Helina Häkkänen. 2006. "Excessive Violence and Psychotic Symptomatology among Homicide Offenders with Schizophrenia." *Criminal Behaviour & Mental Health,* 16(4), 242–253.

Last, Stephanie K., and Katrina Fritzon. 2005. "Investigating the Nature of Expressiveness in Stranger, Acquaintance and Intrafamilial Homicides." *Journal of Investigative Psychology & Offender Profiling,* 2(3), 179–193.

Nikolić, Slobodan, and Vladimir Živković. 2015. "Multiple Sharp Force Injuries to The Head - The Crime of Passion." *Srpski Arhiv Za Celokupno Lekarstvo,* 143(7-8), 494-499.

Radojević, Nemanja, Bojana Radnić, Stojan Petković, Maletin Miljen, Ivana Čurović, Dragana Čukić, Miodrag Soc, and Slobodan Savić. 2013. "Multiple Stabbing in Sex-Related Homicides." *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine,* 20, 502-507.

Safarik, Mark E., and John P. Jarvis, J. 2005. "Examining Attributes of Homicides - Toward Quantifying Qualitative Values of Injury Severity." *Homicide Studies,* 9(3), 183–203.

Slović, Živana, Katarina Vitošević, Radica Živković-Zarić, Nenad Mladjenović, and Miloš Todorović. 2017. "Combined Homicide." *Рационална терапија,* 9(1), 47-52.

Rapid Onset of the Violentization Process: A Case Study of Serial and Mass Murder during Genocide

Mark A. Winton

Lonnie Athens developed violentization theory to explain the developmental process of how an individual becomes a violent and dangerous person. The stages of the violentization process include: brutalization, defiance, violent dominance engagements, virulency, and violent predation (Athens, 2015). The purpose of this presentation is to apply violentization theory to a perpetrator who rapidly moved from a non-violent individual to a serial and mass murderer.

Goran Jelisic, a prison camp leader during the Bosnian genocide, plead guilty to war crimes and crimes against humanity during his trial at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. These crimes included killing thirteen people over a three-week period. Witness testimony and mental health assessments were used from court documents to apply violentization theory to Jelisic's violent behavior.

At the time of the murders, he was a 23-year-old, farm mechanic who traveled to the town of Brcko to assist with separating and detaining Muslim and Croat citizens. It is unclear how Jelisic became a prison camp leader. It was also noted in the court documents that the court could not find any previous violent crimes in his history (Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic, 1999). Based on witness testimony, Jelisic reached the violent predation stage described by Athens (2015). In this final stage, the person engages in extremely violent behavior such as, extreme psychological abuse and humiliation, instilling great fear for one's life, torture, mutilation of bodies, sexual violence, severe beatings, and murder. This appears to have happened rapidly over a two to three-week period.

The defense presented a "seriously diminished psychological responsibility" in relationship to several mental disorders, as well as the claim that Jelisic was acting under orders of his superiors. The prosecution was able to successfully dismiss these two mitigating circumstances. In evaluating the nature of the level of violence used to accomplish his goal, Jelesic went beyond the level of violence needed. For example, he beat prisoners over several days prior to killing them and frequently terrorized prisoners by forcing them to watch the executions. In addition, he forced the prisoners to sing Serbian songs in front of the Serbian flag.

Jelisic showed a consistent method of killing the Bosnian citizens. For example, he killed five citizens at a police station, in an always identical manner which was described by the accused himself . Having undergone an interrogation… the victims were placed in the hands of the accused who took them out to an alley near the police station. The accused executed them, generally with two bullets to the back of the neck fired from a "Skorpion" pistol fitted with a silencer. A lorry then came to gather up the bodies. According to the accused, these murders were committed over a period of two days (Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic, 1999, paragraph 37).

Another victim, was very severely beaten before being executed . It appears that her executioners wanted to find out where her brother and father, members of the police forces before the war, were hiding. She was handcuffed to a signpost and then beaten with long truncheons by several policemen for a whole day . The victim's clothes were torn and covered with blood. That evening, she was brought back to the hangar covered in bruises and moaning with pain. The accused returned for her the next morning and executed her in the same fashion as he had his other victims (Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic, 1999, paragraph 39).

In another violent encounter, Jelisic handcuffed and beat two brothers with a club. His girlfriend, Monika, was also present. At one point, Jelisic, returned after approximately ten minutes. His shirt was stained with blood. He explained "I just killed a man from fifty centimetres away. I cut off his ear. He didn't want to talk, like you". The accused then slashed the victim's two forearms with a knife before again beating him with a club. Goran Jelisi} [sic] next made the victim take out his papers and his money. None of his identity papers gave any indication that he was Muslim. The accused then became angry and asked why the two brothers had been brought to Luka. He ordered their immediate release (Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic, 1999, paragraph 42).

The above scenario shows the compartmentalization that Jelisic exhibited. According to Fox, Levin, and Fridel (2019), serial killers are "able to compartmentalize their attitudes toward people by conceiving of at least two categories of human beings: those whom they care about and treat with decency and those with whom they have no relationship and therefore can victimize with total disregard for their feelings" (p. 76).

Another witness reported that Jelisic, declared that he had to execute twenty to thirty persons before being able to drink his coffee each morning…Thus, on 8 May 1992 he reputedly said to one witness that it was his sixty-eighth victim , on 11 May that he had killed one hundred and fifty persons and finally on 15 May to another witness following an execution that it was his "eighty-third case" (Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic, 1999, paragraph 103).

Regarding the power and pleasure Jelisic obtained from his violence, he seemed to take pleasure from his position, one which gave him a feeling of power, of holding the power of life or death over the detainees and that he took a certain pride in the number of victims that he had allegedly executed… spoke in a bloodthirsty manner, he treated them like animals or beasts and spittle formed on his lips because of his shouts and the hatred he was expressing. He wanted to terrorise them (*Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic*, 1999, paragraph 104).

During his threats and violence, Jelisic identified himself as "Serb Adolf" to the prisoners. Providing a psychological profile of Jelisic, it was reported that he had … a disturbed personality. Goran Jelisi} [sic] led an ordinary life before the conflict. This personality, which presents borderline, anti-social and narcissistic characteristics and which is marked simultaneously by immaturity, a hunger to fill a "void" and a concern to please superiors, contributed to his finally committing crimes . Goran Jelisi} [sic] suddenly found himself in an apparent position of authority for which nothing had prepared him. It matters little whether this authority was real. What does matter is that this authority made it even easier for an opportunistic and inconsistent behaviour to express itself (Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic,

1999, paragraph 105). The court found that Jelisic showed no remorse for the killings. In fact, he was photographed carrying out the executions. Lack of remorse would be consistent with the psychological profile presented during the trial.

During the time of the murders, Jelisic was in the middle of an ethnic cleansing taking place in his surroundings. He was part of a malignant community (Athens, 2015). This type of ommunity is characterized by violent interactions within a chaotic environment. When Jelisic took on his role as prison camp leader, he was already embedded in a community that had become violentized and was carrying out murders against Muslims and Croats. Jelisic's negative and antagonistic view of Muslims was expressed to the detainees. Witnesses stated, He reportedly added that he wanted "to cleanse" the Muslims and would enjoy doing so, that the "balijas" had proliferated too much and that he had to rid the world of them. Goran Jelisi} [sic] also purportedly said that he hated Muslim women, that he found them highly dirty and that he wanted to sterilise them all in order to prevent an increase in the number of Muslims but that before exterminating them he would begin with the men in order prevent any proliferation (*Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic*, 1999, paragraph 102).

Using Athens (2015) violentization model, Jelisic appeared to rapidly move into the violent predation stage. These findings are consistent with the results of Zimbardo's (2007) prison experiment and the Abu Ghraib abuse research. In addition, these findings parallel those found in other studies of genocide perpetrators and violentization theory (Winton, 2011; Winton & Unlu, 2008).

How Jelisic progressed through the other stages are not readily apparent from the court transcripts. One explanation is that he rapidly progressed through the stages during a short period of time because he was enmeshed in a malignant community where his peers and superiors were already carrying out violence in an ethnic cleansing. He was assigned a role of a killer which he seemed to relish and adjust to in a rapid manner. His peers had already completed the violentization process. How Jelisic internalized the killer script is unclear. Additional analysis will be necessary in trying to piece together this case study.

References

Athens, L. (2015). Violentization: A relatively singular theory of violent crime. *Deviant Behavior*, 36, 623-639. doi: 10.1080/01639625.2014.951577

Fox, J. A., Levin, J. & Fridel, E. E. (2019). *Extreme killing: Understanding serial and mass murder* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Prosecutor v. Goran Jelisic, Judgement Case No. IT-95-10T (1999). Retrieved from http://www.icty.org/case/jelisic/4.

Winton, M. A., & Unlu, A. (2008). Micro-macro dimensions of the Bosnian genocides: The circumplex model and violentization theory. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13, 45-59. doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2007.09.001

Winton, M.A. (2011). Violentization theory and genocide. *Homicide Studies*, 15, 363-381. doi.org/10.1177/1088767911424538

Zimbardo, P. (2007). *The Lucifer effect: Understanding how good people turn evil*. New York: Random House.

Children Who Kill Their Adoptive Parents: Case Characteristics and Illustrations

James Hubbell, Kathleen M. Heide, and Norair Khachatryan.

Although there are some journalistic accounts of adopted children who killed their adoptive parents, there is no criminological research that systematically explores the phenomenon of adopted children killing parents in detail. The research that has been conducted on this topic is largely qualitative and centers around psychological explanations. For example, psychological research has focused on reactive attachment disorder as an explanation for behavioral difficulties in adopted children (Hall & Geher, 2010). Furthermore, the extent to which parricide (i.e., killing of parents) by adopted children resembles parricide by biological children and stepchildren, in terms of victim and offender demographic characteristics and incident characteristics, is unknown. Thus, quantitative research with larger sample sizes that examines parricidal adoptees specifically is needed to explore the correlates of this offense.

Limitations in criminal justice databases have prevented large-scale studies of adoptive parricide. Indeed, the three national data sets available in the United States (the Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR), and National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)), do not contain codes for adoption when describing the offender-victim relationship. Therefore, most of what is known about parricide is limited to children who have killed their biological parents or stepparents.

The current study presents the first scientific endeavor to understanding why adopted children might kill their adoptive parents. Available data were collected from newspaper articles concerning adopted parricide offenders for a content analysis. Information regarding a variety of motives typically present in parricide cases were coded along with any additional motives suggested by reading the articles. Moreover, characteristics of the offenders and their accomplices, victims, homicidal events, and judicial proceedings were included to explore differences between adoptees and biological children who commit parricide.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The available literature was reviewed regarding violent characteristics of adoptees. Articles that highlighted struggles disproportionately faced by adopted children or delineated differences between adoptees and non-adoptees were chosen for inclusion.

Violent Characteristics of Adoptees

Two studies that investigated differences between adoptees and non-adoptees with respect to aggressive and antisocial behaviors, using mid-size to large samples, have been examined. Menlove (1965) compared 51 adopted children from a children's psychiatric hospital to their non-adopted counterparts on aggressive symptoms. The adopted children had significantly higher scores on negativism, hyperactivity, and hostility. The adoptees were also found to exhibit higher frequencies of fire-setting, legal trouble, sexual acting out, and impulsiveness, although these differences were not statistically significant. Grotevant, van Dulmen, and Dunbar (2006) investigated differences in the development of antisocial behavior between

adopted and non-adopted children in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, using a sample of 337 adoptees and more than 10,000 non-adoptees. Antisocial behavior was measured by the number of aggressive acts toward people or animals. Contrary to Menlove (1965), the authors found no significant differences between the two groups on aggression as 75% of adoptees and 81% of non-adoptees displayed no aggressive antisocial behavior.

 In a meta-analysis of 66 studies, Weirzbicki (1995) found that adoptees had a significantly higher presence in clinical populations than would be expected from their percentage in the general population. Adoptees also demonstrated significantly higher externalizing behaviors, academic difficulties, and general severity of symptoms. Externalizing behaviors included delinquency, aggression, conduct disorder, among other behaviors. General severity was determined by the length of stay and overall adjustment to the clinical environment.

With respect to homicide, Langevin, Paitich, Orchard, Handy, and Russon (1983) compared the characteristics of 109 homicide offenders, 38 nonviolent offenders, and 54 non-offenders. The researchers found that the homicide offenders were significantly less likely to have been adopted, compared to the non-violent offenders: of the killers, 15% were adopted or fostered, whereas 34% of nonviolent offenders were adopted or fostered. Lastly, Kenney and Heide (1994) examined a variety of characteristics of 14 female serial killers. Notably, at least 29% of sample subjects were found to be adopted. This finding further suggests adoption may have its own unique psychopathology.

More specifically, Lewis, Yeager, Gidlow, and Lewis (2001) examined six male adoptees who killed based on psychiatric evaluations and official record data. One of the subjects murdered both his adoptive parents. All six adoptees additionally had signs of psychiatric disturbance prior to the homicides with all having psychotic biological parents. Four subjects were abused by their adoptive parents, and abuse could not be substantiated in an additional case. The authors noted that the characteristics of the sample were similar to other violent offenders.

As demonstrated by the above literature, the effects of adoption remain largely unknown, particularly with respect to violent/homicidal tendencies. Studies that specifically examine adoptees who kill had only a handful of adopted offenders (e.g., Lewis et al., 2001), which limits the generalizability of the results. These prior studies have also not evaluated the demographic characteristics of the sample as well as the circumstances surrounding the homicidal incidents. The current study aims to contribute to the literature on adoption by describing the victim, offender, and incident characteristics in a sample of adoptees committed parricide offenses.

METHODOLOGY

The present study relies on content analysis, an analytic approach that starts with a research idea, followed by the development of a sampling strategy, delineation of recording units (domains of interest), and finally creation of variables for analysis. As noted by Robson (2002), this process permits the systematic coding of data that requires low subjective inference (e.g., incident data, such as year of offense, location of crime, weapon used) and

data that entail high inference (e.g., motive, intentional killing, overkill) across several categories developed for analysis.

Sample Generation and Variables

This study was conducted using newspaper accounts of adopted child who killed or attempted to kill their adoptive parents. Three databases (Lexis Nexis, Access World News, and Google) were used to search for cases in a manner similar to the one used by Boots and Heide (2006). Search terms used included: "adopted" AND ("kill" OR "murder") AND ("parent" OR "mother" OR "father"). Due to the anomalous nature of parricide, and adoption-related parricide in particular, cases from multiple English-speaking countries and spanning more than 40 years were collected in order to increase the sample size.

To be included in the sample, cases were required to have offenders who were adopted by strangers and had no biological relatives of the adoptees living in the home. Cases in which the offender was adopted by a stepparent with a biological parent in the household were excluded because the environments in which these children were raised was different. Furthermore, information regarding the number and types of criminal charges, pleas, and sentencing had to be available to reflect the judicial system's response to the killings.

Fifty cases initially met the above criteria. Four cases were subsequently dropped. Two of these cases were removed from the sample because the alleged parricide offender received a not-guilty verdict, which indicated that there was reasonable doubt that the adopted child was the killer. The two other cases were removed as they were overturned on appeal due to coerced confessions. Accordingly, the final sample consisted of 46 cases.

Cases were coded based on 136 variables. The variables can be categorized into seven domains: individual-level characteristics (e.g., offender and victim demographics; victim's relationship to offender), incident-level characteristics (total number of offenders and victims; weapon choice), criminal justice system processing variables (e.g., initial charges; whether a juvenile offender was charged as an adult), post-disposition data (e.g., appeals), suggested motive (e.g., money; freedom from chores), other items of clinical concern (e.g., decapitation; dissociative state), and factors often associated with Heide's four parricide offender types (e.g., killed to stop abuse; enraged during homicide incident).

Data Analysis Plan

The data analysis in this study is limited to descriptive data as the study is exploratory in nature. Data were coded independently by two of the three authors of this study. Inter-rater reliability was established using ten cases. Reliability for 1,360 ratings (136 variables X 10 cases) was very high at 93.8%. The two raters continued to code all 136 items for the remaining 36 cases. Any disagreements were discussed and resolved by the coders.

SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT RESULTS

The highest proportion of homicides (37%) occurred between 2010 and 2018, and more than 80% of cases occurred in the United States. In nearly 75% of cases, both adoptive parents were targeted. Mothers were victims in 89% of cases, and fathers were victims in 85% of them. In more than 75% of cases, an offender acted alone in killing one or both of his/her adoptive parents. Adopted sons were the offenders in 91% of cases.

More than half of the cases (52%) involved an offender who was under the age of 18 at the time of the homicide, and more than 35% were between the ages of 18 and 24. Close to 90% of offenders who killed as juveniles were charged as adults. In cases where information on offender race was available, the vast majority of offenders were White (74%).

Firearms were used as the single method of killing in 30% of the cases. More than 60% of cases included an antisocial motive, such as insurance money, freedom from chores or with respect to dating partners, among others. Approximately one quarter of the cases in the sample involved an offender who was psychotic or otherwise severely mentally ill. Moreover, 39% of cases involved overkill, which means that more force was used than was necessary to accomplish the murder.

BRIEF CONCLUSIONS

The results from this study demonstrate important differences between parricides committed by adopted children and those committed by biological children. First, adopted parricide offenders killed both parents in nearly 74% of the incidents, compared to less than 8% of biological parricide offenders. Second, juveniles were more likely to be involved in incidents involving the killing of adoptive parents than of biological parents (52% vs. less than 18%). Third, adopted parricide offenders were more likely to be under age 25 than their biological counterparts (89% vs. 43%) (Heide, 2013).

This study was the first one to have examined in depth the characteristics of adopted parricide offenders in a non-clinical sample, but it is not without limitations. First, the study may not have uncovered parricides by adopted children that were not reported by media sources. Second, the amount of information provided about the homicide varied by case. Lastly, future research would benefit from using primary sources to analyze parricides by adopted children, such as police reports and interviews with convicted offenders.

REFERENCES

Boots, D. P., & Heide, K. M. (2006). Parricides in the media: A content analysis of available reports across cultures. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50, 418-445.

Grotevant, H. D., Dulmen, M. H., Dunbar, N., Nelson-Christinedaughter, J., Christensen, M., Fan, X., & Miller, B. C. (2006). Antisocial behavior of adoptees and nonadoptees: Prediction from early history and adolescent relationships. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16(1), 105-131.

Heide, K. M. (2013b). *Understanding parricide: When sons and daughters kill parents*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Keeney, B. T., & Heide, K. M. (1994). Gender differences in serial murderers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 9(3), 383-398.

Langevin, R., Paitich, D., Orchard, B., & Russon, A. (1983). Childhood and family background of killers seen for psychiatric assessment: A controlled study. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 11(4), 331-341.

Lewis, D. O., Yeager, C. A., Gidlow, B., & Lewis, M. (2001). Six adoptees who murdered: Neuropsychiatric vulnerabilities and characteristics of biological and adoptive parents. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 29(4), 390−397.

Menlove, F. L. (1965). Aggressive symptoms in emotionally disturbed adopted children. *Child Development*, 36(2), 519-532.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Wierzbicki, M. (1993). Psychological adjustment of adoptees: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 22(4), 447-454.

Murdered While Pregnant: an Analysis of Florida's Maternal Homicides

Sonya Spence

Abstract

Homicides occur quite frequently in pregnant women and the latest Maternal Mortality review in Florida (PAMR, 2016) suggests that it is a leading cause of unnatural maternal deaths.24 This study is an exploratory, Qualitative, content analysis that examines Florida's maternal homicides (n=67) to gain insight into an issue affecting pregnant women. To conduct the study, reported maternal homicide data from news sources, police reports and other public records from 2001-2018 were aggregated. The findings show that pregnant women in Florida are victims of drive-by shootings, serial killings, crimes in progress and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) femicides. Further, most IPV victims and perpetrators are African Americans age 20-39 and the motives were unwanted pregnancy or relationship, rejection, avoidance of prosecution, abuse exposure, doubts concerning the paternity of the child and insurance benefits. Moreover, most victims were unmarried or recently married (less than a year) and some perpetrators targeted the unborn child by inflicting a gunshot wound or knife wound to the victim's abdomen. The findings suggest a need for Maternal IPV programs, policies, and interventions targeted towards pregnant women, especially African American women and men who were more likely to be the victims or perpetrators of the homicides.

Pregnancy should be a time of peace and excitement but for some women, it's a time of increased violence and death.2,9,20,25   In 2016, Florida's Pregnancy-Associated Mortality Review (PAMR) reports that more pregnant women died from homicides than motor vehicle accidents.24 Previous studies postulate that victims are usually young, unmarried, undereducated women in abusive relationships.2,20 Other studies suggest that physical violence starts or increases during pregnancy.2,7,9 However, some posit that pregnancy is a 'protected' status for some women, where they don't experience abuse.4,7,16,26 The conflicting findings of the aforementioned studies show that pregnancy violence rates vary from woman to woman. Nevertheless, some studies agree that the greatest risk factor for physical violence during pregnancy is violence before pregnancy.16,17 Helton, (1987), found that 87.5% of women abused before pregnancy were also abused during and after pregnancy.17 Another study on violence during pregnancy found that abusers often target the woman's abdomen, which inevitably puts the mother as well as her unborn child at risk.7,12 Victims who experience extreme violence during pregnancy tend to leave but leaving puts them at an even greater risk of femicide.4 Presently, there's a gap in literature because PAMR doesn't provide public, comprehensive data on IPV Maternal Femicides, Florida is not funded by the National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS) and both PAMR and NVDRS include postpartum women.24&27 Moreover, most studies have focused on non-fatal forms of pregnancy violence instead of fatal forms. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore Florida's Maternal Homicides using a sample of women that were pregnant at the time of their death. The research questions to be addressed are, (1) What are the characteristics of Florida's IPV Maternal Femicides and (2) What other types of Maternal homicides occur in Florida? At the conclusion, I anticipate that the findings will add to the existing literature and encourage more Maternal Homicide research in the state of Florida.

Methodology

The research followed a content analysis strategy. First, qualitative, documentary evidence was gathered from newspapers using the following phrases; pregnant woman killed in Florida and pregnant woman murdered in Florida. To avoid bias, a search was performed using the name of all 67 of Florida's counties. This strategy continued until a thorough search of Google and Bing's search engine was complete. Next, other documentary sources pertaining to injunctions, sentencing, marriage licenses, indigent status, and past deviance were collected using public record databases. The inclusion criteria for the sample were criminally negligent Florida homicides committed from 2001-2018, and the exclusion criteria were maternal deaths caused by suicides, accidents, and non-negligent homicides. After 105 Maternal deaths were gathered, 38 were excluded because they didn't meet inclusion requirements.

Data Analysis

Once the datum were analyzed for accuracy, a QUAL□Quan, mixed-method content analysis commenced. First, the victim and perpetrator datum were inputted into a categorized Excel spreadsheet consisting of 42 Variables, then the data was doublechecked for accuracy, coded and imported into SPSS for further analysis.

Results

Of the Maternal Homicides (n=67), IPV Maternal Femicides accounted for 50.7% of the deaths (n=34). However, an additional 4.5% of the Maternal Homicides were caused by the victim's interference or presence during IPV conflict. The remaining 44.8% of the homicides were drive-by shootings, serial killings, crimes in progress, domestic violence and other homicides (Table A). The results show that pregnant women were victims of both random and targeted homicides and Geographic's might have played a role in some homicides such as drive-by shootings. Collectively, 7 counties; Broward, Duval, Miami-Dade, Palm Beach, Orange, Hillsborough, and St. Lucie accounted for 61.9% of the homicides.

IPV Victims

Most IPV Maternal Femicide victims were age 20-29 and African American women followed by Caucasian women were more likely to be victims. The average month of pregnancy was 4.75 months and firearms were the main method of death, followed by cut, pierce or stab. Corresponding to other studies, most victims were unmarried. However, this study found that most married victims were recently married (less than a year). Further, 32% of the victims were shot in the head and some perpetrators targeted the unborn child by shooting or stabbing the victim's abdomen region. In contrast to other studies, victims living with or without the perpetrator were equally likely to be victims. Nearly all victims were having their first child, or they had children from a former relationship. Plus, 94.1% of the Unborn didn't survive and the sex of the Unborn child didn't affect the rate of perpetration.

IPV Perpetrators

Perpetrators were primarily African American, age 20-39 and the majority were declared indigent (eligible for a public defender). 52.9% had a violent offense in their criminal record (shown in Table B) and 23.5% attempted or completed murder-suicide. The main motives for the reported Maternal Femicides were unwanted pregnancy or relationship, affairs where the father wanted to hide the affair or pregnancy, fear of exposure or prosecution, abandonment or rejection, infidelity accusations, uncertainty of paternity and the perpetrator felt disrespected. Although some Perpetrators committed double homicides or mass murders, most only targeted the victim. In 10 cases, a child or children at the scene were left unharmed and it didn't matter if the child(ren) were biological or not. Of note, a vast number of perpetrators didn't receive an additional charge for the death of the Unborn, but most were sentenced 25 to life. As for the location, 79.4% were committed at a home and Broward county, followed by Palm Beach County had the highest rate of perpetration.

Discussion

This study found that unwanted pregnancy was one of the leading causes of Florida's IPV Maternal Femicides, which corresponds to another study that lists unwanted pregnancies as a risk factor for pregnancy violence.26 Abusers who are not ready to be a father or abusers who feel that pregnancy will cause issues in their life might commit femicide. Pregnant women in abusive relationships where the father is upset about the pregnancy should plan a safe exit from the relationship. Once they exit the relationship they should not meet up with the abuser because some perpetrators planned the femicide and lured the victim under the guise that it was to fix the relationship. In sum, in unwanted pregnancies where the victim couldn't be controlled or persuaded to abort the child, murdering the victim forced her to have an abortion.

Another risk factor that should be further researched is the link between recent marriage and IPV Maternal Femicides. Some victims were both pregnant and recently married (less than a year), which gives me the impression that the relationship moved too fast or that marriage gave the perpetrator the impression that he officially owned the victim. However, since unwanted pregnancy was a top motive, the perpetrator might have felt that the pregnancy changed or negatively affected the new marriage.

As noted, there were several other motives. First, perpetrators who felt rejected by the victim because she moved out, moved on, threatened to leave or was pregnant or allegedly pregnant by someone else committed femicide. Second, some perpetrators sought to disengage from the victim because they were in another relationship, didn't want to commit or wanted to pursue other interests. Third, others wanted to prevent exposure and subsequent prosecution; therefore, they killed the victim to stop her from informing others of the abuse. The latter implies that pregnant women who threaten to or are in the process of reporting their abusive partners are at risk of IPV Maternal Femicide. Also, first-time mothers or women with children from a prior relationship were at risk. Campbell, 2003, also found that women with children from a former partner were at risk of pregnancy violence.5

Conclusion

To conclude, programs related to unplanned and unwanted pregnancies should be implemented for women in the reproductive age, especially African American women who were almost 3 times as likely to be victims of IPV Maternal Femicides than Caucasian women. Since the absence of prenatal care was shown to be a risk factor for femicide we must increase and promote its usage.20   Prenatal care will allow for intervention efforts throughout pregnancy and health care professionals should be trained to carry out the interventions during prenatal checkups. Additionally, African American males should be targeted because compared to Caucasian males they were 6 times as likely to be the perpetrators of IPV Maternal Femicides. Perhaps African-American men at lower income levels see pregnancy as a threat to their livelihood or other factors are at play. To decrease perpetration, strategies, and programs to counteract motives such as rejection, fear of exposure and unwanted relationships should be implemented. Most importantly men should be included in initiatives that educate or assist in unwanted pregnancies. Since IPV victims and their Unborn were intentionally murdered, often without remorse, more research and prevention efforts are imperative.

Table A (n=67)

Circumstances of death	F	%
Intimate partner violence related	34	50.7
Drive-by shooting	6	9.0
Crime in progress	9	13.4
IPV: Victim intervened or was a bystander	3	4.5
Injury occurred during an argument	4	6.0
Unknown Homicide circumstance	3	4.5
Domestic Violence	3	4.5
Gang-related	1	1.5
Serial Killing	2	3
Victim was a bystander	2	3

Table B (n=34)

Perpetrator Criminal History	F	%
No prior criminal history	8	23.5
Past violence in criminal history	18	52.9
Non-violent criminal history	7	20.6
unknown	1	2.9

References

1. Roehl, J., Osullivan, C., Webster, D., & Campbell, J. (2005). *Intimate Partner Violence Risk Assessment Validation Study: The RAVE Study Practitioner Summary and Recommendations: Validation of Tools for Assessing Risk from Violent Intimate Partners*. PsycEXTRA Dataset. Report Available: https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/209732.pdf.

2. Martin, S. L., Macy, R. J., Sullivan, K., & Magee, M. L. (2007). Pregnancy-associated violent deaths. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 8(2), 135-148.

3. Brignone, L., & Gomez, A. M. (2017). Double jeopardy: Predictors of elevated lethality risk among intimate partner violence victims seen in emergency departments. *Preventive Medicine*, 103, 20-25.

4. Decker, M. R., Martin, S. L., & Moracco, K. E. (2004). Homicide risk factors among pregnant women abused by their partners. *Violence Against Women*, 10(5), 498-513.

5. Koziol-Mclain, J., Webster, D., Mcfarlane, J., Block, C. R., Ulrich, Y., Glass, N., & Campbell, J. C. (2006). Risk factors for femicide-suicide in abusive relationships: Results from a multisite case control study. *Violence and Victims*, 21(1), 3-21.

6. Martin, S. L., Harris-Britt, A., Li, Y., Moracco, K. E., Kupper, L. L., & Campbell, J. C. (2004). Changes in intimate partner violence during pregnancy. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(4), 201-210.

7. *WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women*. (2005, November 10). Retrieved September 12, 2018, from https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/24159358X/en/

8. Taylor, R., & Nabors, E. L. (2009). Pink or blue ... black and blue? Examining pregnancy as a predictor of intimate partner violence and femicide. *Violence Against Women*, 15(11), 1273-1293.

9. Mcfarlane J., C. Campbell, J. Sharps,, P, & Watson, K. (2002). Abuse during pregnancy and femicide: Urgent implications for women's health. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 100(1), 27-36.

10. Campbell, J., García-Moreno, C., & Sharps, P. (2004). Abuse during pregnancy in industrialized and developing countries. *Violence Against Women*, 10(7), 770-789.

11. Campbell, J. C. (1995). Addressing battering during pregnancy: Reducing low birth weight and ongoing abuse. *Seminars in Perinatology*, 19(4), 301-306.

12. Jones, A. S., Gielen, A. C., Campbell, J. C., Schollenberger, J., Dienemann, J. A., Kub, J., . . . Wynne, E. (1999). Annual and lifetime prevalence of partner abuse in a sample of female HMO enrollees. *Women's Health Issues*, 9(6), 295-305.

13. Zara, G., & Gino, S. (2018). Intimate partner violence and its escalation into femicide. Frailty thy name is "Violence Against Women". *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1777.

14. Dannenberg, A. L., Carter, D. M., Lawson, H. W., Ashton, D. M., Dorfman, S. F., & Graham, E. H. (1995). Homicide and other injuries as causes of maternal death in New York City, 1987 through 1991. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 172(5), 1557-1564.

15. Morland, L. A., Leskin, G. A., Block, C. R., Campbell, J. C., & Friedman, M. J. (2008). Intimate partner violence and miscarriage. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(5), 652-669.

16. Martin, S. L. (2001). Physical abuse of women before, during, and after pregnancy. *JAMA*, 285(12), 1581.

17. Helton, A. S., Mcfarlane, J., & Anderson, E. T. (1987). Battered and pregnant: A prevalence study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 77(10), 1337-1339.

18. Martin, S. L., Macy, R. J., Sullivan, K., & Magee, M. L. (2007). Pregnancy-associated violent deaths. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 8(2), 135-148.

19. Messing, J. T., & Campbell, J. (2016). Informing collaborative interventions: Intimate partner violence risk assessment for front line police officers. *Policing*, 10(4), 328-340.

20. Chang, J., Berg, C. J., Saltzman, L. E., & Herndon, J. (2005). Homicide: A leading cause of injury deaths among pregnant and postpartum women in the United States, 1991–1999. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95(3), 471-477.

21. Bohn, D. K., Tebben, J. G., & Campbell, J. C. (2004). Influences of income, education, age, and ethnicity on physical abuse before and during pregnancy. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic & Neonatal Nursing*, 33(5), 561-571.

22. Alhusen, J. L., Ray, E., Sharps, P., & Bullock, L. (2015). Intimate partner violence during pregnancy: Maternal and neonatal outcomes. *Journal of Women's Health*, 24(1), 100-106.

23. Paul, A. B., Simms, L., Paul, A. E., Yorke, J., Saroya, T., Schmidseder, C., . . . Mahesan, A. M. (2018). Corrigendum to "Unnatural pregnancy deaths in Las Vegas: A descriptive study". *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 44 (2016), 79–83.

24. PAMR. (2018, May). Retrieved October 12, 2018, from http://www.floridahealth.gov/statistics-and-data/PAMR/index.html.

25. Wallace, M. E., Hoyert, D., Williams, C., & Mendola, P. (2016). Pregnancy-associated homicide and suicide in 37 US states with enhanced pregnancy surveillance. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 215(3), 364.

26. Jasinski, J. L. (2001). Pregnancy and violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(7), 712-733.

27. National Violent Death Reporting System|NVDRS|Violence Prevention|Injury Center|CDC. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/violencepreventionrased.

Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Parricide

Kathleen M. Heide, Rachel Condry, Caroline Miles, and Kate Fitz-Gibbon

The killing of parents, commonly referred to as parricide, is a global phenomenon. To date, however, little research has focused on cross-cultural comparisons. This paper examines parricide in three English-speaking, British-influenced countries – the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. The following areas are addressed across these countries. First, the data bases available to analyze parricide, including the types of data available and the limitations of these data bases, are previewed. Second, the incidence of mothers and fathers slain and the changes in the frequency of parricides over time by country are reported. Third, findings related to parricide situations (single victims, double parricides, and familicides) involving single and multiple offenders are compared to the extent possible across countries. Fourth, the characteristics of victims (age, race) and offenders (age, race, gender), circumstances (conflict, crime, etc.), weapons used, and location are synthesized by country. Fifth, discussion focuses on the typical charges, convictions, and sentences given to parricide offenders in the three countries. Sixth, the article concludes with a discussion of limitations of the data, conclusions that can be drawn from existing data, and directions for future research. In this synopsis, this information is presented per country. In the presentation, the information will be synthesized for each of the study aims to facilitate comparisons across countries.

Data Bases Available

The Federal Bureau of Investigation collects crime statistics in the United States. These data are considered official sources of crime. The data are submitted voluntarily by law enforcement agencies across the United States. There are three FBI sources of crime data: Uniform Crime reports (UCRs), Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHRs), and the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS).

The Uniform Crime Reports are published yearly and available online. Most of the analyses concentrate on eight crimes, one of which is murder and non-negligent homicide. The analyses in the UCR are very basic. For example, the number of murders, the rate per 100,000, and the rate changes over time are reported. The demographic characteristics of arrestees for murder (age, race, sex) are also contained therein. Although it is possible to download tables, very little manipulation of data is possible.

The UCRs report the number of fathers and mothers killed when the relationship of the homicide victim to the offender is known. No information on stepmothers or stepfathers killed is provided. These victims are grouped with other family.

With UCR data, one can get some basic information about homicide, but not about parricide beyond the number of biological parents killed. It is not possible to determine the correlates of parricide, such as the demographics of victims and offenders, or the weapons used in the parricidal incident.

The Supplementary Homicide Reports data base is restricted to homicides. The data set is complex and not easy to manipulate. Fortunately, Dr. James Fox of Northeastern University, a professor of criminology, has compiled multi-year data sets for researchers to use.

The SHR data set is the one I used to obtain a national sample of parricide victims over several different time periods. The data set I used in Understanding Parricide consisted of approximately 10,000 cases of mothers, fathers, and stepmothers, and stepfathers killed during the 32-year period, 1976 to 2007. The SHR data base is the best available source to analyze parricide incidents involving single victims killed by single offenders. Fortunately, more than 80% of parricide incidents in the US involve single victims and single offenders.

SHR data has a major disadvantage: the victim offender relationship is coded for only one victim. SHR does not record data for subsequent victims. In other words, it cannot link multiple victims to an offender. For example, if a 17-year-old white boy kills his 42-year-old white mother and his 45-year-old black father, the victim information age, race, gender, and relationship will be reported for only one of the two victims. There are other variables in SHR that provide information on the number of victims killed and the situation type. There is a variable that codes the homicide situation. In the example provided, it would indicate that this situation is a multiple-victim single-offender incident. There is another variable that codes the number of victims, so it is possible to determine there were two victims in the incident.

The National Incident Based Reporting System began in the late 1980s. This system collects data on murder and many other offense categories. It overcomes the SHR limitation with respect to multiple victim situations. It allows coding individual victim offender relationships for multiple victims and multiple offenders. For example, if a son, daughter, and the daughter's boyfriend killed the siblings' two parents, the victim offender relationship can be coded for all three offenders and for both victims.

Estimating the incidence and correlates of parricide nationally is not possible using NIBRS at the present time, however, due to the low participation of law enforcement agencies across the United States. Historically, large metropolitan agencies have been underrepresented in NIBRS, and the population covered has been disproportionately white. In 2017, about 43 percent of U.S. law enforcement agencies that participated in the UCR Program reported data to NIBRS. The FBI is striving for all law enforcement agencies to submit reports to NIBRS by 2021.

Summing up: which data base is most appropriate depends on the purpose. If one wants a quick reference for the number of biological parents killed in a year, the easiest is to go to the Uniform Crime Reports. If information pertaining to parricide victims and offenders and case-related variables, such as weapons, in single-victim single-offender incidents is needed, then the best source of data is the Supplementary Homicide Reports. When we have multiple victim and / or multiple offender situations, the best data source to use is NIBRS, realizing that, unlike the other two data sets, this data base is not nationally representative at the current time.

Incidence and Frequency

Heide (2013a; 2013b; 2014) analyzed data from the FBI's SHR for the 32-year period 1976-2007 in order to provide information on offenders involved in parricide and stepparricide. Heide examined patricide, matricide, steppatricide, and stepmatricide separately and reported a synopsis of offenders arrested in all types of incidents, including multiple victims and multiple offenders, between 1976 and 2007. During the period of 1976 to 2007, there were an estimated 133 offenders arrested per year for killing their fathers, an estimated 113 offenders for killing their mothers, an estimated 50 offenders for killing their stepfathers, and an estimated seven offenders for killing their stepmothers (Heide, 2013b). Taken together, these killings represented about 2% of total homicides and nearly 4% of homicides in which the victim-offender relationship was known.

Findings Related to Parricide Situations

SHR data indicated that 84% of all victims in the United States during the period 1976 to 2007 were killed in single-victim, single-offender parricides. Nine percent (9%) of parricide offenders used an accomplice to kill one parent. Seven percent (7%) of parricide offenders killed two or more victims acting alone (6.3%), or with others (0.8%).

Victim, Offender, and Case Characteristics – Single-Victim Single-Offender Situations
Seven studies used SHR data to examine the killings of parents in the United States. One seminal study used a graphical analysis to display trends in parricide over the period 1976-1998 (Shon & Targonski, 2003). Analyses included all parricide incidents, rather than being restricted to SVSO incidents, and, hence, are not reviewed below. The remaining six publications addressed the characteristics of single-victim, single-offender parricide incidents using the FBI's Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR) data (Heide, 1993a; Heide, 1993b; Heide, 2013a; Heide, 2013b; Heide, 2014; Walsh, Krienert, & Crowder, 2008) to examine the correlates of victims (age, race), offenders (age, race, gender), and weapons used. Three of these studies explored the characteristics of stepfathers and stepmothers slain, as well as biological parents (Heide 1993a; Heide, 2013b; Walsh, Krienert, & Crowder, 2008). Five of these six publications were authored by Heide; the remaining one was written by Walsh, Krienert, & Crowder (2008). The types of analyses conducted and time periods covered is summarized in Fegadel and Heide (2018).

Walsh and his colleagues limited analyses of parricide and step-parricide offenders to those age 21 and below, whereas Heide included all ages. The results of their analysis, however, generally presented similar victim and offender characteristics to those of Heide's (1993a). Heide's findings across the 32 -year period (1976-2007) were amazingly consistent with those from the earlier 10-year period (1977-1986). Accordingly, statistics from the more comprehensive time frame are presented; group comparisons, which varied between the earlier and later period, are reported, particularly where the differences were statistically significant. Walsh, Krienert, and Crowder's results are included when similar analyses were undertaken. As noted below, Walsh and his colleagues' findings differed from those obtained by Heide in a few analyses, which is very likely due to the truncated age range used in the former study.

Offender Characteristics. Consistent throughout the literature, sons and stepsons were more likely to commit parricide and stepparricide than their female counterparts (Heide, 1993a; Heide, 2013b; Walsh, Krienert, & Crowder, 2008). Offenders arrested for the killing of fathers, mothers, stepfathers, and stepmothers in the United States during the period 1976-2007 were predominantly male (87%, 83%, 85%, and 86%, respectively) (Heide, 2013b).

The average age of parricide and stepparricide offenders involved in single-victim, single-offender incidents during the time period 1976-2007was between 23 and 32 years of age. Patricide offenders averaged 26 years old; matricide offenders, 32 years old; steppatricide offenders, 23 years of age; and stepmatricide offenders, 25 years of age (Heide, 2013b). Offenders who killed their fathers were significantly more likely than offenders who killed their mothers to be under age 18 (25% vs. 15%) and under age 30 (76 vs. 54%) (Heide, 1993a). Offenders who killed their stepparents tended to be younger than those offenders who killed their biological parents. Juveniles comprised 15% of offenders who killed mothers, 25% of those who killed fathers, and 30% and 34% of those who killed stepmothers and stepfathers over the 10-year period (Heide, 1993a).

When age was compared between offenders who killed male parricide victims (fathers, stepfathers) and between those who killed female parricide victims (mothers, stepmothers) across the 32-year time frame, significant differences emerged and again indicated that offenders who killed their stepparents were significantly younger and more likely to be juveniles than offenders who killed biological parents. Juvenile offenders comprised 30% of those arrested for killing stepfathers in comparison to 22% of those who killed fathers (Heide, 2014). The respective percentages for juvenile involvement in stepmatricide vs. matricide arrests were 33% vs. 13%, respectively (Heide, 2013a).

Throughout the literature, parricide offenders were likely to be white males (Heide, 1993a; Heide, 2013b; Walsh, Krienert, & Crowder, 2008). The racial composition of offenders reported by Heide (2013b) was consistent with her 1993 study. Offenders who killed parents or stepparents were approximately 98% White or Black; approximately 60-72% were White. Less than 2% of parricide offenders were Asian/Pacific Islander or American Indian/Alaskan Native (Heide, 2013b). Racial differences were apparent between mothers and fathers, and fathers and stepfathers. Matricide offenders were significantly more likely to be White than patricide offenders (73% vs. 65%), whereas patricide offenders were significantly more likely to be Black than matricide offenders (33% vs. 25%) (Heide, 1993b). Patricide offenders were significantly more likely to be White than steppatricide offenders (67% vs. 60%) (Heide, 2014). White juveniles, relative to Black juveniles, comprised a significantly higher percentage of patricide offenders (28% vs. 20%) and steppatricide offenders (40% vs. 26%) (Heide, 1993a).

Victim Characteristics. Victims of parricide are typically middle-aged with stepparents, on the average, being younger than parents (Heide, 1993a; Heide, 2013a; Heide, 2013b; Heide, 2014; Walsh, Krienert, & Crowder, 2008). Male parricide victims tend to be younger than their female counterparts. Heide reported the mean ages of parricide victims over the period 1976-2007 as follows: fathers, 56; mothers, 60; stepfathers, 47; and stepmothers, 50 (Heide,

2013a; 2014). Stepfathers were significantly younger than fathers killed (47 vs. 56) (Heide, 2014).

Not surprisingly, the racial composition of parricide offenders was nearly identical to that of parricide victims given their biological ties. White victims were more prevalent than any other racial group in all of the studies reviewed (Heide, 1993a; Heide, 2013a; Heide, 2013b; Heide, 2014; Walsh, Krienert, & Crowder, 2008). Consistent with prior studies, approximately 98-99% of parricide victims across the four groups (fathers, mothers, stepfathers, and stepmothers) were either white or black (Heide, 2013b). The estimated percentage of parricide victims who were white during the period 1976-2007 was 60-76% and the estimated percentage of parricide victims who were black was 23-38%. Three of four group comparisons were statistically significant: (1) mothers slain were more likely to be White than fathers slain (74% vs. 65%) (Heide, 1993a); (2) stepmothers were more likely to be White than stepfathers slain (72% vs. 59%) (Heide, 1993a); and (3) fathers were likely to be White than stepfathers (67% vs. 60%) (Heide, 2014).

Types of weapons used. Heide found that four types of weapons were used to kill in more than 90% of SVSO parricide and stepparricide incidents during the two periods: firearms, knives or cutting instruments, blunt instruments (hammers, clubs, etc.) or personal weapons (beating by hands, feet, etc. or use of teeth). Of these four, guns and knives were used to kill male parricide victims in 82-88% of incidents and female parricide victims in 66-74% of incidents (Heide, 1993b; 2013a; 2014). Walsh and colleagues (2008) found even higher percentages of gun and knife usage among offenders aged 21 and under. In their study, approximately 90% of male parricide victims and 95% of female victims were killed by guns or knives.

Patricide offenders were significantly more likely than matricide offenders to employ firearms (65% vs. 39%). Matricide offenders were significantly more likely than their male counterparts to use knives or cutting instruments (29% vs. 20%), blunt objects (12% vs. 7%), and personal weapons (11% vs. 5%). Offenders who killed stepfathers, when compared with stepmothers, were more likely to use firearms although the difference was not significant (66% vs. 50%). However, further analysis revealed that steppatricide offenders, compared to stepmatricide offenders, were significantly more likely to use rifles and shotguns to kill their victims (37% vs. 17%) (Heide, 1993b).

Heide (2013a; 2013b; 2014) analyzed data to determine the type of weapons used in parricide incidents with respect to fathers and stepfathers, and mothers and stepmothers during the 32-year period 1976-2007. Small differences in weapons used were significant between offenders who killed fathers vs. stepfathers (Heide, 2014) and mothers vs. stepmothers (Heide, 2013a). Higher percentages of stepchildren, relative to biological children, used guns to kill stepfathers (62.2% vs. 59.6%) and stepmothers (49% vs. 37%).

Victim, Offender, and Case Characteristics – Multiple-Victim / Multiple Offender Situations
The literature on multiple-victim parricides generally consists of clinical reports and studies with small samples. For example, Weisman and his colleagues (2002) examined 11 case files of individuals who were referred for forensic evaluation for killing two parents between 1978

and 1999 in California. Liem and Riechelmann (2014), in contrast, used SHR data to analyze events where two or more family members were slain in the same incident. They used all offender types. They did not restrict their selection of cases to familicides committed by offspring. In addition to using SHR data, Liem and Riechelmann (2014) used newspaper accounts to acquire additional details on the cases they found.

Fegadel and Heide (2015, 2017) were the first to use NIBRS data to investigate double parricides and familicides involving parents as victims. Observations were made rather than firm conclusions drawn because NIBRS only accounted for about 25% of the population during this 20-year period. Analyses revealed that 90% of the offenders involved in double parricides were white and there were differences between single offender and multiple-offender incidents. Single offenders were slightly older, and a higher percentage were male. The typical single offender who killed both parents was a white male about 30 years old. The typical multiple offender who committed double parricide was white, about 21 years old, and almost as likely to be female as male (Fegadel & Heide, 2015).

Multiple offenders were more likely to be juveniles than single offenders (40% versus 20%). Multiple offenders were more likely to be female than single offenders. In the multiple-offender cases, 4 out of 10 were females, whereas in the single-offender cases, only 3 of 35 were females. Newspaper accounts revealed that most parricide offenders involved in double parricides plead guilty or were found guilty and received long prison sentences. The insanity defense was successful, however, in the three cases in which it was used.

News accounts were typically sketchy with respect to motive and circumstances and should be viewed with caution. Some interesting differences were observed between single offenders and multiple offenders. In single-offender incidents, the history of mental illness was more common. In multiple-offender incidents, two themes emerged-- disapproval of dating partners and killing for profit. Data were available for nine of the 10 multiple offenders; in seven of these nine cases, accomplice of the offspring was a boyfriend or girlfriend. Killing out of desperation to end abuse or due to being terrified was not reported as a motive in any single-offender or multiple-offender double-parricide case (Fegadel & Heide, 2015).

In the offspring-perpetrated familicide article, by definition, incidents involved three victims, at least one of whom had to be a parent or a stepparent, and at least one of the non-parent victims had to be a family member. NIBRS data were supplemented by newspaper accounts. Fourteen familicide cases were identified during the 20-year period. All of these were committed by single offenders. There were no multiple-offender familicides reported in NIBRS data. There were many similarities to the Liem's and Riechelmann's findings regarding the extended parricide/familicide type (Fegadel & Heide, 2017).

The typical offender involved in familicide was a white male about 26 years old. Only 1 of the 14 offspring involved in a familicide was female. Seventy-one percent (71%) of the offspring were white and 29% were black. Two of the 14 familicides involved juveniles, both sons. The typical victim was a middle-aged mother or father. Siblings predominated among non-parent victim types, and firearms were used in the majority of incidents.

Information in newspapers was available for 12 of the 14 familicides. Four of the these 12, one-third of the sample, were dead within 24 hours of killing family members; three killed themselves and one was killed by police in a standoff. Of the eight arrested, five plead guilty to multiple counts. The insanity defense, which was raised in three cases, was not successful. These eight offenders received harsh sentences. Six were sentenced to life without parole and two received multiple life sentences.

News accounts were understandably sketchy. It appeared that three offenders likely suffered from mental illness, at least three had prior arrest records, and arguments and conflicts were suggested in four cases (Fegadel & Heide, 2017).

Limitations of the Data

Existing national data bases in the United States report arrest information; a national data base that records charges, convictions, and dispositions (sentences, referral to mental hospital, etc.) is not available. The SHR and NIBRS data sets are largely limited to basic offender and victim demographic data (e.g., race, age, gender), and incident-related data (e.g., weapon used, victim–offender relationship, victim and offender counts). Although the NIBRS data base has a few additional variables than SHR (e.g., location of incident, time of day) and makes it possible to analyze multiple victim and multiple offender homicide situations, it leaves much to be desired. Neither SHR nor NIBRS data bases contain many variables that are critical in understanding the pathways that lead children and stepchildren to kill their parents and grandparents. These data sets do not contain information on prosecution and case disposition. Accordingly, the extent to which parricide offenders were defending themselves or others, severely mentally ill, or killing out of selfish or instrumental reasons, unbridled rage, or long-term conflict cannot be determined with these data sets. In addition, these data bases do not have information on family dynamics, prior criminal history of the offenders, use of alcohol and / or drugs by the victims and offenders, and availability of guns. Currently, acquiring these kinds of data necessitates using other sources of information such as police reports, trial and hearing transcripts, mental health reports, interviews of the offenders and collateral sources, such as surviving family members, teachers, and friends. Newspaper accounts can also be used to gather additional pertinent information but must be used with caution.

PARRICIDE IN ENGLAND AND WALES

Parricide is a gendered form of violence that has received scarce attention from criminologists in the UK. Despite being relatively rare, the parricide rate has remained stable for many years, even throughout a recent decline in aggregate homicide numbers across England and Wales. In this presentation, we present findings from our analysis of the Home Office Homicide Index, which forms part of a larger research project examining serious and fatal violence towards parents in the UK.

Data Bases Available

The Home Office Homicide Index contains detailed record-level information about each homicide recorded by police in England and Wales. It is continually updated with revised information from the police and the courts and, as such, is a richer source of data than the main recorded crime dataset and is therefore the preferred source for homicide statistics. In England and Wales, the category of homicide covers the offences of murder and manslaughter. Murder is committed when a person (or persons) of sound mind unlawfully kills someone and had the intention to kill or cause grievous bodily harm. There are three exceptions which can make a killing manslaughter rather than murder. First if there was intent but a partial defence applies; second that there was not intent but there was gross negligence and risk of death; or third, that there was no intent but conduct that was an unlawful act which involved danger and resulted in death .

Incidence and Frequency

Our analysis found that the number of parricide victims per year in England and Wales has ranged from 10 to 30 over the past thirteen years, with an average of 22 victims per year. There was a total of 271 events of parricide from April 1st, 2003 to March 31st, 2016. Parricide was conceptualized as a homicide event in which the victim(s) were the parent(s) or step-parent(s) of the suspect(s). Thirteen of these events were double homicides in which both parents were killed, and an additional three events were double homicides in which one parent and one other individual with a different relationship to the suspect were killed. This resulted in a total of 288 victims who were killed by either a child or a step-child. Seven of the victims were killed by two or more offenders.

Findings Related to Parricide Situations

Method and Weapon Used: Nearly half of all parricides are committed with a sharp instrument. In crimes in which a sharp instrument was used, overwhelming the chosen weapon was a knife (93% of sharp instrument deaths). Therefore, knives specifically were used to kill 40% of all parricide victims. Very few individuals were killed with firearms (3%). In 78% of cases in which a firearm was used, the weapon was not licensed.

There were gender differences among victims killed by these methods. Victims killed by hitting or kicking without the use of a weapon were much more likely to be male than female (89.5% of victims were male, 10.5% were female). All four victims killed through negligence or neglect were female. Homicides committed by strangulation, either manual or with ligature, were also more likely to be female (72% of victims were female, 28% male). A higher proportion of suffocation victims were also female (69%).

Main Circumstance Surrounding Homicide: There were two main circumstances surrounding these crimes of parricide. For 40% of the victims, the main listed circumstance of their death was a domestic dispute of some kind. For example, the suspect was driven by motives of jealousy or financial gain.

Another 29% of victims were killed as a result of an 'irrational act' by the suspect, meaning they were insane or disturbed at the time of the offense. Victims of irrational act homicides were significantly older on average than victims of other circumstances (67 years old compared to 61.9 years old) (p<.01). For 10 of the 77 victims who were killed as a result of irrational act on the part of the suspect, no suspect information was listed (no record of someone charged for the crime). There were 70 suspects who were eventually indicted on charges of murder or manslaughter for killing a parent or step-parent under a circumstance of being insane or disturbed. Ninety-two percent (92%) of these individuals were male. Of these indicted suspects, 77% were found guilty of manslaughter 2- diminished responsibility. Eighty-four percent (84%) of suspects who committed their crimes under this 'irrational act' classification were sentenced to hospital orders.

Parricides that were described as 'mercy killings' constituted 3% of all victims. In these cases, a majority of victims were smothered (70% of mercy killing victims). These victims were also significantly older on average (88.8 years old) than parricide victims killed in other types of circumstances (62.8 years old) (p<.001).

Four percent (4%) of victims were killed in what was classified as a fight or brawl circumstance. In these cases, there were significantly higher rates of the victims and suspects currently living together than in other circumstances surrounding the offense (73% compared to 38.4%).

Location of the Offense and Body: 209 victims were killed either inside or in the garden of a home or other dwelling Given the domestic nature of many of these parent-child relationships, this is to be expected. Forty percent (40%) of victims were living with the suspect/s in their deaths at the time. Twenty-three percent (23.3%) of victims were killed in an unknown location and the remaining 4.5% were killed elsewhere (open outdoors, street, other type of building, etc.). Those for whom the location of the homicide event was unknown were killed during the years between 2003/04 and 2006/07 when the homicide index form did not include this information.

Role of Drugs and/or Alcohol in Parricide Crimes: 26 victims had been drinking alcohol at the time of their death, and one of those victims was also on an illicit drug at the time of their death (9% of all victims). Male victims were more likely to have been drinking or using illicit drugs than female victims (18.4% of males compared to only 4% of females). Additionally, victims who had been drinking and/or using an illicit drug were significantly younger than those who had not been drinking (53 years old compared to 64 years old, respectively).

Rates of alcohol and or/drug use for suspects at the time of the homicide were much higher. Nearly thirty-two percent (31.5%) of suspects had either been drinking, taking an illicit drug, or both drinking and taking drugs at the time of the homicide. Male and female suspects had similar rates of drug and alcohol use. Twenty-two percent (22%) of suspects were known to have a history of illegal drug use. For three suspects, their motive for killing a parent or step parent was to obtain money for drugs. While nearly third of suspects had been impaired by either illicit drugs, alcohol, or both at the time of the offense, there were no significant

difference between impaired suspects and non-impaired suspects with regard to the circumstances of the homicides or the method used.

Victim, Offender, and Case Characteristics

Victim characteristics: Parricide victims were equally likely to be male or female. However, a greater proportion of female victims had been a victim of violence prior to their death than male victims (14.3% compared to only 7% of male victims). The median victim age was 61 years old. Two thirds of all victims were born in the UK, with an additional 17.7% having been born outside of the UK (15.9% had unknown or non-reported countries of birth). Two thirds of victims were either retired or employed at the time of their death.

Suspect characteristics: Data were available for 249 suspects who were eventually convicted or whose information has been included due to their involvement in the crime but were not charged due to their own deaths. Twenty suspects killed both parents/step-parents.

Seventeen suspects killed one parent or step parent with one or more of their siblings or step-siblings. There were 6 parricide events in which this occurred. Interestingly, these suspect group parricides were mostly co-ed. In 5 of these, the pair or grouping involved both male and female suspects. In these suspect pair or group events, the average age of the suspects was skewed younger than for suspects who committed their offense alone (26.7 years old vs 34 years old). This group of suspects were also more likely to be convicted of a murder charge that resulted in a custodial sentence than suspects who committed the offense on their own. These age and gender patterns of group parricides may be a result of certain social dynamics that are worth exploring further.

The overwhelming majority of suspects were male (87.6%). Male suspects were also almost entirely responsible for parricide events in which there were two victims. Of the 20 suspects who killed two parents, 19 of these were male. Female suspects were more likely to have killed their female parent whereas male suspects were equally likely to have killed a parent of either sex. The median age of suspects was 31 years old. The youngest suspect was 14 years old, the oldest was 69 years old. Forty-seven percent (47.4%) of suspects were single and never before married at the time of the offense. For 40.6% of suspects, their marital status was not known. Another 7.2% were either married or cohabiting. A small percentage of suspects had prior serious convictions (6.3%) and some suspects were currently on bail for a previous offence (3.1%), indicating a fairly recent interaction with the criminal justice system. Thirty-seven percent (37.4%) of suspects were living with the victims, their parent or step-parent, at the time of the homicide.

A much greater percentage of parricide suspects were born in the UK compared to parricide victims. Seventy-six percent (76%) of suspects were born in the UK compared to only 66% of victims being born in the UK. Six percent (6.4%) of suspects were first generation British (the parent that they killed was not born in the UK, but they were). Another 9.6% were born outside of the UK. All of these foreign-born suspects were male. For 14.3% of suspects, their birthplace was unknown.

Criminal Justice Processing Data

For 85.7% of parricide victims, at least one suspect was eventually charged with either murder or manslaughter. The vast majority of suspects then served or are currently serving custodial imprisonment or hospital order sentences. In parricide cases in which no suspect information exists, we believe this is due to no charges ever being filed against the suspect or the suspect having been found not guilty of the crime.

Ten of the suspects either committed suicide or died before a court judgement was disposed (4% of all known suspects). Thirty-five percent (35%) of suspects were eventually convicted of murder. Twenty-six percent (26%) were convicted of common law manslaughter and the remaining 34.3% were convicted of manslaughter 2- diminished responsibility. The rates of each type of final convictions were approximately the same for suspects of both genders. Of the 88 suspects convicted of murder, the 87.5% were given a custodial sentence and the remainder were given hospital orders. Of those convicted of common law manslaughter, the most common sentence received by 59% of suspects was a custodial sentence (imprisonment without option to fine, custody for life for offenders age 17 to 21 under the Criminal Justice Act of 1982, etc). Of the 86 suspects convicted of diminished responsibility manslaughter, the majority received hospital order sentences (76.7%).

Limitations of the Data

Due to the level of detail of the information collected, the Homicide Index does not provide data that are as timely as the main police recorded crime return. More up-to-date headline figures are published as part of the quarterly ONS (Office of National Statistics) Crime Statistics in England and Wales series . A further limitation is missing data. There appear to be some potential patterns related to missing data for victims and suspects in parricide crimes. A high degree of missing data, which occurred during the 2003/04 to the 2006/07 financial years, can be explained by a change to the homicide return from that occurred in 2007. At this time, variables were added to gather more information about homicide events. There are different definitions of homicide between countries, although definitions vary less than for some other types of crimes; differing points in criminal justice systems at which homicides are recorded, for instance, when the offence is discovered or following further investigation or court outcome; the figures are for completed homicides (that is, excluding attempted murder) but, in some countries, the police register any death that cannot immediately be attributed to other causes as homicide . In England and Wales there is very little research on parricide, and almost no qualitative or detailed contextual published research to understand the act beyond recorded statistics.

AUSTRALIA

The death of a well-known Australian Football Rules coach, Phillip Wash, at the hands of his son in July 2015 brought substantial media attention across Australia to familial homicide in the form of children's physical violence against parents (Zander, 2015). One year later, in July 2016, when a father received fatal injuries after a one-punch attack by his son in the middle of the Brisbane central business district, parricide as a form of family violence was

52

again a point of national media attention (Branco, 2016). Both cases reveal the phenomenon of and high public interest in this form of family violence. However, outside of the perpetration of parricide in the occasional high-profile cases, little is known in Australia about the nature, risks and responses to this unique form of familial homicide and the underlying patterns of violence that precede these fatal events.

Data Bases Available

There is limited Australian based research that provides qualitative analysis of parricide. What is known about the phenomenon is largely quantitative and taken from the annual reviews undertaken by the Australian Institute of Criminology as part of their National Homicide Monitoring Program (NHMP), as well as death review reports produced at the state level (for example, Domestic Violence Death Review Team, 2017). However, while there has not been a specific report or study into parricide undertaken at the national level in Australia, these state and territory-based reviews do provide some quantitative insights into parricide offence, offender, and victim details.

Incidence and Frequency

Parricide, or the killing of a parent(s) by their child, includes either the killing of the perpetrator's father (patricide) or mother (matricide) (Heide, 2013b). In Australia, parricide accounts for approximately four% of homicides annually (Zander, 2015), which equates to approximately one homicide each month. National Homicide Monitoring Report (NHMP) data show that between 2002-3 and 2011-12, there were 128 parricide incidents (Cussen & Bryant, 2015). Most domestic homicides in Australia involve a single victim and offender. But in a small number of these parricides, there were multiple victims and/or multiple perpetrators (12%).

During the period, parricide incidents involved 134 victims (constituting 12% of all domestic homicide victims during the same period) and 132 offenders. This included ten cases in which both parents of the offender were killed. These incidents of lethal violence constitute 12% of all domestic violence homicide victims in Australia for this period (Cussen & Bryant, 2015). This national prevalence rate is comparable to that experienced in other Western jurisdictions, where research suggests the parricide rate ranges from two to six% of homicides annually (Liettu et al., 2009).

Findings Related to Parricide Situations

The study by Cussen & Bryant (2015) reveals that for the ten-year period 2002-3 to 2011-12, 88% of parricides occurred in the victim's home, with 36% occurring between the hours of 6 pm and midnight (Cussen & Bryant, 2015). Statistically, the most common parricide offences in Australia involve patricide by adult sons, while matricide by sons is less frequent. This finding is somewhat distinct to Australia, revealing that female-perpetrated parricide may be less common in Australia compared to other Western countries (Condry & Miles, 2014; Zander, 2015).

Victim, Offender, and Case Characteristics

During the ten-year period between 2002-3 and 2011-12, males committed 54% of parricides in Australia. This is distinct from other forms of domestic homicide where males tend to predominate. For example, males accounted for 77% of offenders in intimate partner homicides during the same period (Cussen & Bryant, 2015). In contrast to intimate partner homicides, which typically involve a female victim, victims of parricide are more likely to be the perpetrator's father (54%) than the mother (46%) (Cussen & Bryant, 2015).

The majority of parricide cases in Australia during this period involved the killing of a parent over 50 years old (74% of cases) (Cussen & Bryant, 2015). The ages of parricide offenders are more varied, ranging from under 17 years old (11% of cases), to 18-34 years old (50% of cases), to over 35 years old (37% of cases). There was only one parricide case in Australia during this period where the offender was over 65 years old (Cussen & Bryant, 2015).

Importantly, data from the National Homicide Monitoring Program reveal that in 18% of parricides, there was a known history of family violence before the killing (Cussen & Bryant, 2015). Given the recognized high levels of under-reporting of family violence, this is likely to be an underestimate of the extent to which families in which parricides occur have a history of other forms of family violence. It also does not reveal between whom the prior history of family violence involved, including whether the parricide offender was the affected family member or respondent in these incidents. Further insights into the histories of family violence prior to an incident of parricide could assist in informing prevention and earlier intervention strategies.

Limitations of the Data

While there has been a significant investment in family violence reform across Australian states and territories in recent years, political attention has been primarily directed towards responses to and prevention of intimate partner violence (IPV). This is understandable given IPV is the most prevalent form of family violence and specifically of fatal family violence in Australia. However, it does mean that there remain significant knowledge deficits about other forms of family violence, parricide included.

Recent reviews at the state (see, for example, Royal Commission into Family Violence, 2016; Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence, 2015) and national (for example, COAG Advisory Panel Report into Violence against Women and their Children, 2016) levels do not specifically refer to parricide as a form of family violence. This is reflective of the limited understanding of parricide across Australia, including gaps in knowledge of the risks and the opportunities for intervention prior to an act of parricide. As such, further research is needed in Australia to address the gaps in current understanding of parricide offences. Greater insight into the known risks prior to an act of parricide, and the circumstances immediately surrounding the use of lethal violence, can be harnessed to inform prevention and intervention strategies and services.

References

Baxter, H., Duggan, C., Larkin, E., Cordess, C., and Page, K. (2001). Mentally disordered parricide and stranger killers admitted to high-security care. 1: A descriptive comparison. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 12(2), 287-299.

Branco, J. (2016). Brisbane CBD "one-punch" attack victim's son charged. *The Brisbane Times*, 5 July. Available online: http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/queensland/brisbane-cbd-onepunch-attack-victims-son-charged-20160704-gpyjbs.html.

COAG Advisory Panel. (2016). *COAG Advisory Panel on Reducing Violence against Women and their Children: final report. Commonwealth of Australia*. Available online: https://www.coag.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/COAGAdvisoryPanelonReducingViolenceagainstWomenandtheirChildren-FinalReport.pdf.

Condry, R., and Miles, C. (2014). Adolescent to parent violence: framing and mapping a hidden problem. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 14(3), 257-275.

Cussen, T., and Bryant, W. (2015). *Domestic/family homicide in Australia*. Research in Practice no. 38. Retrieved from http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/current%20series/rip/21-40/rip38.html.

Domestic Violence Death Review Team. (2017). *A report of the Domestic Violence Death Review Team 2015-2017*. Domestic Violence Death Review Team, Sydney, New South Wales.

Fegadel, A. R., & Heide, K. M. (2017). Offspring perpetrated familicide: Examining family homicides involving parents as victims. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(1), 6-24.

Fegadel, A. R., & Heide, K. M. (2015). Double parricide: An in-depth look at two victim homicides involving parents as victims. *Behavior Sciences & the Law*, 33(6), 723-739.

Fegadel, A. R., & Heide, K. M. (2018). NIBRS and SHR: A comparison of two national homicide data bases with respect to parricide. *Victims & Offenders*, 13(2), 235-256.

Fitz-Gibbon, K. (2018) Explainer: What is parricide and how common is it in Australia? *The Conversation*, 19 July. Available online: https://theconversation.com/explainer-what-is-parricide-and-how-common-is-it-in-australia-100088.

Heide, K. M. (1993a). Parents who get killed and the children who kill them. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 531-544.

Heide, K. M. (1993b). Weapons used by juveniles and adults to kill parents. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 11, 397-405.

Heide, K. M. (2013a). Matricide and stepmatricide victims and offenders: An empirical analysis of U.S. arrest data. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 31(2), 203-214.

Heide, K. M. (2013b). *Understanding parricide: When sons and daughters kill parents*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heide, K. M. (2014). Patricide and steppatricide victims and offenders: An empirical analysis of U.S. arrest data. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 58(11), 1261-1278.

Liem, M., & Reichelmann, A. (2014). Patterns of multiple family homicide. *Homicide Studies*, 18(1), 44-58.

Liettu, A., Saavala, H., Hakko, H., Rasanen, P., and Joukamaa, M. (2009). Mental disorders of male parricidal offenders. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology,* 44, 96-103.

Royal Commission into Family Violence. (2016). *Report and recommendations*. Royal Commission into Family Violence: Victoria. Available online: http://www.rcfv.com.au/Report-Recommendations.

Shon, P. C. H., & Targonski, J. R. (2003). Declining trends in U.S. parricides, 1976-1998: Testing the Freudian assumptions. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 26(4), 387-402.

Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence. (2015). *Not now, not ever: Putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland*. Queensland Government.

Walsh, J. A., Krienert, J. L., & Crowder, D. (2008). Innocence lost: A gender-based study of parricide offenders, victim, and incident characteristics in a national sample, 1976-2003. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*, 16, 202-227.

Weisman, A. M., Ehrenclou, M. G., & Sharma, K. K. (2002). Double parricide: Forensic analysis and psycholegal implications. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 47, 313–317.

Zander, J. (2015). When a parent is killed: Family tragedy is often a mark of our broader failings. *The Conversation*. 15 July. Available online: https://theconversation.com/when-a-parent-is-killed-family-tragedy-is-often-a-mark-of-our-broader-failings-44504.

Coercive Control Legislation: Legislating Against Non-Violent Forms of Domestic Violence

Donna J. King, Courtney Kalmanson, and Lin Huff-Corzine

Millions of women around the world experience intimate partner violence (IPV)[1] every day; however, IPV does not take a specific form of abuse (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2009; Stark, 2007; Weitzman, 2000).[2] Scholars from various academic disciplines and experts in related fields, including sociology, psychology, and law have studied DV for decades (Bowman, Rosenbury, Tuerkheimer, & Yuracko, 2011; Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Mossman, 1991). Although there is a plethora of research linking DV to arrest rates as an indicator of whether the policing of DV is successfully reducing the prevalence, there is a major deficiency in the academic literature that extends beyond the offender's initial encounter with law enforcement (Block & Block, 1992; Glass, Laughon, Campbell, Block, Hanson, Sharps, & Taliaferro, 2008; McFarlane, Campbell, Wilt, Sachs, Ulrich, & Xu, 1999; Mears, 2003). Also, there is a lack of consensus among differing worldwide cultural accounts and explanations about the cause of DV. Thus, programs aimed toward decreasing IPV have become stagnate, and little progress is being made toward the elimination of this devastating social epidemic (Dalton & Schneider, 2001).

The criminal justice system attempts to protect victims and punish their abusers based solely on the idea that domestic abuse occurs in discrete and insular acts of physical violence rather than on the notion that it is comprised of a continuum of actions, which may *never* involve physical violence (Dragiewicz, 2011; Hanna, 2009; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). Unquestionably, protecting victims of DV from the non-violent tactics of coercive control is a challenging and unresolved proposition. Courts, especially criminal courts, consider each act of physical violence as an isolated, discrete incident without considering the ongoing continuum of abuse between the parties that may transpire for years (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). In fact, the continuing abusive behavior, known as coercive control, is rarely recognized by courts; and, if it is, it is simply to inform the court about the likelihood of future physical harm to the victim(s) (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Stark, 2007). Generally, the U.S. criminal and civil justice court systems do not consider episodes of abuse that do not include physical violence as offenses worthy of punishment.

Defining and responding to DV effectively are daunting tasks. Lack of consistency exists among scholars, legislators, law enforcement, prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, and DV program employees, for example, about how to define and, thus, respond to this universal social problem (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Riger, Ahrens, & Blickenstaff, 2000). National, state, and local governments throughout the world employ different definitions in their recognition and prosecution of DV. Many definitions only include physical acts of violence, with situational violence being the best understood. Situational violence is understood as

---

[1] Intimate Partner Violence (IPV), the violence between intimate partners, and Domestic Violence (DV), between any persons sharing a residence will be used interchangeably in this paper.

[2] It is a well-known fact that both men and women, whether in heterosexual or homosexual relationships, experience domestic violence as victims and offenders; however, this article focuses on intimate heterosexual relationships in which the man is the offender and the woman is the victim.

occasional physical violence that erupts in response to a conflict within the relationship (Wright, 2013). Despite the differing definitions and responses to domestic violence, DV is broadly recognized as having "a cohesive pattern of coercive controls" (Offner, 1998, p. 6; see also Stark, 2007; Tuerkheimer, 2004).

The type of coercive control men assert over women is particularly sex-asymmetrical, meaning it is not experienced in a similar manner by both sexes (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2009; Dragiewicz, 2011; Offner, 1998). It has been argued that DV is a symmetrical offense, meaning that men are victims of DV perpetrated by women offenders just as often as women experience DV inflicted by men (Offner, 1998). Still, in the United States alone, DV accounts for approximately two million injuries per year, most involving women as the primary victims and men as the primary offenders (Lininger, 2009, p. 866-67). Nevertheless, anti-feminists, including conservative father's rights groups, assert that violence against men by women is as common and devastating as men's violence against women (Crowley, 2003; Dragiewicz, 2011). Nevertheless, some ultra conservative men's groups advocate for the abolition of laws regulating DV, arguing that the U.S. government's focus on women as victims of DV is a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (Dragiewicz, 2011; King, 2012). By the same token, they often assert that female victims of IPV are masochists, a statement that is almost as ridiculous as saying that the 10,470 women killed by the hands of their intimate partners between 2001 and 2012 wanted to die (Berns, 2004).

To provide broader protection that encompasses all victims of DV, it is necessary for legislators to understand that the non-violent forms of abuse may be just as devastating for the victim, than physical acts alone (Stark, 2007). Accordingly, with such an understanding, it is reasonable to think that legislators would seek to protect the citizenry from non-violent forms of abuse as they have from the physically violent forms. This study seeks to find answers to whether the victims of non-physical abuse are, in fact, covered by the state laws to which police must turn when making an arrest.

Data and Methods

To complete this study, we collected information to form a database from all of the state level legislation from the fifty (50) United States and the District of Columbia (DC) determined to include wording regarding the prevalence of protection against coercive control as a form of DV or IPV.[3] To begin the data collection, the text of each of the state level statutes were collected using LexisNexis. All of the statutes' definitions of *domestic violence*, *domestic abuse*, *spousal abuse*, *spousal violence*, *intimate partner violence*, *interpersonal violence*, and *coercive control* were used to begin building the new database. Additionally, the Terms and Connectors research tool available in LexisNexis was used to focus on specific key terms identified with coercive control tactics as it is recognized throughout United States' legislation as a form of DV. Through this search process, the key coercive control terms identified include: *coercive control*, *isolation*, *economic abuse*, and *emotional abuse*. Once both processes of the data collection within LexisNexis were

---

[3] This search specifically excludes any reference to federal legislation.

completed, these data were analyzed for their content relative to the identification and regulation of coercive control and its various, so-called, non-violent tactics using Nvivo 11.

Results and Discussion

Several states enacted statutes with specific language identifying coercive control or its non-violent tactics; however, they are typically civil and regulatory in nature rather than pecuniary and criminal. Other statutes utilizing coercive control's specific language provide funding for domestic violence programs and address issues related to dissolution of marriage.

Key Coercive Control Terms Search within U.S. State Statutes

Of the states identified through the key coercive control terms search, a total of fourteen (14) states within the United States contain a collective total of twenty-one (21) statutes that address coercive control or at least one of its non-violent tactics in relation to domestic violence. Of the fourteen states specifically regulating the coercive control or its non-violent tactics, four (4) states; California, Colorado, Kentucky, and Oklahoma; contain the specific term phrase *"coercive control"* within the text of their statutes.[4] Nine (9) statutes from seven (7) different states appearing in the search results include the keyword *isolation* and the phrase *domestic violence*. Two (2) laws from two (2) different states provide protection from *economic abuse* within its definition of domestic violence; however, the specific terminology used in the Nebraska state statute identifies IPV as "domestic intimate partner abuse." Seven (7) different statutes from four (4) different states utilize the phrase *emotional abuse* in their statutes relevant to domestic violence.[5]

The most notable result of this research is that no statute regulated any form of criminal acts of abuse, whether physical or non-physical forms of DV. Colorado's legislative declaration statute includes *coercive control* among its explanation of behavior occurring within the home. The statute recognizes a need for additional funding, beyond that provided by the federal government, for the development of DV programs among specific agencies and local governments. Kentucky's statute uses *coercive control* to help define the criminal conduct of DV for the purposes of establishing certification standards for mental health professionals who provide court-mandated treatment services for those individuals determined to be domestic violence offenders. Although this is an important mandate, many mental health providers and health related professionals are not adequately trained in interpersonal violence, so it does not go as far as to criminalize the behavior of DV (Raphael, 2000). Indeed, this statute *does not regulate any behavior* related to DV. Thus, it certainly is not utilized as a tool for the prevention of coercive control as a crime.

Oklahoma's statute, which contains the specific terminology *coercive control*, was enacted for the purposes of guiding courts during custody disputes. Similar to Colorado and Kentucky, Oklahoma's statute does not define DV for the purposes of providing victims

---

[4] None of the four states utilizing the term *coercive control* in their statutes do so for the purposes of criminalizing it as a form of abuse.

[5] This number is exclusive of any statutes related to mental health patients, incapacitated persons, and disabled persons who experience *emotional abuse*.

protection from abusive non-violent behavior. California is the most recent state to enact laws with the term coercive control in its statutes, and it is also the most aggressive state in utilizing the term to protect victims of DV within its jurisdiction. Both of California's statutes attempt to work in tandem by providing the DV victim with a protective order to prevent contact with the abuser and to provide sufficient time for the victim to present enough evidence of current and past abuse to show a pattern of violence, which suggests California's consideration of coercive control's continuum of abuse.

In summary, very few states address coercive control issues related to non-physical abuse and of those that do California is the only state to date to consider the additive effect of coercive control. Of course official reaction to physical abuse is important, but as the legislation in California is beginning to recognize, official reaction to threats of violence, enforced isolation, humiliation, and the many other forms of non-physical coercive control is also important if there is a chance to reduce DV.

References

Berns, N. (2004). *Framing the victim: Domestic violence, media, and social problems*. NewYork, NY: Walter de Gruyter.

Birenbaum J., & Grant, I. (2013). Taking threats seriously: Section 264.1 and threats as a form of domestic violence. *Criminal Law Quarterly*, *59*, 1-35. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2159498

Block, C. R., & Block, R. L. (Eds.). (1992). Questions and answers in lethal and non-lethal violence. *Proceedings of the first annual workshop of the homicide research working group*. Ann Arbor, MI. (June 14-16, 1992.) Retrieved from http://homicideresearchworkinggroup.org/proceedings_1992.pdf

Bowman, C. G., Rosenbury, L. A., Tuerkheimer, D. & Yuracko, K. A. (2011). *Feminist jurisprudence: Cases and materials* (4th Ed.). St. Paul, MN: West.

Crowley, J. E. (2003). *The politics of child support in America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Dalton, C. & Schneider, E. M. (2001). *Battered women and the law*. New York, NY: Foundation Press.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2009). *Dangerous exits: Escaping abusive Relationships in rural America*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Dobash, R. E. & Dobash, R. P. (1992). *Women, violence and social change*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Dragiewicz, M. (2011). *Equality with a vengeance: Men's rights groups, battered women, And antifeminist backlash*. Boston, MA: University Press of New England.

Glass, N., Laughon, K., Campbell, J., Block, C. R., Hanson, G., Sharps, P. W., & Taliaferro, E. (2008). Violence: Recognition, management, and prevention – non-fatal strangulation is an important risk factor for homicide of women. *Journal of Emergency Medicine, 35*(3), 329-335.

Hanna, C. (2009). The paradox of progress: Translating Evan Stark's coercive control into legal doctrine for abused women. *Violence Against Women*, *15*(12), 1458-1476.

Hirschel, D., & Buzawa, E. (2002). Understanding the context of dual arrest with directions for future research. *Violence Against Women*, *8*, 1449-1473.

Lininger, T. (2009). The sound of silence: Holding batterers accountable for silencing their victims. *Texas Law Review*, *87*(5), 857-911.

McFarlane, J. M., Campbell, J. C., Wilt, S., Sachs, C. J., Ulrich, Y., & Xu, X. (1999). Stalking and intimate partner femicide. *Homicide Studies, 3*(4), 300-316.

Mears, D. P. (2003). Research and interventions to reduce domestic violence revictimization. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 4*(2), 127-147.

Mossman, M. J. (1991). Feminism and legal method: The difference it makes. In Fineman, M. A. & Thomadsen, N. S. (Eds.). *At the boundaries of law: Feminism and legal theory* (pp. 281-300). New York, NY: Routledge.

Offner, L. E. (1998). Power and control: Dispelling the myths surrounding domestic violence. *Nevada Family Law Report*, *13*(5), 6-9. Retrieved from http://nvbar.org/sites/default/files/NFLR_WinterExtraDec1998.pdf.

Raphael, J. (2000). *Saving Bernice: Battered women, welfare, and poverty*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Riger, S., Ahrens, C., & Blickenstaff, A. (2000). Measuring interference with employment And education reported by women with abusive partners: Preliminary data. *Violence and Victims*, *15*(2), 161-72.

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tuerkheimer, D. (2004). Recognizing and remedying the harm of battering: A call to criminalize domestic violence. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, *94*(4), 959-1032.

Wright, C. (2013). Torture at home: Borrowing from the Torture Convention to define domestic violence. *Hastings Women's Law Journal*, *24*, 457-564.

Considerations When Doing Research with Families and Friends of Homicide Victims

Jeanna M. Mastrocinque

Introduction

Research with families and friends of homicide victims requires researchers to consider how to best protect participants. This work often asks study participants, many of whom do not know the researchers and will likely not see the researchers again, to share their experiences regarding a loved one's homicide. Researchers should be aware of the privilege they have in families and friends sharing their experiences about their loved ones, and the difficulties families and friends may encounter in deciding to share such information. Due to the nature of this type of research, researchers need to be aware of concerns such as sensitivity, mental health, and trauma. The following paper will discuss suggestions when doing such work. Topics include: considerations when selecting a research team; protecting confidentiality; creating victim informed questions; creating a comfortable environment; selecting a time and location; mental health concerns; participant burden; providing support information; and researcher transparency and accountability.

Selecting a research team

Our work with families and friends of homicide victims has been an interdisciplinary collaboration. Our research team has included physicians, mental health providers, attorneys, social workers, and victim researchers. Creating an interdisciplinary team establishes many benefits. First, the team members are able to assist with suggesting questions that might be of interest to their specific field, including emerging issues in the specific discipline. Second, because it is likely this will be the same team that analyzes the data from the focus groups, it is invaluable for the analyses to be done by people in various fields. There are different frameworks that specific fields can offer for analysis, and there are also various conclusions that can be drawn from different fields. Finally, as discussed in more detail later, it is crucial that a mental health care provider is present at the focus groups to address any mental health concerns. With larger groups, it is best to have more than one provider.

Protecting confidentiality

Confidentiality is a priority for such work, especially given that some experiences shared may be specific enough for someone else to be able to research, if the work is not presented in a careful manner. In our research, we do not ask participants for their names. Our groups are audio recorded and transcribed. In the transcribed documents, all identifying information is removed from the transcripts. It is important to note that researchers are unable to prevent participants in the focus group from sharing information from the group, which we make participants aware of in the information letters. Also, when placing people into focus groups, it is important for researchers to remember not to confirm or provide any information about other participants who plan to attend. For example, two people might be interested in attending, and one might ask the research coordinator if he/she could place them in the same group as the other person that they know. In such situations, the coordinator should state they are unable to discuss any of the other registered participants, and that the person calling should contact the person that they know to ask for further information.

In our research, we do collect the first name and phone number or email of interested and eligible participants for a reminder phone call or email, if requested, and that information is destroyed after the focus group. Additionally, if the group gets cancelled for some reason, it is important to be able to contact the interested participant. It is important that the participant is asked if they want a reminder, and if so, using which mode of communication. Additionally, if the participant provides a phone number, it is important to ask whether a message can be left at the number. When dealing with trauma research, it is not uncommon that a participant does not want other family members or friends to know that they are participating in this research. Also, it is important that if you are not collecting participant information as data, that emails sent and received, and phone call logs, are deleted.

Creating victim informed questions

When creating the questions for a focus group with families and friends of homicide victims, it is important to be aware of sensitive language and topics. To this extent, people who are interested in pursuing such research should work with either an organization that specifically works with families and friends of homicide victims or with someone who is a family or friend of a homicide victim. While there is no universally accepted language or questions in such an area, it is important to try to be as informed as possible. For example, words such as "closure" and "loss" are not well received by many families and friends of homicide victims.

Creating a comfortable environment

It is important that research participants are in a safe, secure location. When possible, researchers should try to hold focus groups in locations that are near public transportation, and to be aware of costs such as bus fare and parking. It is best to try to cover such costs, if possible, through grants or additional funds. Focus groups should be held in places where restrooms are accessible, and refreshments are also important, given that many of these groups will be held for several hours. Researchers should also be sure tissues are available, that the location is in a place away from the general public, and that when possible, the rooms are not rooms surrounded by windows where those passing by in the building may be able to see the participants. It is also good practice for the researchers at the table to spread out around the area, rather than gathering together at one section of a table to create a more informal setting.

Selecting a time and location

When selecting a time and location, researchers should be aware of several factors. The time of year is important, as it might be best to avoid holding research groups relating to homicide close to major holidays. It is also important to take into consideration the length of the focus group and to be aware of when participants would be leaving the focus group. For example, if you are expecting a three hour focus group, starting in the evening at 7pm would result in participants leaving the group in the late evening hours. While evenings are usually most convenient, one should consider the time of year (i.e., the fall when it is darker outside earlier), and also the option of holding groups in the afternoon on a weekend. Additionally, it is important, given potential mental health concerns, for researchers to be aware of the nearest emergency medical or psychiatric intake location.

Mental health concerns

It is important to have someone who is a trained and licensed mental health care provider at the focus groups. It is important to also be aware of any questions in individual surveys that may require a mental health professional to respond (e.g., any suicidality assessment). The person on your research team who is in this role should be comfortable in knowing they may need to respond in this situation, and to be sure he/she is comfortable in doing so. It is best to have a provider who is knowledgeable of trauma.

Participant burden

It is not uncommon that people who are interested in participating in a focus group, might decide not to attend the day of the group. It is important that if only one person attends the focus group that the person is asked if they are comfortable discussing their loved one, even if no other participants attend. The concern in such a situation is participant burden, in having someone who has come to the group to discuss the homicide of their loved one, being turned away because of the group attendance. It is also possible for people to attend later in the session, due to various reasons. The fact that people are providing the privilege to researchers to hear their stories and experiences about the homicide of a loved one needs to be appreciated, and the effort it takes to attend a group to share such an experience should be respected.

Providing support information

It is important that support information is available both when screening for eligibility to be a part of the focus group and at the focus group itself. One criterion in our research was that the case could not currently be under active investigation, which means that someone who had a homicide recently occur may be interested in participating in the focus group, but is not eligible. The research team member who is answering the calls and screening for eligibility should have support resources readily accessible to share with the interested participant. Additionally, support information should be available at the focus group, which can include brochures from local organizations or a list of local resources. It is also helpful to provide online support resources, which may be a more convenient option for some.

Researcher transparency and accountability

Again, it is difficult to overemphasize the importance of respecting and appreciating the families and friends who are sharing their stories about the homicide of their loved ones. In more recent studies, I have shifted to focus on transparency and accountability. In recent groups, I have explained that I am unable to reach out to participants due to confidentiality concerns and due to not keeping their contact information, but I provide my contact information and encourage participants to contact me if they want to know about the state of the work. I explain how long it takes to publish findings and translate findings into practice. Researchers may also want to try to schedule a day and time to share findings with the public, even if preliminary, at an open community venue. It is helpful if this information can be shared at the groups, but if not, researchers can attempt to publicize such findings through the same avenues that they used to recruit (e.g., flyers, electronic information, social media). Such transparency and accountability is especially important when asking about sensitive topics such as homicide. Finally, if possible, researchers might discuss at the focus group

what has been done with previously collected data so far, and what is planned in the future without overpromising deliverables.

Conclusion

Research with families and friends of homicide victims provides a voice to the experiences of a unique group of people. Often families and friends will participate in such research interested in advocating for change, and we as researchers have the ability to communicate their stories to service providers and practitioners to better inform responses. Given the great privilege researchers are provided to have access to these stories and experiences, it is important that we take great care to create a comfortable, safe, and trusting environment for our participants.

Exploring Neighborhood Variation in the Influence of Forensic and Incident Characteristics on Time to Homicide Clearance

Wendy Regoeczi and Tom McEwen

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of the larger neighborhood context on the solvability of homicide cases. Our analysis includes assessing whether the effects of homicide type and availability of forensic evidence are conditional upon neighborhood structure. To this end, we analyze multilevel survival models of homicide and census data from Cleveland, Ohio from 2008-2011. Theoretical and policy implications are discussed.

Background

Increasing attention has been given to the issue of unsolved violent crimes and the factors that influence the likelihood a perpetrator will be arrested for these serious offenses. Much of this literature has focused on how the characteristics of the victim and incident impact the solvability of the case (Addington, 2006; Lee, 2005; Litwin, 2004; Litwin & Xu, 2007; Lundman & Myers, 2012; Puckett & Lundman, 2003; Regoeczi, Jarvis, & Riedel, 2008; Roberts, 2007), with a small but growing body of research examining aspects of the investigations themselves (Davis, 2014; McEwen, 2009; Peterson, Hickman, Strom, & Johnson, 2013; Peterson, Sommers, Baskin, & Johnson, 2010; Wellford & Cronin, 1999).

Homicide investigations do not take place in a vacuum. In the same way that neighborhood structures, such as concentrated disadvantage and residential instability, impact neighborhood levels of violence, they are also likely to have an influence on the response to those incidents of violence. Furthermore, when certain types of homicides occur in neighborhoods characterized by particular structures, investigators may face even greater obstacles to solving the cases. And to the extent that neighborhoods undergo changes in terms of their characteristics and levels of criminal activity, the context of homicide investigations may be altered as well.

The usual approach to analysis of solvability of homicide cases employs logistic regression in which the dependent variable is a binary variable reflecting whether the case was solved (closed case) or unsolved (open case). Covariates in the regression usually include victim characteristics (age, race, sex) and incident characteristics (e.g., weapon, location (inside/outside), number of witnesses, and others. Results from a logistic regression include statistical significance and odds ratios associated with the covariates. With few exceptions, past studies have ignored neighborhood influences on solvability, basically assuming that those influences do not vary across neighborhoods.

The current study differs from past efforts in two important ways. First, we include potential neighborhood influences through measures of concentrated disadvantage and residential instability based on 2010 census data at the neighborhood level. Second, our statistical

approach is a time-to-event analysis. The event in our application is arrest. For closed cases, the time under study is the number of days between a homicide incident and an arrest. For unsolved cases, the time under study from the homicide incident to the last day of data collection in our study, which is July 15, 2012, as described later in this summary.

The focus on elapsed time, coupled with measures of neighborhood influences, provides a different perspective on homicide investigations. It extends research on homicides beyond the open/closed dichotomy with the aim of having an expanded view of investigations.

Data

The dataset for this study consisted of 299 homicides that occurred in the city of Cleveland between mid-2008 through 2011. Data were collected by the authors in 2012 under a grant awarded from the National Institute of Justice awarded. The data collection effort for the incidents, which consisted of reviewing reports available from the homicide unit of the Cleveland Police Department, began in March 2012 and was completed on July 15, 2012.

Incident Level Variables

Figure 1 provides frequencies for the incident-level variables in the analysis.

Figure 1: Incident-level Variables

Variable		Percent	Variable		Percent
Sex	Male	86.3	Location	Inside	31.7
	Female	13.7		Outside	68.3
Race	Non-white	84.3	Witnesses	No witnesses	35.3
	White 15.7			Witnesses	64.7
Age	< 25 years	34.0	Evidence	No forensic evidence	14.7
	25-45 years	46.7		Forensic evidence	85.3
	>45 years	19.3			
Weapon	Non-firearm	29.4			
	Firearm	70.6			

The variable labeled witnesses indicates whether investigators were able to interview one or more persons at the scene. These witnesses may have provided beneficial information to investigators either because they saw the incident or described events that led up to the incident. The evidence variable reflects whether crime scene investigators collected DNA, latent prints, or firearm evidence at the scene. These three forensic evidence categories are the "big three" in homicide investigations in regard to potential for providing analysis leading to arrest.

Clearance Rate

As of July 15, 2012, the overall clearance rate for the 299 homicides was 62.3 percent. However, an examination of clearance rates across Cleveland's 34 neighborhoods shows considerable variation. For example, the Clark-Fulton neighborhood had a clearance rate of 88.9 percent, while the Buckeye-Shaker Square neighborhood had a clearance rate of 28.6 percent.

Neighborhood-level Variables

To create composite measures at the neighborhood level, we conducted a factor analysis using varimax rotation on five neighborhood-level variables from the 2010 census: percent of female-headed households with children, percent of renter occupied housing units, percent of individuals below the poverty line, percent of households who moved in 2005 or later, and the unemployment rate. As shown in Figure 2, these five variables clearly loaded onto two separate factors. The female-headed households, poverty, and unemployment measures load onto one factor, which we labeled concentrated disadvantage. Rental housing units and mobility loaded on a separate factor, which we labeled residential instability.

Figure 2: Factor Analysis of Cleveland 2010 Census Variables after Varimax Rotation
Component

Variable	1	2
Percent of female-headed households with children	.813	.210
Percent below poverty line	.774	.430
Unemployment rate	.933	.020
Percent renter occupied units	.380	.903
Percent of households moved in 2005 or later	.052	.983
Percent variance explained	45.6	40.2

Time-to-Event Analysis

Figure 3 shows the basic ideas behind time-to-event analysis. The first line shows that 90 of the initial 299 homicides resulted in arrest within 2 days for a clearance rate of 30.1 percent. The second line starts with the 209 remaining cases with 56 arrests in the 2-14 day period for a closure rate of 26.7 percent. Particularly noteworthy is that no cases were closed in the 201-300 day period, and only 6 closed cases after 300 days.

Figure 3: Time-to-Event

Cases	Duration	Closed	Rate	Open
299	<2 days	90	30.1 %	209
209	2-14 days	56	26.7 %	153
153	15-100 days	22	14.4 %	131
131	101-200 days	13	10.0 %	118
118	201-300 days	0	0.0 %	118
118	>300 days	6	5.1 %	112
Overall		118	62.5 %	112

By calculating on a day-to-day basis, a more granular view emerges on time to event, as shown in Figure 4. Note that the graph starts high at the beginning, which reflects the large number of arrests in the first two weeks, and then the line rapidly decreases.

The last part of the presentation will show results from a parametric analysis for time to event.

References

Addington, L. A. (2006). Using National Incident-Based Reporting System murder data to evaluate clearance predictors. *Homicide Studies*, 10(2), 140-152.

Davis, R. C., Jensen, C.J. III, Butgertte, L., & Burnett, K. (2014). Working smarter on cold cases: Identifying factors associated with successful cold case investigations. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 59, 375-382.

Lee, C. (2005). The value of life in death: Multiple regression and event history analyses of homicide clearance in Los Angeles County. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(6), 527-534.

Litwin, K. J. (2004). A multilevel multivariate analysis of factors affecting homicide clearances. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 41(4), 327-351.

Litwin, K. J., & Xu, Y. (2007). The dynamic nature of homicide clearances: A multilevel model comparison of three time periods. *Homicide Studies*, 11(2), 94-114.

Lundman, R. J., & Myers, M. (2012). Explanations of homicide clearances: Do results vary dependent upon operationalization and initial (Time 1) and updated (Time 2) data? *Homicide Studies*, 16(1), 23-40.

McEwen, T. (2009). *Evaluation of the Phoenix Homicide Clearance Project*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

Peterson, J. L., Hickman, M. J., Strom, K. J., & Johnson, D. (2013). Effect of forensic evidence on criminal justice processing. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 58(S1), 78-90.

Peterson, J. L., Sommers, I., Baskin, D., & Johnson, D. (2010). The role and impact of forensic evidence in the criminal justice process. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/231977.pdf.

Puckett, J. L., & Lundman, R. J. (2003). Factors affecting homicide clearances: Multivariate analysis of a more complete conceptual framework. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(2), 171-193.

Regoeczi, W. C., Jarvis, J., & Riedel, M. (2008). Clearing murders: Is it about time? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 45, 142-162.

Roberts, A. (2007). Predictors of homicide clearance of arrest. *Homicide Studies*, 11(2), 82-93.

Wellford, C., & Cronin, J. (1999). *An analysis of variables affecting the clearance of homicides: A multistate study*. Retrieved from http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/reports/Clearance_of_Homicide.html.

Criminal Justice Outcomes for Offenders Involved in the Killing of Law Enforcement Officers

M. Dwayne Smith, Sondra J. Fogel, and Beth Bjerregaard

Introduction

This descriptive presentation contributes to a scarce literature addressing judicial outcomes for individuals involved in the killing of law enforcement officers who are in the commission of their duties. While the issue of the killing of law enforcement officers (usually referred to generically as "cop killing") has been considered broadly by a number of researchers, a sampling of that work finds that the focus has usually been on (1) temporal trends (e.g., Batton & Wilson, 2006; Quinet, Bordua, & Lassiter, 1997; Kaminski & Marvell, 2002); (2) attempts to develop a profile of cop killers and their victims, as well as the circumstances of the crime (see Bumbak, 2014; Chapman, 1986; 1998; Stone, 2015); and whether the availability of a death penalty can be associated with a reduction in cop killing within those jurisdictions (including Batton & Wilson, 2006; Bailey & Peterson, 1987; 1994; Moody, Marvel, & Kaminski, 2002).

While the extant literature, as well as an additional volume of works not cited here, has been useful in a better understanding of this particular type of homicide/murder, there has been no specific literature that systematically traces the judicial and/or extra-judicial outcomes for individuals involved in the killing of law enforcement officers. The study reported takes a step in that direction by determining the fates of individuals who were cited as being involved in the deaths of law enforcement officers in the state of North Carolina over the past four decades. This state was specifically selected because it allowed for additional analysis of those offenders for whom the death penalty was sought as those cases are included in the North Carolina Capital Sentencing Project (for a description, see Earl, Cochran, Smith, Fogel, & Bjerregaard, 2008).

Method

Our analysis focuses on offenders involved in the deaths of law enforcement officers in the state of North Carolina during the period June 1, 1977 through October 17, 2018. The former date marks the beginning of the contemporary practice of capital punishment in North Carolina; significantly, the killing of a law enforcement officer is an aggravating circumstance in North Carolina statutes that allows for seeking this sanction (note: this is true for all other states that practice capital punishment). The latter date is that of the last officer death meeting our criteria.

The source of information regarding officer deaths was the Officer Down Memorial webpage (https://www.odmp.org/). While it is impossible to verify the historical accuracy of this database, our experience is that virtually all cases of officer deaths, especially those under criminal circumstances, have been reported to this source during the selected period of study.

Several methodological issues were confronted in constructing the dataset for this analysis. First, the Officer Down Memorial webpage employs a fairly broad definition of those serving as law enforcement officers, and their coverage extends well beyond those serving as police officers. We opted to adopt that approach because North Carolina capital punishment statutes contain coverage of law enforcement officers, broadly defined, as ones for which the death penalty may be sought. Second, officer deaths that occurred in the course of vehicle pursuits in which the officer last control of his/her car, as well as traffic accidents resulting in the death of an officer in which the offender was at fault, were debated as appropriate cases to be included. A decision was made to include them in the interest of constructing a broad dataset that could accommodate the focus of future studies. Third, we also included those officers who were killed while not on official duty if they were attempting to intervene in a crime in progress or who were killed while in uniform at an off-duty detail. To reiterate, these decisions were an attempt to create an inclusive dataset that could be easily tailored to specific foci.

Using the criteria described, 109 offenders were identified as involved in the deaths of 106 law enforcement officers. Supplemental secondary data about each of these cases were gathered from newspaper stories, North Carolina Department of Corrections records, post-conviction appeals decisions, and internet searches. While there was extensive coverage of many cases, there were some, especially those prior to 1990 and those occurring in rural areas, in which coverage was limited. This resulted in some missing data, including one case for which the identity of the offender could not be determined. Utilizing the data collected, coding schemes were developed for various aspects of the cases as reflected in the discussions to follow.

Results

For readers who are interested, the specific law enforcement position of victims is shown in Table 1. As can be seen there, roughly half of victims were police officers, following by those serving with sheriff's departments. As a note, the three federal agents shown were included because their cases were adjudicated within the state.

The contexts in which officer deaths occurred are shown in Table 2. By far, officer deaths were most common when responding to a call for service, especially if domestic disputes are included in that count. As well, serving a warrant, along with traffic stops, are shown to be of some risk. Taken together, those four types constitute 76 (69.6%) of the circumstances under which offenders killed officers. Of note, 15 offenders were associated with officer deaths in an peripheral manner. That is, they were not the direct cause of the officer's death, but were either involved by fleeing from arrest (vehicle pursuit) during which the officer was killed or they were the driver in a vehicle accident that led to an officer's death, either by striking the officer's vehicle or hitting them with the vehicle. These are treated as distinct from cases where offenders directly rammed an officer's car or ran over him/her in an attempt to escape arrest.

Table 1. Law Enforcement Positions of Victims (N = 106)

Agency	n	%
Police Department	51	48.2
Sheriff's Department	30	28.3
Highway Patrol	10	9.4
Reserve Sheriff or Police	2	1.9
Corrections Officer	7	6.6
Wildlife & Fisheries Officer	3	2.8
Federal Agency Officer	3	2.8
Totals	106	100.0

Table 2. Context of Victim Deaths (N = 109 Offenders)

Circumstance	n	%
Responding, investigating, or coming onto crime scene	46	42.1
Responding to domestic disturbance	7	6.4
Serving warrant or summons	10	9.2
Traffic stop	13	11.9
Off duty detail	4	3.7
Off duty, intervened in crime or apprehension	4	3.7
Killed at home because of law enforcement position	4	3.7
Killed by incarcerated inmate	6	5.5
Killed during vehicle pursuit	10	9.2
Killed in traffic accident caused by offender	5	4.6
Totals	109	100.0

Moving to the specific topic of this presentation, what happened to the offenders is presented in Table 3. Broadly, the outcomes can be categorized into judicial and extra-judicial outcomes. Noting that nine cases are still pending an outcome, eight of which the death penalty may be pursued, the most common outcome is that the case was pursued capitally (death penalty sought), but the jury assigned a life sentence. While 16 death sentences were assessed, eight have been overturned or retried and the offender given life. Seven individuals remain on death row in North Carolina. Only one individual has been executed – in 1984 for the murders of two county sheriffs and one highway patrolman in a one-day spree of violence (Associated Press, 1984). Of note, he was the first person executed in North Carolina in the post-Furman/post-Gregg era.

Table 3. What Happened to the Offender? (n = 108*)

Outcome	n	%
Prosecuted capitally, received death, on Death Row	7	6.5
Executed	1	.9
Sentence overturned, received life at retrial	3	2.8
Sentence overturned, life sentence imposed	5	4.6
Prosecuted capitally, received life sentence	20	18.5
Non-capital, jury convicted 1st degree murder	2	1.9
Non-capital, jury convicted 2nd degree murder	6	5.6
Non-capital, jury convicted manslaughter	2	1.9
Offender pled guilty to 1st degree, received life	7	6.5
Offender pled guilty to 2nd degree	8	7.4
Offender pled guilty to manslaughter	3	2.8
Offender convicted of non-felony offense	11	10.2
Offender committed suicide	8	7.3
Offender killed at scene or being apprehended	13	11.9
Offender ruled incompetent to stand trial	3	2.8
Outcome still in progress or undetermined	9	8.3
Totals	108	100.0

*There was one case in which the identity, and thus the outcome, for the offender could not be determined.

Beyond being considered for the death penalty, 10 offenders were tried non-capitally, two of whom received life sentences while eight others were convicted of non-capital first-degree murder charges. Eighteen offenders avoided going to trial by pleading guilty to various levels of murder. Eleven offenders were convicted of non-felony offenses, usually in traffic pursuits and accidents, including some cases where surprisingly light sentences were assessed given that driver inebriation and/or gross negligence was involved.

A second set of outcomes did not involve judicial decisions. Notably, eight offenders committed suicide and 13 were killed at the crime scene or in a pursuit that followed. As a qualitative note, we were struck by the restraint showed by law enforcement officers in some cases where the suspect was captured, and hence did not fall into the latter category, even after a pitched gun battle.

For a more focused review of outcomes for offenders involved directly in the deaths of officers, and who ultimately were judicially processed, a reduced set of outcomes is presented in Table 4. Of those 64 offenders, 16 received a death sentence, though half of those were commuted to a life sentence. Twenty offenders (56% of those for which a death penalty was sought) received a life sentence at trial. It is of interest that in a recent study

addressing whether the killing of a law enforcement officer is more likely to receive a death sentence than in other death-penalty trials, Stewart, Cochran, Smith, Bjerregaard, & Fogel (2019) found that it does not when controlling for a host of other circumstances that are predictive of imposing that sanction.

Table 4. What Happened to Offenders Who Were Prosecuted for Murder (n = 64)

Outcome	n	%
Prosecuted capitally, received death, on Death Row	7	10.9
Executed	1	1.5
Sentence overturned, received life at retrial	3	4.7
Sentence overturned, life sentence imposed	5	7.8
[Received a death sentence from jury	16	25.0]
Prosecuted capitally, received life sentence	20	31.2
Non-capital, jury convicted 1st degree murder	2	3.1
Non-capital, jury convicted 2nd degree murder	6	9.4
Non-capital, jury convicted manslaughter	2	3.1
Offender pled guilty to 1st degree, received life	7	10.9
Offender pled guilty to 2nd degree	8	12.5
Offender pled guilty to manslaughter	3	4.7
Totals	64	100.0

Discussion

This study is necessarily descriptive in nature, and while providing an overview of outcomes for cop killers, it implicitly raises a number of questions. Perhaps most intriguing is why, in cases where a murder charge was brought, was a death sentence not pursued (e.g., a guilty plea accepted) or, alternatively, why juries returned a lower level of conviction than was originally sought by the prosecution. This issue is touched on by Stewart at al. (2019), but deserves further exploration. Because this requires an in-depth analysis of these cases, this would require a project of considerable challenge, especially those cases occurring 20 years or more ago.

For the most part, one impression to emerge is that the killing of law enforcement officers, in and of itself, does not necessarily signal the likelihood of an enhanced sanction for an offender. It is not clear that the public views "cop killing" as a special case that deserves an enhanced sanction, though the presence of an aggravating circumstance to cover this type of murder in all states that utilize capital punishment would seem to suggest that possibility. More research on this topic, would be revealing to any number of parties. Importantly, it is necessary to replicate the essence of this study across a variety of states to see whether the patterns described here are unique to North Carolina, or are in fact in line with national or even regional patterns of sanctioning of those who kill law enforcement officers.

References

Associated Press. (1984). North Carolina man executed in deaths of 3 police officers. *New York Times*. Available on-line: https://www.nytimes.com/1984/03/16/us/north-carolina-man-executed-in-deaths-of-3-police-officers.html.

Bailey, W. C., & Peterson, R. D. (1987). Police killings and capital punishment: The post-Furman era. *Criminology*, 25, 1-26.

Bailey, W. C. & Peterson, R. D. (1994). Murder, capital punishment, and deterrence: A review of the evidence and an examination of police killings. *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 53-74.

Batton, C., & Wilson, S. (2006). Police murders: An examination of historical trends in the killing of law enforcement officers in the United States, 1947-1988. *Homicide Studies*, 10, 79-97.

Bumbak, A. R. (2014). *Profiling cop-killers*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Chapman, S. G. (1986). *Cops, killers, and staying alive: The murder of police officers in America*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Chapman, S. G. (1998). Murdered on duty: *The killing of police officers in America* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Earl, J. C., Cochran, J. K., Fogel, S. J., and Bjerregaard, B. (2008). Racial bias and the death penalty. In M. J. Lynch, E. B, Patterson, & K, Childs (Eds.), *Racial divide: Race, ethnicity, and criminal justice* (pp. 147-196). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Kaminiski, R. J, & Marvell, T. B. (2002). A comparison of changes in police and general homicides: 1930-1998. *Criminology*, 40, 171-190.

Quinet, K. D., Bordua, D. J., & Lassiter, W. (1997). Line of duty police deaths: A paradoxical trend in felonious homicides in the United States. *Policing and Society*, 6, 283-296.

Moody, C. E., Marvel, T. B., & Kaminiski, R. J. (2002). *Unintended consequences: Three-strikes laws and the murders of police officers*. (NCJRS #203649). Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Stewart, B., Cochran, J. K., Smith, M. D., Bjerregaard, B., & Fogel, S. J. (2019). Cop killers and the death penalty: An exploratory mixed methods analysis, North Carolina (1977-2009). *Journal of Crime and Justice*. Advance on-line publication: https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2019.1583595.

Is There Evidence of Racial Disparity in Police Use of Deadly Force? Analyses of Officer-Involved Fatal Shootings in 2015–2016

William Terrill

Abstract

Is there evidence of a Black–White disparity in death by police gunfire in the United States? This is commonly answered by comparing the odds of being fatally shot for Blacks and Whites, with odds benchmarked against each group's population proportion. However, adjusting for population values has questionable assumptions given the context of deadly force decisions. We benchmark 2 years of fatal shooting data on 16 crime rate estimates. When adjusting for crime, we find no systematic evidence of anti-Black disparities in fatal shootings, fatal shootings of unarmed citizens, or fatal shootings involving misidentification of harmless objects. Exposure to police given crime rate differences likely accounts for the higher per capita rate of fatal police shootings for Blacks, at least when analyzing all shootings. For unarmed shootings or misidentification shootings, data are too uncertain to be conclusive.

Introduction

One of the most pressing topics capturing public attention is racial disparity in officer-involved shootings. In this article, we argue for more reasonable benchmarks to compare fatal shooting rates across racial groups, allowing for a new understanding of whether racial disparity exists in fatal officer–involved shootings. First, we question the traditional benchmark used to study racial disparity and describe why claims of racial bias based on this benchmark can be misleading. Second, we show that analyses based on more appropriate benchmarks reveal no evidence of systematic anti-Black disparity in police fatal shootings at the national level.

Calculating Racial Disparity in Fatal Police Shootings

The most common means of testing for racial disparity in police use of deadly force is to compare the odds of being fatally shot for Blacks to the odds of being fatally shot for Whites (The Counted, 2016; Gabrielson, Jones, & Sagara, 2014). Calculating the odds for each group involves comparing the group's raw shooting numbers against each group's overall representation in the population. Blacks represent ~13% of the U.S. population; if Blacks represent more than ~13% of U.S. citizens shot, this is taken as evidence of racial disparity. Such a calculation answers the question: "given the population proportions of each race, are Blacks more likely to be fatally shot than Whites?"

The challenge with benchmarking an outcome against population proportions is that this carries with it a critical assumption: The opportunity for the event to occur is equally likely for every person within each group. In terms of understanding racial disparities in death by police gunfire, adjusting raw shooting values by population proportions necessarily requires that White and Black citizens are equally likely to occupy situations in which deadly force is

used. If this assumption does not hold, then adjusting raw fatal shooting data for overall population values is in error. If different groups are more or less likely to occupy those situations in which police might use deadly force, then a more appropriate benchmark as a means of testing for bias in officer decision making is the number of citizens within each race who occupy those situations during which police are likely to use deadly force. One cannot experience a policing outcome without exposure to police, and if exposure rates differ across groups, then the correct benchmark is on those exposure rates.

Method

We present an analysis of the odds of being killed by police gunfire for Blacks versus Whites, benchmarked against measures of criminal activity for each race. Data on fatal police shootings are compiled across a 2-year period, 2015–2016, taken from The Guardian's online database (The Counted, 2016). This database is more complete than official federal databases; police departments underreport to the federal government by ~50% (Klinger, Rosenfeld, Isom, & Deckard, 2016; Nix et al., 2017). We analyze all fatal shootings, fatal shootings in which citizens were unarmed and not aggressing against police, and fatal shootings involving misidentification of a harmless object for a weapon. As actual crime rates cannot be known for certain, they must be approximated or inferred from some measure. We estimate criminal activity of Blacks and Whites from four sources: (1) the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI's) Summary Report System (SRS), (2) the FBI's National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), (3) the Bureau of Justice Statistics' National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), and (4) the Centers for Disease Control's (CDC) WONDER database.

Results

All Fatal Police Shootings

Between 2015 and 2016, 1,051 Whites and 510 Blacks were killed by police gunfire. Benchmarking these fatal police shooting data on U.S. Census population values, the odds ratio for Blacks relative to Whites is 2.5. However, when fatal shooting data are benchmarked against the number of murder/nonnegligent manslaughter reports and arrests, the odds ratio obtained when benchmarking against population proportions flips completely. For instance, the odds were 2.7 times higher for Whites to be killed by police gunfire relative to Blacks given each group's SRS homicide reports, 2.6 times higher for Whites given each group's SRS homicide arrests, 2.9 times higher for Whites given each group's NIBRS homicide reports, 3.9 times higher for Whites given each group's NIBRS homicide arrests, and 2.5 times higher for Whites given each group's CDC death by assault data. A similar pattern emerges when we benchmark fatal police shooting data by violent crime arrests, as well as when benchmarking on weapons violation data. In nearly every case, we found that Whites were either more likely to be fatally shot by police or police showed no significant disparity in either direction. Although Blacks have greater odds of being fatally shot given population proportions, Whites overall were more likely to be fatally shot given each group's involvement in those situations where the police may be more likely to use deadly force.

Fatal Police Shootings of Unarmed Citizens, With No Citizen Aggression

Between 2015 and 2016, 62 Whites and 40 Blacks were killed by police gunfire while unarmed and not aggressing against police. The odds were 3.3 times higher for unarmed Black citizens to be killed by police gunfire given population proportions. However, consistent with the analyses on all fatal shootings, none of the benchmarks on crime revealed substantial anti-Black disparity in fatal police shootings of unarmed citizens as officers either showed no meaningful disparity in either direction or, if anything, an overall pattern of anti-White disparity.

Fatal Police Shootings of Unarmed Citizens Reaching for or Holding an Object

Between 2015 and 2016, 26 Whites and 19 Blacks were shot and killed while reaching for or holding a harmless object. Odds were 3.7 times higher for Blacks relative to Whites to be fatally shot given population proportions. Consistent with the findings reported above, none of the benchmarks on crime rates revealed consistent anti-Black disparity in being fatally shot while reaching for/holding a harmless object. There was no evidence of systematic anti-Black disparity in fatal police shootings when those decisions are in response to the misidentification of a harmless object or movement by the citizen

Conclusion

At the national level, we find little evidence within these data for systematic anti-Black disparity in fatal police deadly force decisions. We do not discount the role race may play in individual police shootings; yet to draw on bias as the sole reason for population-level disparities is unfounded when considering the benchmarks presented here. We hope this research demonstrates the importance of unpacking the underlying assumptions inherent to using benchmarks to test for outcome disparities.

References

Gabrielson, R., Jones, R. G., & Sagara, E. (2014). Deadly force, in black and white: A *Pro Publica* analysis of killings by police shows outsize risk for young black males. *Pro Publica*. Available on-line: https://www.propublica.org/article/deadly-force-in-black-and-white.

Klinger, D., Rosenfeld, R. R., Isom, D., & Deckard, M. (2016). Race, crime, and the micro-ecology of deadly force. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 15, 193–222.

Nix, J., Campbell, B. A., Byers, E. H., & Alpert, G. P. (2017). A bird's eye view of civilians killed by police in 2015: Further evidence of implicit bias. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 16, 309–340.

The Counted. (2016). *The Guardian*. Available on-line: https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/ng-interactive/2015/jun/01/the-counted-police-killings-us-database.

Stone, M. (2015). Men who kill policemen. *Violence and Gender*, 2, 87-97.

2019 HRWG Meeting Participants

Kat Albrecht	Kat.Albrecht@nlaw.northwestern.edu
Beth Bjerregaard	bebjerre@uncc.edu
Becky Block	crblock@rcn.com
Dick Block	crblock@rcn.com
Burt Burraston	bburston@memphis.edu
Bre Butler	bbutler1@augusta.edu
Rachel Condry	Rachel.condry@st.-hildas.ox.ac.uk
Jay Corzine	jay.corzine@ucf.edu
Kim Davies	kdavies1@augusta.edu
Madelyn Diaz	Madelyn.diaz@knights.ucf.edu
Dallas Drake	dallas.drake@homicidecenter.org
Ketty Fernandez	kfernandez1@knights.ucf.edu
Kate Fitz-Gibbon	Kate.FitzGibbon@monash.edu
Sondra Fogel	sfogel@usf.edu
James Alan Fox	jfox@northeastern.edu
Yasmin Hall	Yasmin.hall.2030@gmail.ucf.edu
Shila Hawk	shawk@ars.corp.com
Kathleen Heide	kheide@usf.edu
Kari Holt	holtkari@msu.edu
James Hubbell	jhubble1@mail.usf.edu
Richard Hough	rhough@uwf.edu
Lin Huff-Corzine	lin.huff-corzine@ucf.edu
Meredith Ille	mille@uco.edu
Courtney Kalmanson	ckalmanson2018@my.fit.edu
Norair Khachatryan	norairk@mail.usf.edu
Donna King	donna.king@knights.ucf.edu
Ashley Mancik	amancik@udel.edu
Angel Madden	acrews1@memphis.edu
Traccy Martins	traccymartins@knights.ucf.edu
Jeanna Mastrocinque	mastrocinque@rown.edu
Kimberly McCorkle	Kmccorkle@uwf.edu
James McCutcheon	jcmcctch@memphis.edu
Tom McEwen	tommcewen@aol.com
Courtney Miles	Caroline.Miles@manchester.ac.uk
Noe Morales	Nm30@students.uwf.edu
Karissa Pelletier	kpelliti@asu.edu
Grainne Perkins	perkinsgrain@seattleu.edu
Jesenia M. Pizarro-Terrill	jeseniampizarro@gmail.com
Michael Planty	mplanty@rti.org

Wendy Regoeczi	w.regoeczi@csuohio.edu
Amber Scherer	amber.scherer@gmail.com
Matt Segal	mattsegal44@knights.ucf.edu
Dwayne Smith	mdsmith8@usf.edu
Eldra Solomon	epbsolomon@aol.com
Sonya Spence	Sspence8@knights.ucf.edu
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller	mjttzlff@memphis.edu
William Terrill	wcterrill@gmail.com
Kayla Toohy	krtoohy@knights.ucf.edu
Pawel Waszkiewicz	p.waszkiewicz@wpia.uw.edu.pl
Stephen Watts	sjwatts@memphis.edu
Greg Weaver	weavegs@auburn.edu
Mark A. Winton	Mark.Winton@ucf.edu
April Zeoli	zeoli@msu.edu

2018-2019 HRWG Committees

Steering Committee
Kim Davies
Richard Hough
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller
Dallas Drake
Candice Batton
John Jarvis
Greg Weaver
Jay Corzine
Jolene Vincent

Publications
Madelyn Diaz
Ketty Fernandez
Jesenia Pizarro

Site Selection
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller
Ketty Fernandez

Wendy Ringgenberg
Jay Corzine
Candice Batton

Nominations and Elections
Shila Hawk
Wendy Ringgenberg
Kat Albrecht

Membership
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller
Kim Davies
Dick Block

Richard Block Award
Wendy Regoeczi
Kat Albrecht

2019 Annual Program
Greg Weaver
Jay Corzine
Jesenia Pizarro
Shila Hawk

ASC Coordination
Greg Weaver
Shila Hawk

Communications
Dallas Drake
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller
James Alan Fox
Ellen Cohn
Madelyn Diaz

Marketing
Melissa Tetzlaff-Bemiller
Lin Huff-Corzine

Carolyn Rebecca Block Award
John Jarvis
Becky Block
Dallas Drake

Practitioners
Amber Scherer
Kimberly McCorkle
Richard Hough

Student Committee
Kayla Toohy
Kat Albrecht
Nik Lampe