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The research that examines female homicide offenders goes litt­le further than investigating whether or not offenders were pre­viously victimized by those whom they kill. This research project is designed to contribute to this extant body of literature and theory in two ways. The first is to add and provide a comprehen­sive picture of African-American and white female homicide offenders in intimate versus non-intimate relationships in homicidal events. The second manner of contribution lies in the testing of a creative and integrative theoretical model. This model addresses race, under­class context, alcohol use, social disorganization and prior arrest record of female homicide offenders in intimate versus non-intimate person killings. 

This research employs a secondary analysis of homicide data for the jurisdiction of Chicago from 1980 through 1995. Bivariate and multivariate techniques are utilized in order to develop and test the fuller picture and model of African-American and white women who kill. The results indicate that race of the offenders is not the only variable tied to the occurrence of an intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide. Other factors that mediate the
race effects are found in considerations surrounding such variables as underclass context and prior arrest record of the victim. And more specifically, that race of the offender may not be the best predictor of intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide. Past interpretations underscore the significance of investigating the multiple mediating factors that help to understand African-American and white women homicide offenders. It is in this light that recommendations for future research are offered by way of conclusion.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Homicide is any killing of a human being by another human being: most commonly used to refer to an unlawful homicide such as murder and manslaughter. The destruction of the life of one human being by the act, agency, procurement or culpable omission of another. The destruction of life must be complete by such act or agency; but although the injury which caused death might not, under other circumstances, have proved fatal, yet if such injury be the cause of death, without it appearing that there has been any gross neglect or improper treatment by some person other than the defendant... it would be homicide. (Gifis, 1991, p. 221).

Lethal violence in the United States is "a predominantly male phenomenon" (Browne & Williams, 1993, p. 78). Because of the frequent occurrence of male violence, most criminological research studies have tended to focus on male offenders and victims. Very few studies explore the topic of women and homicide "beyond their status of female homicide victims" (Johnson, 1996, p. 207).

Unfortunately, the study of male homicide offenders has overshadowed any focus on women offenders, creating a research arena with little clear knowledge of the causes of female homicide offending (Ogle, Katkin & Bernard, 1995). One of the major problems thwarting the formation of alternative theoretical explanations may be that studies have included both male and female subjects, thus submerging differences and increasing the lack of clarity of the subject matter. There is a need for a separate explanation of female homicidal behavior. As a result of the lack of separation be-
tween male and female homicide offenders, previous research may mask causes and explanations specific to women. Yet, there well may be unique motives and distinctive characteristics pertaining to homicides committed by females.

Besides clarity of female homicide offenders, the second major division in research regarding causes of homicide relates to the impact of race on homicide offending. Homicide in the United States is especially prevalent among certain racial and ethnic groups. Regardless of this, the research literature becomes extremely limited when examining race, and female homicide offenders. One racial group seems to dominate in the female homicide research, this is African-American females. Mann (1990b) argues that in "every study where racial proportions of female committed murders or murderers were known, black women predominated" (pp. 180-181).

The third major division in the homicide literature concerns the prevalence of intimate partner homicide cases versus non-intimate homicide cases. Emerging from the research literature on female homicide offenders, which will be elaborated upon in Chapter II and III, is the salience of intimate or partner (versus non-intimate) homicide. Research indicates that the victim-offender relationship may unlock the mystery of why women kill.

Also evident in the research, and elaborated upon in Chapter II and III, are other correlates to female homicide: race and sex of the offender, weapon choice, prior arrest, offender and victim age and alcohol use. What is problematic in this research is that the
studies are usually only descriptive. Because of this, the research fails to test competing and/or complementary theories of female homicide offending.

Based upon the three major divisions described above, the present study seeks to accomplish two goals. The first goal is to provide a comprehensive profile of the African-American and white female offender. Because of the disparity in the rate of African-American (versus white) homicide offending, this study only examines African-American and white female homicide offenders. In other words, this research excludes other racial/ethnic groups of women. This choice is justified on two bases. The first is that African-American "women rank second in frequency of arrest for murder and non-negligent homicide in the United States" (Mann, 1990a, p. 76). Because of their prevalence of African-American women as homicide offenders, there is a need to understand the reasons underlying the higher occurrence of African-American female homicides in contrast to these women's white counterpart. The second justification is that the addition of white women enhances this study by providing a group for comparison to the African-American woman offender. Other women may warrant attention, but the inclusion of additional groups may diminish attention from the African-American and white female homicide offenders.

Because of the disparity in the proportion of African-American and white female homicide behavior, there is a need for a separate examination of the African-American versus white female homi-
cidual behavior in relationship to intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide. The question becomes is race the only correlate with female homicide behavior, or is some alternative correlate (or set of correlates) the key to the occurrence of intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide? Additional research on the African-American and white female homicide offenders is important. Good research can uncover the causes of the numerous homicides committed by African-American and white women both.

There is a need to clarify the different dynamics of female homicidal behavior when examining African-American and white female homicide offenders. More specifically, research that is inclusive of race, as well as underclass context of female homicide offending is direly needed to explore the impact of previously relevant variables.

The second goal of this research is to test a theoretical model addressing race, and the underclass context of female homicide offending. This model is based on the prominent work of Wilson (1987, 1996), Ogle, et al. (1995) and Sally S. Simpson (1991). Ogle, et al. (1995) design a theory that provides a single explanation of violence by women in different settings. This theory contributes to the research model in addressing the gender and underclass issues. Wilson's (1987) work, which is a component of the Ogle et al. (1995) model, delineates further the underclass context component. Simpson's (1991) focuses on a theory of inclusivity that incorporates race, class and gender begin in helping to fill out a model. Simp-
son’s (1991) focus highlights the distinctions between the African-American and white female. The combined work of the three perspectives will be elaborated upon in Chapter II. The noteworthy point here is that developing a combined theoretical perspective will facilitate addressing female homicidal behavior committed by African-American women in comparison to white women. The use of all three of these theories will enable the researcher to examine the importance of race vis-à-vis the noted alternative variables to better understand the occurrence of intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide.

In order to engage in the assessment of intimate versus non-intimate homicide committed by African-American and white female offenders, this research will examine a dataset on homicides committed in Chicago between 1980-1995. Carolyn Rebecca Block originally collected the data. The present study is a secondary analysis of this research. The present study is a secondary analysis of this research. The analyses are designed to address two primary objectives. The first is to produce a comprehensive portrait of African-American and white female homicidal behavior. The second objective is to assess the relative significance of race in light of other notes variables of influence in an integrated, comprehensive theoretical model of women who kill intimate versus non-intimate parties.

The presentation of this research is divided in eight chapters. A review of the theoretical explanations is provided in Chap-
Chapter II. The theoretical explanations of African-American and white female homicide offenders are discussed in the context of male and female homicide offenders considered jointly in the literature, and then in the context of female homicide offenders when considered singly in the literature. Chapter III focuses on the descriptive studies and empirical tests of theories of the African-American and white female homicide offender. Chapter IV describes the present study, articulating hypotheses that emerge from the previous theoretical (Chapter II) and empirical (Chapter III) literature. Chapter V defines the methods and analytic techniques used in this study. The methods section of this chapter begins with a description of the data set used in this study, along with a specific discussion of how the data are organized and analyzed. The analysis section defines the variables and procedure of the bivariate analysis and the multivariate analysis, respectively. Chapter VI offers analysis of the tabular data to answer the research questions identified in Chapter IV. Chapter VII offers analysis of the multivariate model to answer the question identified in Chapter IV. Finally, Chapter VII provides a summary and discussion of the findings of this study. The final chapter goes on to offer a conclusion, along with some recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

THEORIES OF FEMALE HOMICIDE

This chapter reviews the existing explanations of homicidal behavior among women. The theories are the following: subculture theories; gender role theory; the liberation hypothesis; the battered woman syndrome; the self-defense model; the interconnected nature of race, class and gender; and a theory of female homicidal behavior. Many of the early and present attempts to explain homicidal behavior of females have been based on the joint examination of male and female homicide offender's samples.

Theoretical Explanations of Female Homicide Offending

Subculture Theories

Subculture of Violence

The classical theoretical explanation of homicidal behavior is based on a study by Wolfgang (1958). One of the most pivotal perspectives that emerged from Wolfgang's (1958) work was the subculture of violence theory. He defines the subculture of violence as a subculture that differs from middle-class value systems in that personal assaults are not defined as wrong or antisocial (Wolfgang, 1958). Personal assaults are so prevalent within the subculture that they are viewed as a normal part of daily life (Wolfgang,
1958). The subculture of violence theory was more fully developed in the work of Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967). Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) state that "there is a potent theme of violence current in the cluster of values that make up the life-style, the socialization process, the interpersonal relationships of individuals living in similar conditions" (p. 140). The subculture of violence theory has seven propositions (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967).

The first is that the subculture of violence group does not only express violence, but has "interlocking value elements shared with the dominant culture" (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967, p. 158). Violent aggression is the predominant mode of expression that distinguishes the two groups, but the degree and extent of violence used by both the larger society and the subcultural group are the variables that determine the subculture. The second proposition is that the existence of a subculture does not demand that the members share the same basic value system to express violence in all situations (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967). Homicides occur in a variety of situations, and members of the subcultural group do not engage in violence constantly. If the individuals did engage in violence constantly, there would be no normal functioning of the subculture. These authors recognize this, but also stress that carrying and using weapons for protection symbolize the willingness to participate in violence, the expectation of violence, and the need to be ready for retaliation.

The third proposition, the zeal to engage in violence in a
variety of situations, illustrates the penetrative nature of the cultural theme (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967). The varied situations in which individual employs violence can be correlated to the extent the individual has assimilated that particular cultural value system. The third proposition examines the "psychological dimensions in measuring adherence to a subculture of violence" (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967, p. 159). The fourth proposition is that the "subcultural ethos of violence may be shared by all ages in a sub-society, but this ethos is most prominent in a limited age group, ranging from late adolescence to middle age" (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967, p. 159). All members may share the same values, but the spirit of the belief system and high rates of violence are concentrated in the late adolescent to middle age group. The fifth proposition is that "the opposite of this group would be a non-violent group" (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967, p. 160). Membership, in any group, is dependent on the maintenance of expectations and obligations of the group. And when a member does not fulfill the obligations of the group, they are ostracized and separated from the group. Thus, the opposite of a violent group, in this scenario, would be a non-violent group.

The sixth proposition is that the development of an approving perspective of violence "involves exposure to learned behavior in a process of differential learning, association or identification" (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967, p. 160). Individuals are not equally exposed to all subcultural themes. Therefore the individual must not only be exposed to the themes, but s/he must also learn the be-
behavior associated with the theme. Lastly, violence is not necessarily defined as inappropriate in the subgroup, and, as a result, "the perpetrator may not deal with feelings of guilt" (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967, p. 161). Violence becomes a part of every day life. Other members of the subcultural group reinforce this subcultural theme. Therefore, the members do not view the behavior as inappropriate and usually do not have feelings of guilt concerning forms of aggression.

If Wolfgang and Ferracuti's (1962) assertions were correct, it would seem that African-American women would commit homicides because they are a part of the subculture of violence. This point is illustrated by their higher rates of homicide offending than white women. However, the theory does not account for variations among gender, and racial/ethnic groups. For example, the theory does not account for variations among Black and white women and men. According to Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967), the higher rate of homicides could be attributed to African-American women and men's differential (greater) exposure to violent aggression in the subculture. Following Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967), how can you then account for the prevalence of white female homicides? They do have an occurrence of female homicide offending, but not as high as African-American women. Who is part of the subculture? Is it African-American women, men, white men, white women, or who?

Numerous criminologists have disagreed with the subculture of violence theory. Hawkins (1985), for example, finds the following
major weaknesses in the subculture of violence theory. The first is that the theory lacks empirical grounding. The second is that the theory assumes that the individual's attitudes are a perfect replication of the subculture, and that exposure to the learned behavior combined with an attitude transformation produces an individual taking on or changing his or her definitions favorable or unfavorable to deviance. The third is that this theory ignores structural, situational and institutional variables that may explain interpersonal violence. This may be especially problematic when examining blacks and the historical changes over time, which may be instrumental in explaining higher rates of violence among African-Americans.

The fourth is that the theory underemphasizes the impact of "modes of deterrence" (law enforcement, law, etc.) on the pattern of homicides (Hawkins, 1985, pp. 93-94). The modes of deterrence alone may impact the pattern of criminal behavior. Last, the theory does not include the impact of economic factors. According to Hawkins (1985), the theory postulates that economic "factors are said to determine the contours and boundaries of a given subculture," but the theory does not specify economic factors that correlate with black and white homicides (p. 94).

Wolfgang (1958) articulated one of the first theories of homicide. However, because of the theory's flaws, Hawkins (1985) expressed the need and urgency for a new alternative to the subculture of violence theory. This point will be elaborated on in Chapter
III. However, an alternative to the subculture of violence theory that does also exist is the subculture of hopelessness theory.

Subculture of Hopelessness

Mann (1990b) developed an alternative to the subculture of violence theory as an explanation for the high prevalence of homicidal behavior among African-American women. African-American women are second only to African-American men among those arrested for homicide. Mann (1990b) analyzed numerous perspectives ranging from economic theory to sentencing outcome perspectives, searching for a theoretical alternative to the "subculture of violence" (p. 198) explanation for homicidal behavior among African-American women. Mann (1990b) criticized the subculture of violence perspective for its lack of empirical support and concluded that for African-American women the issue is not a "subculture of violence," but a "subculture of hopelessness" (p. 198). Mann (1990b) defines the plight of lower class African-American women as the following:

Their fierce independence, their tendency to batter or to kill when battered and their almost insurmountable economic obstacles represent a constant struggle. By the time these women reach age 30 or more, they feel the full impact of the hopelessness of their lives. When the last straw is broken, they finally strike back at the closest living representative of their plight. (p. 198)

According to this theory, poor African-American women kill their intimate partners because of their frustration and hopelessness. Unlike the subculture of violence theory, this theory specifically addresses poor, African-American female homicidal behavior.
but falls short of explaining poor white female homicidal behavior. Based upon both Mann (1990b) and Wolfgang (1958), it seems impossible for individuals to deviate from the culture or subculture to which they have been exposed. Thus, there can only be deviant groups or cultures, not deviant individuals. There are no individual or independent sources of variation in either one of these theories, beyond exposure to the subgroup and incorporation of the learned violence, which results in criminal behavior. However the importance of gender, for both Black and white women, may be an alternative variable that dictates the likelihood of a homicide, particularly an intimate partner homicide, as will be discussed in the next section.

Gender Role Theory

What is gender? What does it mean to be feminine or masculine? Gould (1997) defines two key points in the definition of gender.

First, it can be distinguished from the idea of a biologically determined nature or essence that is fixed by genetic structure. This is most often identified as a difference between gender and sex. Second, the idea of gender differences may be contrasted with the notion of a universal human nature or with a focus on human beings where this transcends any specific differences among individuals. (p. xvii)

Gender roles are defined "as those expected attitudes and behaviors which a society associates with each sex" (Lindsey, 1997, p. 3). The terms gender roles and sex roles are used interchangeably here. For this discussion, the terms are also used interchangeably in the context of a non-biological interpretation.
Traditionally in society, women have been characterized as passive, dependent and emotionally expressive in comparison to men who are active, instrumental and aggressive (Weitzman, 1975). These feminine and masculine characteristics are a result of gender-role socialization. Gender role socialization focuses on behavioral aspects of being a woman or a man rather than biological differences between males and females. The process of gender-role socialization starts and continues throughout the individual's life and facilitates the process of learning age-specific sex-role behaviors (Weitzman, 1975). The media, adults and other social institutions provide explicit instructions on proper behavior to reinforce gender role appropriate behaviors (Weitzman, 1975).

One of the early works to outline sex roles in criminal activity is the work of Hoffman-Bustamante (1973). She describes five factors that operate differently among the sexes in criminal activity:

1. Varying role expectation and socialization patterns; 2. Application of social control based on the sex of the individual; 3. Varying opportunities to commit particular offenses based on the individual's gender; 4. Sex variations in terms of access to criminal subcultures and careers; and 5. Offenses in the legal system is classified relative to sex role differences. (pp. 117-136).

The following section elaborates on the five factors. Society may have embraced the unisex treatment of men and women in some ways, but the "traditional separation of the sexes through gender socialization is the American mode" (Mann, 1975, p. 99). For example, girls and women receive attention and praise for their at-
tractiveness, while boy and men are respected for their achievements and cleverness (Weitzman, 1975). A byproduct of gender role socialization is a form of social control that operates differently for men and women in the home. Women are more closely supervised than men, "witnessed in the fact that males are permitted to violate certain conventional standards for which females would be censured, such as getting drunk or fighting back if challenged" (Mann, 1975, p. 99).

The gender role of women defines them as wives and mothers and restricts their access to experiences beyond the home. In committing crimes, the individual must have access to the tools and training in the (inappropriate) behavior, usually obtained from the criminal subcultural group. The socialization process limits the individual's skills and their access to criminal subcultures and careers. Therefore, because of their gender, women only possess certain skills and can be members of certain subcultures. Because of their lack of skills and training, women rather than men can only commit certain types of crimes. According to Hoffman-Bustamante (1973), women do not have the skills needed to execute the task of a burglary as a result of the restriction of their gender, hence the need for an accomplice. Lastly, Hoffman-Bustamante (1973) states that certain crimes are associated with certain genders. For example, rape is associated with men and prostitution is associated with women.

Based on this theory, women would commit crimes that are consistent with their gender roles, such as lesser property crimes.
and prostitution. This theory attributes women's choice of crimes to their skills as a result of their gender. However, the theory could only attribute violent behavior among women to their non-socialization to appropriate gender role expectations within society or their subcultural group. What is lacking in the theory then is how women gain the skills and tools to commit violent crimes based upon the restrictions of their gender. The theory also falls short of explaining intra-gender variations in criminal offending by race and class. For example, variation differences of crime rates exist between Black and white women. As a result of this difference, do African-American women have greater access than white women to the skills and training to commit violent crime because of their race?

This theory also ignores the fact that gender-role standards vary across racial and ethnic groups and by social class (Weitzman, 1975). African-American women are socialized to be independent and self-sufficient in the social structure. This theory falls short in accounting for the African-American women's perception of the self, based on their particular socialization and culture. Also important in this argument is the issue of the patriarchal society as a fundamental foundation of societal organization. A patriarchal society is defined as a society "in which the rights and privileges of males are superior and those of female are subordinated" (Akers, 1997, p. 190). For women, the occurrence of certain acts is conceivably confounded with the opportunity to engage in them. This is relevant to gender differences in crime. Therefore, it seems appropriate to
widen the search to include valid measures of the construction of gender opportunities as they relate to culture and socialization.

Liberation Hypothesis

The liberation hypothesis is based on the work of Adler (1975). She discusses the rise in women's crime and women's assertiveness as possible side effects of the women's liberation movement. Adler (1975) argues that women have become equal to men in most fields, including illegitimate fields. Adler (1979) states that the transformation is due not just to the liberation movement, but a "new feminism" that affects all women.

The new feminism pertains to women who may deny any sympathy for the formalized action, but who have recently secured their first job since marriage or decided to go back to school. It applies to women who staunchly defend their right to be feminine, and their right to define feminine as a variety of human rather than as a complement of masculine. They are standing up and speaking without apology at parent-teacher meetings, they are organizing demonstrations, walking picket lines, and influencing decisions at all levels of their community. It includes nuns who are asking for rights more closely aligned with the rights which priests enjoy, and the housewives who have come to expect their husbands to share more of the duties of the home. It also means sexually honest women who expect the same orgasmic satisfaction as men, and who are requiring that men do something about it. (p. 92)

Women can also take their place as fully liberated felons. According to Adler (1975), both (legitimate and illegitimate) women realize the confines of being "feminine" (p. 15). Adler (1975) states that a "new breed exists in society, and that female criminality may be approaching the level of male criminality" (p. 1). Her work echoes and endorses women's desire to commit crime as an ex-
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pression of masculinity. According to Adler, crime becomes a pursuit because it has been traditionally the territory of men (Naf- fine, 1987). The basic proposition is that as social change occurs to advance both men and women in all arenas, criminality will not be different. Women and men will become similar in their delinquency in all levels of the criminal justice system.

There appears to be a blatant neglect of the differences between women with this theory. Adler (1967) seems to generalize the occurrence of women's involvement in criminality, and gloss over differences among women. Cole (1995) sums up the reason for recognizing differences by way of a question: "If you see one woman, have you seen them all?" (p. 148). This theory ignores differences among women and herein does not address any race or class issues. Adler (1975) attributes different rates of criminal behavior between African-American and white women to their varying levels of liberation. Adler (1975) states that African-American women were thrust into a masculine role of dominance because of the changing social structure of the African-American community. She states the following for the African-American female:

expediency not aspirations, necessity not preference thrust this upon her many years ago when circumstances coerced her out of the traditional American female role of submissiveness and compelled her into the masculine role of dominance. (p. 140)

As a result of this transformation, the African-American women allegedly took on male characteristics. Again according to this theory, women's liberation leads to criminal behavior. Thus, Afri-
can-American women were liberated sooner than white women and consequently engaged in higher rates of homicidal behavior. Adler (1975) even goes on to say that African-American women reached for the moon and grasped the dark side.

This theory has not been supported by empirical research. Smart's (1979) critique of this "new female criminal" theory illustrates that the theory is based on a statistical illusion caused by the smallness of the database. Closer interpretation of the statistics shows that the rates of female criminality remained small. "For example, between 1965 and 1975 there has been an increase of 500 percent in murder by women; the absolute figure for 1965 was one and for 1975 it was five" (Smart, 1979, p. 53). Therefore, based on the findings as presented by Smart, the percentage was low, so any type of increase would give the illusion of a large increase. Women, regardless of race, are not taking over or catching up to men as violent criminals.

To sum up the theoretical review thus far, Wolfgang (1958) laid the groundwork with the subculture of violence theory. Mann (1990b) introduced the concept of the subculture of hopelessness, but the theory is not applicable to explaining the homicidal behavior of poor white women. The gender-role perspective filled in gender gaps but ignored racial and class issues. Lastly, Adler's (1975) work questions the formation of gender but also ignores racial and class issues. What is very prevalent in the research literature so far is the lack of connection of variables and the
neglect of intimate partner relationships in relation to homicide.

According to more recent research, women have a higher likelihood of committing intimate partner homicide than non-intimate partner homicide. Specifically addressing female homicidal behavior and intimate partner homicides are two theories: the battered woman syndrome and the self-defense perspective.

The Battered Woman Syndrome

The battered women syndrome, based on the work of Walker (1984), has two components: (1) the learned helplessness theory, and (2) the cycle theory of battering. The learned helplessness theory states that women feel powerless to control their own lives, resulting in "apparent emotional, cognitive, and behavioral deficits observed in the battered women, which negatively influence her from leaving a relationship after the battering occurs" (Walker, 1984, p. 2). The learned hopelessness theory addresses the psychological and sociological reasons that the individual stays in an abusive relationship. The theory attempts to uncover susceptibility factors that increase the likelihood of the battered women syndrome. Once the woman learns certain behaviors, ranging from avoidance of the batterer to rigid sex role observation, it is difficult for her to stop the batterer's violent behavior; domestic violence has begun (Walker, 1984).

The cycle theory of battering explains the occurrence of victimization by the nature of the cycle of violence. Battering oc-
curs in a repeated three-phase cycle. According to Walker (1984),

the first phase is a period of tension building, which leads up to phase two or the acute battering incident. The third phase consists of kind, loving, contrite behavior displayed by the batterer toward the woman, which provides the reinforcement for the cycle. (p. 2)

There are five risk factors associated with the cycle of violence: (1) sexual intimacy in the relationship; (2) nurturance of the batterer and possession by the batterer of the woman's time; (3) traditional versus liberal view of sex roles; (4) sociodemographic variables between the batterer and the battered women; and (5) abuse of drugs. The five risk factors will each be explained in the following section.

A key characteristic of the batterer is that he is seductive and charming. He is usually quickly able to convince the woman to have sex with him in the early stages of their relationship. Walker (1984), for instance, found that one-third of the sample was pregnant at the time of their marriage. The second risk factor is that insecurity in men often leads to a greater need for the possession of a woman's time (Walker, 1984). Because the batterer's insecurity, he often quickly becomes possessive with the woman's time. Women seem to enjoy the extra attention in the beginning, but quickly resent the intrusion that it eventually becomes (Walker, 1984). The third is that traditional views of women often result in expectations of traditional gender appropriate behavior. Men who hold traditional views evaluate their feelings for women based on the women's ability to fulfill gender-specific sex roles. It would be
expected that women, who possess liberated gender roles, would clash with men who held traditional sex role behaviors (Walker, 1984). The fourth is that the research indicates that there are socio-demographic differences between the batterer and the battered woman. The batterer is usually less educated, from a lower social economic class, and from different ethnic, racial or religious groups than the battered woman (Walker, 1984). Lastly, the presence of drugs and alcohol may predict violent behavior. Numerous researchers have indicated mixed results on the effects of drugs. Walker (1984) agrees that in the battered woman syndrome, this relationship needs more careful study as it relates to the relationship of drugs and women being battered.

The five risk factors create a relationship between the woman and her batterer that dictates a controlling environment characterized by constant conflict. The constant conflict is a result of the five risk factors that tie into the cycle of violence and the learned hopelessness skills. With the learned hopelessness skills the individual tries to "pay close attention to the batterer's emotional cues to protect themselves against another beating" (Walker, 1984, p. 12).

Walker (1984) suggests that if a woman is to escape such a relationship, she must break the cycle. One of the options the battered woman has is to kill the batterer. Research indicates that because of the battered women syndrome, and more women have felt forced to kill the batterer because they believe they can leave the
situation. Hence, an abusive intimate relationship can lead to women opting to kill their partner to escape the abuse.

The self-defense model described below connects the law and the battered woman syndrome. The self-defense model is not a theory per se, but a legal mitigating type factor that is often used as an explanation of female homicidal behavior.

Self-Defense Model

The self-defense model, also known as the self-protection model, began with the work of Browne (1987). According to Browne (1987), self-defense is "defined as the justifiable amount of force against an adversary, when one reasonably believes that one is in immediate danger of unlawful bodily harm and that the use of such force is necessary to avoid this harm" (p. 171). There are four essential components to this defense: imminent danger, equal force, accuracy of perceptions, and the duty to retreat. The following section outlines the four essential elements of this defense.

Imminent danger accounts for incidents during a calm in the argument or during the fight, in which the individual perceives immediate danger from the batterer. For the offender, this is a period in which a fight or argument is not occurring, but the female offender perceives danger from the batterer. Imminent danger does not take into account the "cumulative effects of repeated violence, nor does it account for the prediction of repeated violence in the future (but it does) allow for the defender to have been reasonable
but wrong* (Browne, 1987, pp. 172-173). This process accounts for
danger, fear, and its effects on perception. In neutralizing the
imminent danger, the individual must then use the least amount of
force possible to stop the threat of bodily harm or death. In some
jurisdictions, it must be shown that the individual exhausted all
forms of retreat before responding to force with force.

Pivotal for this defense is that the woman must document dead-
ly force, but as it applies to her mental state and not a history of
the abuse. "A history of physical abuse alone does not justify the
killing of the abuser" (Browne, 1987, p. 175). Physical abuse is
pertinent to the case as it relates to the individual's state of
mind at the time of the killing, for example, how the past behavior
affected the women's perception of imminent danger by the batterer
in the scenario in question (Browne, 1987).

Neither of the battering theories accounts for documented race
and class differences in female homicidal behavior. In other words,
females suffering from the battered woman syndrome would have a
higher likelihood of committing a self-defense homicide. But do
African-American women learn the helplessness skills, repeat the
cycle of violence and fall into the self-defense model more often
than white women? The most recent attempts to deal with this sub-
ject are found in Simpson (1991) and Ogle et al. (1995).

A Theory of Inclusivity

Simpson (1991) argues that race, class and gender must be
considered together when explaining homicidal behavior among African-American women. Simpson (1991) reviews and critiques three theoretical perspectives that explain violent behavior: Neo-Marxian theory, power-control theory and social-feminist theory. Based on her critique of these theories, she develops her own theory to explain intragender variations in the homicidal offending by race and class. The next section will critique each theory and introduce Simpson’s subsequent theory on inclusivity.

Critique of Neo-Marxian Theory

Neo-Marxian theory formulates the crime problem by examining the class position of the worker as it relates to the formation of disciplinary control and alienative bonding. Disciplinary control is defined as how the parents train their children to follow the guidelines of society (Stein, 1973). And alienative bonding is defined as a bonding between a child and parent that is "hostile, indifferent or estranged" (Stein, 1973, p. 34). According to the theory, parents who experience alienative bonding and authority in coercive work situations tend to reproduce the same environment at home. A parenting style that includes alienative bonding and coercion combined with alienative bonding in the school system tends to produce violent juveniles more so than other alternative discipline modalities and bonding (e.g., "remunerative/calculative or symbolic/moral") (Simpson, 1991, p. 392).

For example, white collar workers have relatively more control
at work than non-white collar-workers, and develop strong moral norms, which result in their children being socialized in a more positive way to develop strong moral bonds (Akers, 1997, p. 172). In contrast, parents with lower paying jobs are controlled by their bosses, and as a result become more punitive and controlling of their children (Akers, 1997). Therefore, based on the location of the parent in the hierarchical class system and the level of discipline, the individual's bonds to authority and the likelihood of committing a crime will vary.

Simpson (1991) states that this theory does not account for gender differences in juveniles whose parents are located in the same social economic class, but have different delinquency rates. Simpson (1991) also states that this theory does not account for individuals in the lower social economic class who are not in the labor market, but do have a delinquency group to which they belong. In other words, one of the essential components of the theory is the labor market. But if the labor market is not in place to produce a particular environment, then what produces the crimes?

Critique of Power-Control Theory

Power-control theory is based on the work of Hagan (1989). The power-control perspective focuses on family class structure and "social reproduction of gender relations" as the causes of gender differences in crime. Family class structure "consists of the configurations of power between spouses that derive from the positions
these spouses occupy inside and outside the home" (Hagan, 1989, p. 145). Social reproduction of gender relations "refers to the activities, institutions, and relationships that are involved in the maintenance and renewal of gender roles, in the family and elsewhere" (Hagan, 1989, p. 145).

Hagan's theoretical model examines the construction of larger power relationships in society, typically the workplace environment, and its reemergence in the patriarchal family unit. Patriarchy is defined as a hierarchical structure of relations created by men "through which they dominate others" (Hagan, 1989, p. 151). The patriarchal system is a distinct type of family structure that "plays a central role in accounting for a strong connection between gender and crime" (Hagan, 1989, p. 154).

Unifying the power and control theories, Hagan's theoretical model links class and gender relations with delinquency (Hagan, 1989). The power-control theory accounts for the individual deviation from social norms in the context of patriarchal power and control. From this perspective: "family class structure shapes the social reproduction of gender relations, and in turn the social distribution of delinquency" (Hagan, 1989, p. 145). Hagan goes on to state that this theory includes the social-psychological process involving the adolescents whose behaviors we wish to explain, social positions consisting of the gender and delinquency roles in which the adolescents are located, and the class structures by which families are socially organized. (p. 151)

Based on this perspective, gender relations can be fully ex-
explored in a patriarchal family defining gender preferences for risk taking, the amount and type of control exercised over children, and the definition of delinquency for each gender type. For example, the patriarchal family has an unequal power structure between men and women, thus the "greater rates of common delinquency by sons than daughters, because within the family males are socialized to have a greater taste for risk than females" (Simpson, 1991, p. 393). This stands in contrast to the egalitarian family, where both parents share the power, and where the daughter gains freedom relative to the son. Thus, the daughter becomes more risk prone and delinquent. Overall then, delinquency rates will be determined by class and family structures (Simpson, 1991).

A major weakness in this theory is that it assumes that black men and women, and white men and women are similar, ignoring racial variations (Simpson, 1991). Because the power-control theory fails to address patriarchy across racial and social groups, empirical testing has been inconclusive (Simpson, 1991).

Critique of Socialist-Feminist Theory

Socialist-feminist theory as discussed by Simpson is based on the work of Messerschmidt (1986). According to this theory, society is composed of two equally important and discrete systems: patriarchy and capitalism. As stated by Simpson (1991), according to Messerschmidt (1986, pp. 30-31), socialist-feminism has two strengths:
First, the criminality of males and females varies in frequency and type due to the gendered social organization of productive (class) and reproductive (family) spheres. Neither sphere is privileged over the other as sources of oppression; they are mutually reinforcing. Consequently, the economic base of capitalist society and its ideological superstructure (social institutions and culture) are seen as dynamic and dialectical. Second, personality and individual consciousness are seen to reflect the dominance/subordination relations found in production and reproduction. (p. 124)

Socialist-feminist theory creates two distinct groups: the powerful (males and capitalists) and the powerless (females and working class). Based on the distinctive group's opportunities that exist in society, the individual will be able to commit certain types of crimes.

The focus of the theory is to comprehend the interdependence of both gender and class. In order to understand crime from a socialist-feminist approach, first power must be comprehended in the context of the powerless and the powerful in the arena of patriarchy and capitalism. And second, power must be comprehended in terms of gender and class. Consequently, "under patriarchal capitalism, powerless males commit violent street crime; powerless females engage mostly in nonviolent property and/or vice offending (primarily drugs and prostitution)" (Simpson, 1991, p. 395).

Simpson (1991) states that this theory ignores how racial oppression/racism interacts with other oppressions to produce a pattern of criminal offending. A second problem is the theory's insensitivity to intragender variations in violent offending. Suggesting that males are violent and females are not glosses over African-American female criminality.
Toward a Theory of Inclusivity

In the analysis of the three theoretical perspectives to explain homicide offenders Simpson (1991) found that each of the three theoretical perspectives to be inadequate for explaining differences in homicidal behavior among women given race and class differences. This is because each of the three theories excluded at least one of the three components: (1) class, (2) gender, or (3) race. Simpson's (1991) focus was towards a theoretical inclusivity of race, class and gender as these relate to differences in power, control and homicidal behavior.

Determination of the power of an individual is based on class, race and gender within productive and reproductive spheres (Simpson, 1991, p. 395). Simpson (1991) states that

within the workplace, white females are less powerful than white males, but more powerful than African-American females. Bourgeois blacks are more powerful than lower-class blacks, but less powerful than bourgeois whites. (p. 395)

However, Simpson (1991) states that power determination in the family is less clear. Unlike working class white men and women, there is greater economic parity between black males and females in working class families. Because of economic parity in black working class families, males have less economic power within black families, and thus less decision making power. In lower class families, according to Simpson (1991), "black males are absent due to violent death, drug addiction, prison or unemployment" (p. 396). In this instance (Simpson, 1991), states that
interpersonal male power is negated by absence, but replaced with the patriarchal state (e.g., through female interactions with Aid for Dependent Children, children's services, the criminal justice system, and so on). (p. 396).

The ideology and culture of the society "determine who gets control and how" (Simpson, 1991, p. 396). In traditional families, control operates in part through patriarchal structures. The patriarchy provides for (white and black) males and females, the manhood and womanhood typescripts. Typescripts are defined as the "appropriate behavior for men and women" (Simpson, 1991, p. 397). These typescripts also define the appropriate reaction to stresses and frustrations for each gender. Simpson (1991), following Collins (1986), uses differences in these typescripts to explain why Black males in the underclass commit more violent crimes than African-American women.

Based upon the typescript model for males, Black males are able to act out their frustration in society with violent acts. This stands in contrast to African-American women, whose typescript defines that stress and anger are to be internalized into self-destructive behavior (suicide, depression) (Simpson, 1991). White women are more apt to overcome their powerlessness by attaching themselves to powerful white males. Simpson (1991), following past research (Lorde, 1988; Hook, 1984), states that "under the pretense of sharing power white females may be seduced into joining the oppressor" (p. 397). And as a result, white women are more discouraged from crime than African-American women because they have more perceived consequences to lose (loss of status, negative labeling, and
Finally, Simpson (1991) notes that violence is a part of everyday life in lower class Black communities. In the Black community, the ethos of violence became the appropriate response to various situations. This has gained cultural legitimacy far more than in white communities. However, the degree to which violence is legitimized within Black lower class communities differs along gender lines and can account for gender differences in violent crime among Blacks, as well as between white and African-American women. He goes on to say that

the observed gender differences in the way violence is interpreted and incorporated into one's behavioral repertoire emerge from the contradictory cultural tendencies of caste (i.e., female = nonviolent, black = violent)(Lewis, 1981). African-American females, given their dedication to keeping home and community together (Joseph, 1981) are more apt than black males to delegitimate violence. However, given their racial oppression and differential experience of patriarchy in the family, African-American females are perhaps less apt to delegitimate violence than their white counterparts. (p. 399)

According to Simpson's theory, African-American women, particularly those in the lower class, are expected to have higher rates of homicide than lower class white women. In addition, given that African-American women have more power within the home, they would be more frequently expected to kill their abusive intimate partner than their white counterparts who allegedly have more to lose.

Simpson's (1991) theory is important because it attempts to link race, class and gender in explaining homicidal behavior. The theory, however, falls short of taking into account changes in race/
gender relations over time. For example, with the epidemic of crack in the lower class Black community, the ethos of violence may have affected the desire/ability of African-American women to keep the home and community together. And as a result, in the 1990's one might expect to find increasing rates of violence among lower class African-American women.

A Theory of Female Homicidal Behavior

Moving beyond Simpson's (1991) argument of applicability of past theories of female homicidal behavior, Ogle et al. (1995) identified six flaws in existing theories of homicidal behavior among women. The first is that female homicidal behavior is the least discussed type of crime. Theories have typically focused on less serious types of female criminality. The second is that the prevalence of crime is attributed to individual pathology, ignoring the social structural context of the behavior. The third is that female criminal behavior, e.g. Adler's work, is associated with women's liberation from traditional sex roles. The fourth is that theoretical explanations for women's violence are not applicable to a variety of settings. Research has typically explained intimate partner homicide, but the theoretical explanation may not be applicable to women who are strangers to the deceased. The fifth is, according to Ogle et al., (1995) that some theories have tended to blur the line between scientific explanation and legal defense. For example, battered women's syndrome can be a part of the legal justification of self-defense for killing an abusive partner, while postpartum
psychosis can be part of the legal excuse of temporary insanity for killing an infant. (p. 174).

And the sixth is that the battered women’s syndrome and postpartum depression are different as incompatible. The battered women’s syndrome addresses issues of women being battered and the postpartum depression address women killing their children because of depression. But also, according to Ogle et al. (1995), there are some similarities between women who killed abusive spouses and women who have killed infants* (p. 174).

Because of the weakness of the existing theories of female criminality, Ogle et al. (1995) designed a theory that addresses the limitations of prior theories. They did so by incorporating individual, situational, and structural variables, including the tendency for an offender to be a traditional rather than a liberated woman. Their theory provides a single explanation of violence by women in different settings. This theory is based on the integration of Agnew’s general strain theory (1992); Megargee’s overcontrolled personality perspective (1966, 1973); and Bernard’s chronic high arousal in the underclass thesis (1990, 1993). Ogle et al. (1995) incorporate four components in their theory of female homicide offending: baseline stress and negative affect in the lives of women, blockage of women’s coping mechanisms, overcontrolled personality, and situational stresses.

Baseline Stress and Negative Affect in the Lives of Women

Ogle et al. (1995) argue that the amount of stress experienced
by women in society is at least similar, if not higher, than that
experienced by men. Ogle et al. (1995) state that

the literature points to the intensity of role socialization,
role intersection and conflict, social/familial support,
structural inequities and conditions of society, and indivi­
dual coping techniques that frequently result in despair and
depression. (p. 177)

For example, research has indicated that women often have to perform
two shifts. The first shift is at a male-centered work environment
and the second shift includes fulfilling the major parental role at
home. As a result, women experience a great deal of stress more so
than men do based upon fulfilling the interconnected obligations and
expectations of being a woman in society.

Underlying this argument is the cultural oppression of women
in society and the internalization of the devaluation of femaleness
(Ogle et al., 1995). This cultural view is a byproduct of defining
men as the center and women as the "others" (Ogle et al., 1995, p.
177). It is prevalent in definitions of sexuality and reproduction,
and the appropriate sex-role behavior of being a "good girl" or a
"bad girl" in the culture. There are the numerous laws surrounding
issues such as abortion, determining the exact steps and appropriate
choices and behavior for women in society (e.g., abortion, birth
control).

Even women's legitimacy in society is determined by her re­
relationship to a man. For example, marriage is the socially con­
structed form of legal legitimacy of women and children in society.
Therefore, the "social status of women and children depends on the
legitimacy of her relationship to a man* (Ogle et al., 1995, p. 178). Because of male absence due to death, drug addiction, prison or unemployment in lower class families, some women cannot achieve legitimate status (Simpson, 1991).

For some women, satisfaction in society can only be achieved if women break social norms and accept the social consequences from society (Ogle et al., 1995). And because of limited legal, social and political opportunities for lower class women, for example, there is more stress. This in turn contributes to breaking social norms and accepting the social consequences because of the limited marriageable male pool. The combination of social and structural domains (e.g., employment, marriage, and personal relationships) and the cultural definition of being female determines what type of stress the woman experiences. Therefore, women with lower social class status experience more stress than women with higher social status because their opportunities to fulfill femaleness in roles diminishes along with their opportunities in society.

This component explains that women in general experience more stress than men. This component also explains that the structural and social domains of the stress of being a female and the more general stresses derived from cultural deviation of femaleness are greater for women in the lower class. Therefore, lower class women experience more stress in fulfilling the female role. Based on this argument, Ogle et al. (1995) offer the following propositions: "Stress is higher for women, on average, than for men."
Women with lower social status experience higher stress, on average, than women with higher social status" (p. 179).

**Blockage of Women's Coping Mechanisms**

The second component of the theory is the blockage of women's coping mechanisms, based on the work of Agnew (1985). Agnew's (1985) work is a derivative of the strain theory. Agnew's (1985) new model incorporates not only goal-seeking efforts being blocked but also pain-avoidance behavior being blocked for the individual.

Based on the work of Agnew (1992), Ogle et al. (1995) argue that "the removal of positively valued stimuli and/or the presentation of negative stimuli result in negative affect and the adoption of coping mechanisms for avoiding this negative affect" (p. 175). Ogle et al. (1995) state that not only do men and women have different levels of stress, but they also have different coping mechanisms available to them.

Ogle et al. (1995) state that women generally view themselves in connection to relationships around them and "evaluate their self-worth based on the value and success of these relationships" (p. 179). Anger stimulates a sense of alienation from the relationship. Typically, women who are able to express anger are considered "bitchy" or "bossy" for behavior similar to men's accepted behavior (Ogle et al., 1995, p. 180). On the other hand, women with less autonomy "often react to these same situations by striving above all to preserve relationships" (Ogle et al., 1995, p. 180). For these
women, the coping mechanism involves recasting the anger as guilt (characterized by a sense of failure) or hurt (characterized by sadness) (Ogle et al., 1995). These feelings are reinforced with the cultural message that women are incapable of defending themselves, weak and willing to suffer (Ogle et al., 1995). Even though it is not stated specifically by Ogle et al. (1995), it can be assumed that women with a higher status have developed more autonomy than women with lower status. Women with higher status usually have more education and opportunities than women with lower status. As a result, a woman with higher educational status would have a greater likelihood of being able to separate herself from a relationship, due to her additional opportunities in comparison to a woman whose identity is dependent on that relationship.

The core of the argument is that the issue of anger, and coping with anger, is related to the baseline stress that causes of homicidal behavior. Anger is correlated with aggression and violence (Ogle et al., 1995). For women, anger is internalized and rationalized, forming a pocket of guilt or hurt. From this argument the following propositions are put forward:

Women, on average, have more blockages on coping mechanisms for dealing with anger than men. Women with lower social status, on average, have more blockages on their coping mechanism for dealing with anger than women with higher social status. (p. 180)

**Overcontrolled Personality**

The basis of this section is predicated on the work of Megar-
gee on overcontrolled personality (1966, 1973). Ogle et al. (1995), according to Megargee (1966, 1973) define overcontrolled personality as the following:

These individuals ordinarily manage negative affect through a variety of coping mechanisms that involve cognitive reinterpretations or withdrawal, and they exhibit powerful inhibitions to the expression of anger, so they engage in much less violence and aggression overall than others. (p. 181)

An essential point is that individuals with overcontrolled personalities do not learn socially acceptable or moderate methods of expressing anger (Ogle et al., 1995).

Megargee's theory has been tested mainly on male populations. Yet research indicates that female offenders awaiting trial had characteristics of an overcontrolled personality. Ogle et al. (1995) state that an extension of Megargee's work seems appropriate, because "women as a group are more controlled than men, particularly with respect to their experience and expression of anger" (p. 181). To support this argument, Ogle et al. (1995) make two points. The first is that women's crime rate is lower than men's crime rate. Thus, if women did not have an overcontrolled personality their crime rate would be higher.

The second point is that the "overcontrolled" personality is illustrated in women's tendency to respond to negative situations with guilt or hurt feelings, in contrast to men, who respond to such situations with anger. Following Megargee's argument, "when a person with an overcontrolled personality overcomes their high level of inhibition, an explosion of aggression occurs at a level beyond the
Building on the causes discussed above, Ogle et al. (1995) argue that women are more controlled than men, particularly with respect to their experience and expression of anger (Ogle et al., 1995). Because women have more rigid role expectations about expressing anger than men, they have a higher likelihood of developing an over-controlled personality. From this argument, Ogle et al. (1995) argue the fifth proposition: "women are more likely to develop overcontrolled personalities than men" (p. 182).

Situational Stresses

This section is based on the work of Bernard (1990, 1993). Underlying Bernard's (1990, 1993) work is the work of Wilson (1987, 1996). Wilson's (1987) work has many themes, but the focus for this component of the theory is his work on the truly disadvantaged. Wilson (1987, 1996) describes the truly disadvantaged as an isolated group, for the most part, similar in racial and economic characteristics. He states that the social isolation,

not only implies the contact between the group of different class and or racial backgrounds is either lacking, or has become increasingly intermittent but the nature of this contact enhances the effects of living in a highly concentrated poverty area. (p. 61)

The society includes a complex system of limited friendships and kinship networks and associational ties rooted in family life, and the ongoing socialization process (Wilson, 1987). In turn, these limited networks and associational ties block access to legitimate
means for upward social mobility, such as well paying jobs. Wilson (1987, 1996) argues that the development of a distinct subculture is a response to the social structural constraints and blocked opportunities faced by the truly disadvantaged living in central cities (like Chicago).

Using Wilson's (1987) work on the truly disadvantaged, Bernard (1990, 1993) argues that "chronic high arousal among the 'truly disadvantaged' results in unfocused explosions of aggression against visible and vulnerable targets" (Ogle et al., 1995, p. 175). This part of the theory questions how the following alternative factors may account for violence: urban location, low social position, discrimination and social isolation.

Urban location includes physiological arousal because of physical difficulties from the environment, ranging from crowding to a lack of quiet time for rest and recuperation from the rigors of daily life (Ogle et al., 1995). There are different types of urban locations that can cause physiological arousal. Low social position "is associated with increased physiological arousal because it entails limited financial resources" (Ogle et al., 1995, p. 183). Because of limited financial resources, individuals are unable to avoid annoyances, aggravations, etc. Individuals with resources (or low social position as stated by Bernard) typically use those resources to avoid, resolve or eliminate such problems. Ogle et al. (1995) sum up the plight of being poor in the following way: "the essence of being poor is that you live in difficult and stressful
Discrimination further increases physiological arousal be­cause threats, insults, and so forth block goal directed activities (Ogle et al., 1995). Because of the social organization of discrim­ination in society, individuals are unable to prevent/or retaliate against discriminatory situations.

Social isolation involves two roles. The first role is a subculture of angry aggression* (Ogle et al., 1995, p. 184). In this subculture there are *constitutive rules* and *regulative rules* (Ogle et al., 1995, p. 184). Constitutive rules involve the expectations and dictation of appropriate displays of anger. Regu­lative rules involve the level and degree of violence and aggression (Ogle et al., 1995). The formation of the subculture is dependent on its member's accepting/legitimizing such rules.

The second role of isolation is that it determines the target for the angry aggression. According to Bernard (1990), for the truly disadvantaged the target is usually invisible and invulnerable (Ogle et al., 1995).

For example, broad historical, economic and social conditions are invisible in the sense that the aroused person may not really perceive them at all, while politicians, employers and landlords are often invulnerable in that they can make retal­iation too costly to be practical. (p. 184).

Instead, individuals turn to their immediate environment and retal­iate against those targets. This process illustrates why anger from the truly disadvantaged is directed at other truly disadvantaged people (Ogle et al., 1995).
Following Megargee's argument, people with overcontrolled personalities do not learn moderate or socially accepted ways to express anger. Bernard (1990) notes that they also never develop "regulative rules" for anger (Ogle et al., 1995, p. 185). Regulative rules suggest that anger can be controlled and directed, but the process requires experience and learning. Unlike men, women are less likely to have regulative rules because only the rule is the cultural restriction of anger, namely that anger is inappropriate and forbidden (Ogle et al., 1995). Thus, when women finally express anger it will probably be uncontrolled and unregulated (Ogle et al., 1995).

Formulating a more complete picture in abusive relationships, all women experience baseline stress and peaks of stress brought on by particular situations. If these high levels of stress overwhelm coping mechanisms converting anger into hurt and guilt, the overcontrolled personality will experience intense anger amounting to rage (Ogle et al., 1995). Based on this argument, Ogle et al. (1995) offer the following propositions:

Women, on average, are less likely than men to have developed regulative rules for the experience and expression of anger. Women experiencing peaks of stress are more likely than men to explode with episodes of extreme uncontrolled violence. Targets of this violence are most likely to be those in the immediate environment, whether or not those targets represent the actual source of stress. (p. 186)

This theory is designed to account for variations in the criminal homicidal behavior of women. However, this theory does not explicitly account for race differences in homicidal behavior among
women. The other gaps of the theory which is alcohol use and prior arrest record. This theory does not examine that component. This theory also fails to examine substance use. Even pioneering researchers question the relationship between substance use and homicide, suggesting its influence on the occurrence of homicide.

Conclusion

There is some disagreement across the theoretical perspectives about the explanation of female homicidal behavior. Two theories that incorporate and build upon the theoretical explanations of past research are Simpson (1991) and Ogle et al. (1995). For example, Simpson (1991) is similar to the work of Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967). Wolfgang and Ferracuti's (1967) propositions are that personal assaults are prevalent within the subculture and that they are viewed as normal. The subculture of violence theory is alluded to in Simpson's (1991) work, when she addresses how the African-American community has a higher prevalence of violence, and how it is legitimated more than in the white communities.

Simpson (1991) and Ogle, et al. (1995) are similar to the work of Mann (1990b). Mann (1990b) opens the door to the many dynamics and unanswered questions concerning African-American female homicide offending. Simpson (1991) summons for the incorporation of interactive affects of race class and gender in her theory. Ogle et al. (1995) do not explicitly address this point, but the baseline stress component alludes to the stress of being a female and the
stress of the devalued nature of femaleness by society in a way that also facilitates addressing race and gender differences.

Both the gender role and the liberation hypothesis addressed gender issues, but the theories did not account for the inclusion of race and class issues. The battered woman syndrome and the self-defense model specifically looked at intimate partner homicide, but neglect race and class. The combination of both Simpson (1991) and Ogle et al. (1995) allows for addressing both race and gender issues, which are lacking in the above theories. However, in order to fully explore class issues, the work of Wilson (1987, 1996) will be incorporated in this study. Ogle et al. (1995) incorporates Wilson's (1987) work on the truly disadvantaged, but this component will be elaborated upon in relation to the class component for the study.

Developing a combined theoretical explanation will facilitate addressing female homicide behavior by exploring race, class and female homicide offenders simultaneously. Combining the insights from the theoretical analysis of Wilson (1987, 1996), Ogle et al. (1995) and Simpson (1991), allows for a sound examination of African-American and white female homicide offenders. This will contribute to an understanding of African-American and white women who kill under a variety of circumstances.

The following table (Table 1) summarizes the key elements of the theoretical literature. The table includes author, year of the study, a name for the theory and an explanatory note providing a
particular detail of the theory. The next chapter is a review of the empirical literature on female homicide offenders.

Table 1
The Key Elements of The Theoretical Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCHER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang &amp; Ferracuti</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Subculture of Violence</td>
<td>*Lacks theoretical application to female offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>1990(b)</td>
<td>Subculture of Hopelessness</td>
<td>*Does not explain white female homicide offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman-Bustamante</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Gender-role</td>
<td>*Ignores gender-role variation across racial and ethnic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Liberation Hypothesis</td>
<td>*Ignores differences among women (class, race)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Battered Woman Syndrome</td>
<td>*Lack of distinction in race differences in intimate partner homicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Self-Defense Model</td>
<td>*Lack of distinction in race differences in intimate partner homicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>A Theory of Inclusivity</td>
<td>*Does not take into account changes in race/gender relations over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Social Disorganization</td>
<td>*Ignores race and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogle et al.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>A Theory of Female Homicidal Behavior</td>
<td>*Does not account for race differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON FEMALE HOMICIDE OFFENDING

The main purpose of this chapter is to review the empirical work, encompassing both the descriptive and theoretically based studies, of African-American and white female homicide offending. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section looks at the descriptive literature and the second section looks at the theoretically based literature. In both sections, studies are reviewed and critiqued with regards to methodological and analytical design and/or variable exclusions.

Descriptive Studies

Wolfgang's Study in Philadelphia

Some of the earliest writings on the prevalence and occurrence of homicidal behavior are by Wolfgang (1958). He conducted a community case study of criminal homicides recorded by police in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, between January 1, 1948 and December 31, 1952 (Wolfgang, 1958). Wolfgang (1958) analyzed every aspect of the homicides ranging from motive to victim-offender relationship. The study included

- race, sex, age differences; methods and weapons used to inflict death; seasonal and other temporal patterns; spatial patterns; the relationship between the presence of alcohol and homicide; the degree of violence in homicide; motives; the interpersonal relationships between the victim and offender;
homicide during the commission of another felony; victim-precipitated homicide; homicide-suicide; unsolved homicide; the tempo of legal procedures; court disposition; and insanity. (p. 318)

Wolfgang (1958) utilized four major sources of data: (1) police records, (2) coroner's reports, (3) court or judicial records and (4) records of prison commitments. To understand Wolfgang's (1958) work and how it relates to female homicide offenders, this section will review the initial study and Wolfgang's (1962) later work that divided the study into victim-precipitated (VP) and non-victim-precipitated (NVP) homicides. Victim precipitated homicide is defined as a criminal homicide in which the victim is the first to use force in the crime (Wolfgang, 1962). Wolfgang (1962) defines four prerequisites that must exist in order for a crime to be defined as VP:

1. There must have been adequate provocation; 2. The killing must have been in the heat of passion; 3. The killing must have followed the provocation before there had been a reasonable opportunity for the passion to cool; 4. A causal connection must exist between provocation, the heat of passion and the homicidal act. (p. 388)

Some of the subsections of Wolfgang's work (1958 & 1962) that are applicable to the female homicide offending in this study are: race, sex, age, method, place and motive, victim-offender relationship, alcohol, and prior arrest. The following section will outline Wolfgang's work in the subsections as it relates to female homicide offending.

Race

"Nearly 80 percent of the VP cases and 70 percent of the NVP
cases involved African-Americans" (Wolfgang, 1962, p. 392). The research found a significant association between race and VP. In the analysis of African-American and white women, Wolfgang (1958) notes that African-American women dominated as homicide offenders. Wolfgang (1958) also notes that the difference in the frequency of criminal homicide was significantly greater between the races within each sex than the differences between the sexes within each race.

**Sex**

"Men comprised 94 percent of VP homicides and 72 percent of NVP cases as victims, showing a significant association between sex of the victim and VP homicides" (Wolfgang, 1962, p. 392). Women had a low rate of homicide, with white women only having sixteen of the cases in the study. Combining both African-American and white women, Wolfgang (1962) found a significant association between female offenders and VP homicides.

**Age**

"Age has no apparent effect on VP homicide" (Wolfgang, 1962, p. 392). The median age of VP victim was 33.3, the median age for NVP was 31.2. When examining the differences between women, Wolfgang (1958) found that age of the African-American female homicide offender was between 25 and 35, in comparison to the white female homicide offender whose age was between 20-24.
Method

Wolfgang (1962) found a "significant association between method used to inflict death and VP homicide" (p. 392). "Stabbing accounted for 54 percent of the VP cases and 34 percent of NVP cases" (Wolfgang, 1962, p. 393). When examining women, Wolfgang (1958) found that females generally stab their victims.

Place and Motive

No important difference was found between VP and NVP with respect to a home/not home dichotomy, nor with respect to motives listed by the police (Wolfgang, 1962). But over half of the VP and NVP occur in the home. The highest-ranking motive among both the VP and NVP cases was domestic quarrels and altercations, with lower frequencies in NVP category. But combined, these two motives account for a slightly larger share of VP than NVP cases. For women, as the offender, the most prevalent location of the slaying was in the kitchen (Wolfgang, 1958).

Victim-Offender Relationship

Intra-racial killings predominate in both cases, but inter-racial cases comprised a larger share of VP than NVP cases (Wolfgang, 1962). Research indicates that killings across racial lines are often likely to be provoked by the victim, but no statistically significant association was found between inter-racial slaying and VP homicides. A significant difference between VP and non-VP cases
does emerge when determination of the sex of the victim, relative to
the sex of his specific slayer is taken into account* (Wolfgang,
1962, p. 393).

Friends, acquaintances and relatives are the three major types
of relationships between victim and offender in both VP and NVP
cases. Wolfgang (1962) found a significant association between mate
slaying and VP homicide, and that significantly more husbands than
wives are victims of VP mate slayings. The case of African-American
men killed by African-American women was three times more frequent
among VP homicides than was among NVP homicides (Wolfgang, 1962.
Therefore, African-American men were more likely to be victims of VP
homicides than NVP homicides.

Alcohol

There is a significant association between VP homicide and
alcohol, but the relationship is not necessarily a causal one (Wolf­
gang, 1962). Victims have been found to be drinking in more VP than
NVP cases (Wolfgang, 1962). Wolfgang (1958) reported that:

whether alcohol is present in the victim or offender, lowered
inhibitions due to ingestion of alcohol may cause an individ­
ual to give vent more freely to pent-up frustrations, ten­
sions, and emotional conflicts that have either built up over
time or that arise within an immediate emotional crisis. (p.
261)

Prior Arrest

Wolfgang (1962) found that in VP cases, the victim was more
likely to have a previous arrest record. This portion was higher
than NVP victims. Wolfgang (1962) also found a significant association between VP victims and previous arrest record.

As discussed in the last chapter, Wolfgang's (1958) research also introduced the subculture of violence hypothesis. In the study Wolfgang (1958) did not test this theory, but offered it as an explanation for the prevalence and occurrence of homicidal behavior. Wolfgang's (1958) work laid the foundation for numerous projects in the field of homicide. Due to the high prevalence of homicides among African-Americans and numerous findings in homicide research, a recognized need emerged for more research in the field.

Goetting's Study of Female Homicide in Detroit

Goetting's (1988) work followed Wolfgang's (1958) legacy but focused on women. She analyzed the police records of homicides by women in four areas: demographic and social characteristics of offender and victims; demographics and social relationships between the offender and victims; circumstances of the offense; and arrest dispositions. The subjects in her research were 134 African-American and 2 white female arrestees for homicides (exclusive of negligent use of vehicles) committed in Detroit, Michigan during 1982 and 1983 (Goetting, 1988). The subject pool represents 18.1% of all homicide arrestees in that city during those two years (Goetting, 1988). Police-record information regarding each case was collected from investigator reports, interrogation records and witness statements. According to Goetting, from the police reports, all socio-
logically relevant variables were coded and tabulated, and comparisons were made between the study's population and research that did not control for gender (Goetting, 1988).

Goetting (1988) followed Wolfgang's (1958) research design, but added two additional components to the study: religious affiliation of the offender; and residence and birthplace of the offender. The profile that emerged of the offender from this (Goetting, 1988) was that she was a

locally born African-American Detroit resident in her early 30's who is Protestant, married (legally or by common law), and living with her family. She is undereducated, unemployed welfare recipient with an arrest record, whose final in a series of arguments or fights with her slightly older current or former husband or lover culminated in a defensive gunshot in a private residence on a weekend between 2:00 p.m. and 1:59 am. (p. 15)

Goetting's (1988) research mirrored many of the findings of Wolfgang's (1958) work, but she did discover two differences. The first was that women offenders were using a gun more so than a knife as a weapon. Second, she found that nearly two-thirds of the females had an arrest record.

Goetting's (1988) analysis compares past male and female research with her sample that only examines female offenders. Goetting (1988) even states that the comparisons were less than ideal for the following two reasons: "(1) the comparison groups are not mutually exclusive for offender gender, and (2) except when 1982 and 1983 Detroit data are available, the comparison groups are not geographically and temporally comparable" (p. 5).

Goetting (1988) states that comparisons were made when fea-
sible, in order to begin to establish the picture of the female homicide offender. However, the effort to provide alternative theoretical explanations may be hampered by previous studies that include both male and female subjects. To build on this foundation may only increase the lack of clarity of the subject matter. Review of past research may be necessary, but comparison may only end up continuing to document male and female differences and end up emphasizing the limited amount of research on the female homicide offender. Given the prevalence of intimate relationships, alcohol use, weapon choice, prior arrest and the predominance of African-American women, there is a dire need for the development of theories of female homicidal behavior that differ from those explaining male homicidal behavior.

Block's Study of Female Homicides in Baltimore

Block's (1990) work creates a clearer portrait of female homicidal behavior. She focused on the relationship between age and homicide. Her study consisted of 294 women offenders from the Violent Crimes Unit of the State Attorney's Office for the city of Baltimore from January 1, 1974 to December 31, 1986. The data included all cases of criminal homicide (murder and non-negligent manslaughter). The data were coded according to event, which is defined as a situation in which a woman, acting alone or with others, unlawfully kills one or more persons. According to Block (1990), the event is classified according to the following criteria:
for each event, the age and race of the offender, and the age, race, and gender of accomplice(s) and victim(s) are coded. The average age per event is coded for both accomplices and victims where there is more than one event. The race of the offender and victim(s) is either African-American, white, or other. Accomplices are either African-American and white (there are no other race accomplices). The gender of victims and accomplices is male, female or male and female in appropriate multiple accomplices or multiple victim events. For each event the number of offenders and victims is examined. The variables are dichotomized for analysis as single or multiple. Concurrent felony is either present or absent. The cause of death is coded as a shooting, a stabbing, a beating, or another cause of death. (p. 48)

The purpose of the study was to determine whether variations in the offender's age affect the following: "the patterning of the number and race of offenders; the age, gender, race and number of victims and accomplices; the presence of concurrent felonies; and the cause of death" (Block, 1990, p. 42). To address the purpose of the study, the research was broken up in the following subsections for comparison with past research: the age-crime cycle; offender's age and victim's age; characteristics of women's homicide; multiple offenders and concurrent felony homicides; and cause of death.

The Age-Crime Cycle

The age-crime cycle subsection rests on the perimeters of the age-crime curve debate (Block, 1990). The age-crime curve debate includes many issues. One of the most prevalent components of the debate is the extent to which the age-crime curve predicts the incidence and prevalence or both, in this case, of a homicide. This study does not directly address that debate, but does find that the distribution of age mirrors past research. In the study, the of-
fencers ranged in age from 13 to 74. Youthful offenders outnumbered elderly offenders, and "African-American women accounted for almost 90 percent of the offenders" (Block, 1990, p. 49). For African-American women, consistent with past research, the age distribution peaked at the age 26 and then gradually declined. This female also was consistent with past research.

**Offender's Age and Victim's Age**

The study found that the offender's age is associated with the victim's age in non-concurrent felony homicides. In contrast, in felony homicides the participant's age depends on whether the woman acted alone (Block, 1990). Younger women commit concurrent felony homicides with accomplices and victimize older individuals. Older women commit concurrent felony homicides alone and victimize individuals who are slightly younger. Block (1990) also found that homicides committed by women were disproportionately committed by youthful offenders. This pattern is similar to studies conducted on men, but the findings on women do not create as skewed a picture as those which include male subjects.

**Characteristics of Women's Homicide**

Block's (1990) results again were similar to past research. These include the following findings: women kill alone, they kill a person of the same race, and the person they kill is usually male. The two most common causes of death were shooting and stabbing.
Block's (1990) findings were similar to those of Goetting (1988), in that women were using guns to commit the homicide. However, two major distinctions were found between African-American and white women. The first is that white women stabbed their victims less frequently than African-American women. The second is that white women were slightly older and victimized more often than African-American women. Beyond the characteristics of the female offender and victim, Block also examined multiple and concurrent felony homicides and cause of death.

**Multiple Offenders and Concurrent Felony Homicides**

A multiple offender homicide is defined as a homicide that has more than one offender. A concurrent felony homicide occurs when two major crimes happen at the same time. Block (1990) found that the majority of homicide events involved lone offenders. She found that the presence of a concurrent felony and the number of offenders correlate with the victim's race. In events involving an accomplice, the accomplice is usually male and usually of the same race as the offender.

**Cause of Death**

Women used knives slightly more often than firearms. Women involved in multiple offender homicides or concurrent felony homicides used firearms (Block, 1990). Block's (1990) results filled gaps in our knowledge concerning female homicide offenders by show-
ing a connection between age and homicide. However, the use of records from the Violent Crimes Unit of the States Attorney's Office failed to include cases where the offender committed suicide. These cases come to the attention of the police, but often did not come to the attention of the States Attorney's Office, because there is not a case to legally process. The States Attorney's Office may also not receive cases that involve suspects that are fugitives. Additionally, the office does process unsolved cases. These unsolved cases are the cases usually excluded in official court statistics. This presents an incomplete picture of women who kill.

Mann's (1990b) Research on Substance Use and Homicide

Creating clarity in another area of female homicidal behavior is research that examines the relationship between homicide and substance use. Many studies, even the work of Wolfgang (1958), illustrated the need to explore the correlation between homicide and substance use/or abuse. Mann (1990b) pursued this connection.

The study consisted of a subsample of women who had used drugs prior to killing from a data base of 296 randomly selected of cleared homicide cases in Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, and New York, Atlanta and Baltimore for the years 1979 and 1983 (Mann, 1990b). According to Mann (1990a),

the six cities were chosen because each had equivalent or higher rates of homicide than the national average for both years, and homicidal rates were similar to the regional representation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Report (UCR) for 1979 and 1983. (p. 177)
Mann (1990b) collected data on demographic and social characteristics of the offender and the victim, offense data, and criminal justice data. The data were collected over a two year period wherein the researcher spent one to two weeks in each city recording information from police reports, court records, photographs and autopsy reports (when available), and any other form of reporting in the file. Follow-up contacts were made to obtain missing or additional data, which frequently consisted of court disposition information.

Mann (1990b) examined "women who killed while under the influence of a substance such as alcohol and narcotics or, in some cases, had used both alcohol and drugs prior to homicide" (p. 87). The user subsample consisted of 96 women who killed someone after they had used alcohol/or drugs. This defined the study group. The non-matched comparison group consisted of "non-substance using cases on selected social characteristics of the offender and their victims, characteristics of the homicide, and the criminal history and processing of the homicide offender" (Mann, 1990b, p. 94). The focus of the study was on the social characteristics, circumstances of the homicide and criminal justice processing.

In the examination of these different variables, Mann (1990b) reports four significant findings. The first is that only a few characteristics distinguish the non-substance user from the user. The user is more likely to have a prior arrest record and to be about three years older. Mann (1990b) found that "one-half of the
women who killed while using some substance had violent arrest records (50%) compared to only 22.5% of the nonuser group" (p. 102). The second significant finding is that the victims of both groups are more similar than different. The study confirmed past research that non-white men predominated as victims and that the victims were in an intimate relationship with the assailant. Mann's third significant finding was that the event and circumstances surrounding the homicide showed more similarities between the groups than differences. The similarities included the time of week, the time of day of the homicide was committed and the choice of weapon. With respect to these similarities (Mann, 1990a), there were minor distinctions:

1) individuals in the study group were slightly more likely to kill on the weekend 2) both chose a gun as a weapon of choice 3) both groups were more likely to inflict their homicide with one wound although the homicides of the user groups reflected multiple wounds more than the comparison group of non-users. (p. 106)

The final point is that no significant difference existed between nonusers and users in the criminal justice system dispositions. Mann (1990b) only found a slightly higher proportion of the study group was sentenced to prison for murder, but inexplicably, the nonuser group was sentenced to more years in prison.

Mann (1990b) noted that the study had four limitations. The first is that the study only focused on women who killed when using drugs or alcohol, but did not examine the "issue of domestic violence in relation to substance use at the time of the homicide" (p. 88). The second is that there was no attempt to apply theoretical
models to the study, because it was explanatory in nature. The third is that because of the use of police files and the lack of details of drug use, the study was primarily descriptive. Lastly, since men were not included in the study, no comparison could be made between men and women.

Mann (1990b) herself states that because of the low numbers the generalizability of the findings was limited. The number of women was small and the groups were not matched. However, the results of the study mirrored past research and also pointed to a need for more knowledge about the connection between homicide and drugs. But what about the prevalence of African-American female homicide offenders? Using the same dataset, Mann (1990b) examined the African-American female homicide offender.

Mann (1990a)- The African-American Female Homicide Offender

As previously noted limited research exists that focuses on the African-American female homicide offender. Mann (1990a) focused on filling in some of the gaps that exist in the research literature with her particular focus on the African-American female homicide offender. Her second study consequently focused on the following characteristics: offender profile, victim profile, victim-offender relationship, circumstances of the homicide, and the criminal justice system processing. The study goes beyond filling in gaps and tries to present a more comprehensive picture of the African-American female homicide offender by specifically comparing findings to
those of past studies. The research (Mann, 1990a) is shaped by the following questions:

1) Does an economic theory of crime apply to African-American women who commit homicide?; 2) Is there any validity to the subculture of violence perspective as applied to African-American female homicide offenders?; 3) Are victim precipitation and/or battered woman syndrome valid predictors of homicide by African-American females?; 4) Does limited access to prompt and proper medical care affect trauma-induced mortality in African-American female homicide cases?; 5) Are there regional differences between African-American women who kill?; 6) Is African-American life devalued by the courts? (p. 177)

Using the same dataset from the previous study, this sample consisted of 164 cases in 1979 and 132 cases in 1983, totaling 296 subjects. Mann (1990a) reported the following similarities to findings of past research with regards to African-American women:

1) Offenders continue to kill those closest to them; 2) Kill in crimes that are intersexual, intraracial and intrafamilial; 3) Have prior arrest records; 4) Unemployed; 5) Live in ghettos; 6) Are mothers; 7) Have few marketable skills; 8) Kill in acts precipitated by victims; 9) Acts committed alone. (p. 198)

Some distinguishable findings that Mann (1990a) continued on to note were that African-American female homicide offenders:

1) Kill with guns as opposed to knives; 2) Are not treated harshly in the criminal justice system; 3) Kill during the leisure time which lasts throughout the week; 4) Kill in situations that either she, the victim or both have been using alcohol or narcotics; 5) Are older than African-American men who kill. (p. 198)

Mann (1990a) comments that what emerges from the prison walls are still unskilled young women returning to the urban ghetto to look for their children, and falling into a never ending cycle that is not a subculture of violence, but a subculture of hopelessness.

Mann (1990a) did not test this theory, but offered it as an alterna-
tive to the subculture of violence perspective of African-American female homicide offending. Mann's work (1990a) enhances our knowledge of the African-American female homicide offender, but one must be cautious about data from any official collection agency. Mann (1990a; 1990b) implemented several city cross-sections in her study, ranging from criminal justice data to autopsy reports.

To sum up past research to this point, Wolfgang's (1958) work laid the groundwork in the field. Goetting's (1988) results were similar to Wolfgang, but she found greater proportions of female offenders having prior arrest records and using firearms. Block's (1990) results filled another gap on females by showing a connection between age and homicide. Mann (1990a & 1990b) looked at the connection between substance use and the prevalence of African-American female homicidal behavior. One pronounced theme echoing throughout all of these studies relates to the issue of the victim-offender relationship. Even in the early work of Wolfgang (1958), a prevalence of intimate partner over non-intimate partner homicides was noted when the killer was a woman. This result is reported including past efforts to the present study.

Three Studies of Intimate Partner Homicide

Three pieces of research have filled in gaps left by this previous body of literature on the topic of intimate partner homicide by women offenders. This body of literature was conducted by Browne and Williams (1993), Johnson (1996) and O'Keefe (1997), respective-
Browne and Williams' Study of Marital Status and Intimate Partner Homicide

Browne and Williams' study (1993) "documents patterns of homicide between opposite gender relational partners for the twelve years of 1976 through 1987 from Supplementary Homicide Report Data (SHR), comparing rates between couples in marital and nonmarital relationships" (p.78). The SHR, collected by the FBI as part of the UCR, incorporates four categories: murder and non-negligent manslaughter, manslaughter, negligent manslaughter and justifiable homicide. For this study, the focus was centered on one-on-one cases involving partners (i.e., marital, ex-, and common-law partner, as well as cohabiting couples) that were defined as murder and non-negligent homicides. According to the researchers, two major problems occur when using the SHR: underreporting and missing data. To deal with these problems, the study weighted rates to resolve the problem of underreporting, and performed a statistical adjustment procedure to account for missing data. The adjustment procedure included extrapolating the "relationship data of the known cases to those with missing information" (Browne & Williams, 1993, p. 83). For example, if a felony homicide were missing victim/offender relationship data, the missing data would be classified according to felony homicides that were known in the study. According to the researchers, the non-inclusion of "missing data can result in the underestimation of partner homicide rates and misrepresentation of
time differences in those rates" (Browne & Williams, 1993, p. 83).
The results of this process produced 38,648 victims of homicide perpetrated by intimate partners during the 12-year period.

The study found that different patterns of lethal victimization emerged when looking at married versus unmarried couples (Browne & Williams, 1993). For example, the study (1976-1987) showed a decrease in lethal violence in married couples, but an increase among those in unmarried relationships. In looking at the trend variation by gender, when husbands were killed by their wives and wives were killed by their husbands, Browne and Williams (1993) found that "both exhibit a downward pattern, and the trends are fairly similar; however, the peak in the lethal violence of wives is greater in 1979 and 1980 for husbands" (p. 87).

In contrast, the trends for unmarried couples differed by gender. Male victimization in unmarried couples showed a decline in the post-1980 years, and a sharp increase in 1986-1987 (Browne & Williams, 1993). And female victimization in unmarried couples showed a "considerable increase overall from 1976 through 1987" (Browne & Williams, 1993, p. 87). But, as stated by Browne and Williams (1993) this occurrence could be due to changes in society and an increase in the number of co-habitating relationships versus married relationships.

Because of this, Browne and Williams (1993) call for a theory that incorporates the salient conditions of women's lives and that pays attention to how those conditions might change with an altera-
tion of intimate relationships. Browne and Williams (1993) articulate three points that would broaden the scope of the inquiry: social control and intimate lethal violence; gender differences in motivations of homicide perpetration; and relational differences and the impact on homicide perpetration.

The social control and intimate lethal violence angle looks at the impact of legislation and third party mechanisms that provides alternative choices to domestic violence situations (Browne & Williams, 1993). The gender difference in motivations for homicide perpetration angle explores the issue of what perceptions underlie men’s motivation to kill intimate women partners. And relational differences examine “differences in precipitating factors for homicide have on couples in unmarried relationships” (Browne & Williams, 1993, p. 94). In order for the debate about women’s homicidal behavior to incorporate more useful information, Browne and Williams (1993) call for the inclusion of these variables in future research.

Johnson’s Research on Female Homicide Offenders and Intimate Partner Homicide

Johnson (1996) added to the discussion on intimate partner homicide. Johnson (1996) used both qualitative and quantitative data to examine thirty females arrested for homicides in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama from 1975 to 1992. The data set was derived from homicide files. It included investigators’ reports; interrogation records; witnesses
Because of the small sample size (36), the analysis focused on descriptive data and case history analysis. Johnson (1996) examined demographic, social, homicide, and legal variables. These were defined as:

- **Demographic variables** included race, age, employment, marital status, relationship between the offender and victim, and whether the offender was a mother.
- **Social variables** included history of domestic abuse, domestic abuse at the time of the murder, type of domestic abuse, alcohol use and victim precipitation.
- **Homicide variables** included type of weapon used, nature of injuries, offender role, presence of witnesses, person reporting the crime, place of occurrence of the homicide, date and time of the homicide, and whether the victim was armed at the time of the murder.
- **Legal (criminal justice variables)** included prior criminal history, type of charge, type of trial, type of sentence, whether bond was set, and the amount of bond.

Johnson (1996) found that women who killed loved ones or acquaintances, and even those women who killed strangers, were involved in either an argument or a fight prior to the homicide incident. The level of emotion did not result in overkill, but rather the perpetrators killed with a single blow and often turned to an appropriate facility to obtain help for the victim (i.e., hospital, police). Johnson (1996) found that the murders were committed more frequently during the winter months and during weekends. Johnson's (1996) data yielded the following profile of the thirty-six women:

The murderer is a 33 year old African-American mother who is married and living with her family (i.e., husband and children) at the time of the murder. She is an unemployed, uneducated female who kills her intimate partner in an emotionally charged act of violence in a private residence on Friday or
Johnson (1996) concluded that future research is needed in this neglected area of female perpetrated homicide. Research can contribute to the development of a more complete picture.

O'Keefe's Research on Women Battering and Intimate Partner Homicide

O'Keefe (1997) compared battered women incarcerated for killing/seriously assauling their abusers with those battered women incarcerated for other offenses. She explored possible similarities and differences in the characteristics and experiences of the two groups. She further determined the factors that may lead some battered women to use lethal force against their partners. The study presented three hypotheses:

1. Regardless of criminal offense, it was expected that battered women in both groups would report multiple experiences of victimization; severe assaults by men with whom they were intimate as well as histories of parental physical abuse and sexual abuse during childhood. 2. Regarding differences between the two groups, it was expected that battered women incarcerated for homicide/serious assault of their partners would report experiencing more frequent and severe battering as well as greater injuries compared to those incarcerated for other offenses. 3. Battered women who killed/seriously assaulted their partner would report inflicting less violence on their partner compared to those incarcerated for other offenses. (pp. 4-5)

The data consisted of 76 self-identified battered women convicted of various criminal offenses incarcerated in two California correctional facilities (O'Keefe, 1997). Of the 76, 56 were in the homicide/assault group. The comparison group consisted of crimes involving possession, transport or sale of drugs; forgery; grand
theft; petty theft; prostitution and pandering and child maltreatment. The evaluation was divided in the following subsections: violence experienced, violence inflicted, injury scale, childhood trauma, perceived social support, actions taken to obtain help, alcohol and drug use, and sociodemographic and background variables (O'Keefe, 1997).

The Conflict Tactics Scale was used to assess the amount of violence participants experienced during the last year they lived with their spouses/partners. The injury scale covered injuries sustained as a result of the partner and injuries inflicted to the partner's actions.

Childhood trauma was assessed using the Childhood Violence Scale (CVS). The instrument focuses on childhood physical abuse, sexual abuse, and witnessing interpersonal violence (O'Keefe, 1997). Perceived social support was elicited by asking participants to identify individuals who helped during violence with a partner and also those individuals who assisted after their arrest (O'Keefe, 1997). Actions taken to obtain help were evaluated by asking participants if they had ever taken the following actions to obtain help or end the violence: called police; filed for divorce/separation; sought protective order; filed charges; and tried to leave (O'Keefe, 1997).

Alcohol and drug use were coded with a range from no use to abuse. Participants were also asked to indicate the percentage of the time the violence in their relationship was associated with al-
cohol and drug use; and whether they had been under the influence of
drugs/alcohol when they committed the crime for which they were con-
icted (O’Keefe, 1997). The sociodemographic and background vari-
ables included: "age, ethnicity, education, employment, marital sta-
tus and income prior to arrest, length of relationship, length of
violence in the relationship, and number of times previously ar-
rested or incarcerated" (O'Keefe, 1997, p. 9).

O'Keefe (1997) found "many similarities and differences be-
tween the two groups of offenders" (p. 14). Both groups reported
"being beaten (75%) and sexually assaulted (60%) by their partners/
spouses" (O'Keefe, 1997, p. 14). Almost one half of the women in
both groups reported being "victims of parental physical abuse and
child sexual abuse, and had witnessed interparental violence" (O'

The differences discovered by O'Keefe included several dimen-
sions. First, women who killed/ seriously assaulted their partners
tended to be older, in the relationship longer, and experienced a
longer duration of violence in this relationship (O'Keefe, 1997).
Second, women, who killed/ seriously assaulted their partner had
experienced more frequent and severe battering (including sexual
assault), believed their lives were in danger, used less violence
against their partners, and stated that their partners sustained
fewer injuries than the comparison group (O'Keefe, 1997). There
was no difference found in the partner's alcohol and drug abuse,
but what was significant was that 50% of batterers abused alcohol
daily and over two-thirds of the batterers abused hard drugs (O'Keefe, 1997). With regards to substance and alcohol abuse of respondents, battered women incarcerated for other offenses had higher drug abuse rates. This however, could be attributed to the fact that 38% of these women were incarcerated for drug-related offenses (O'Keefe, 1997). With respect to alcohol abuse by respondents, no significant differences existed between the groups (O'Keefe, 1997).

The findings on perceived help did not support the notion of learned helplessness, but did support the conclusion that learned helplessness of battered women is a function of inadequate social, legal/or economic supports rather than a psychological dysfunction (O'Keefe, 1997). O'Keefe (1997) also found that of the 50 women who killed/seriously assaulted their abusers, 80% had no previous arrest record. In contrast, 57% of the women in the comparison group had previous arrests. This is consistent with past research. It is noteworthy that even without having previous arrest records, the group that killed/seriously assaulted their spouse/partner received longer prison sentences and the sentences were frequently for life (O'Keefe, 1997).

In the analysis O'Keefe (1997) presented three cautionary points:

1) the sample is non-random; participants identified themselves as being battered women and voluntarily participated, and it is not possible to tell whether those who chose to participate systematically differed from those who did not;
2) self-reported data must be viewed with caution; and 3) participants were asked to recall spousal violence and
characteristics of the battering relationship that had occurred many years before. (p. 14)

O'Keefe (1997) also stated that battered women (incarcerated and nonincarcerated) should be followed over time to assess the emotional and psychological aftermath of the abuse, the process of recovery, as well as factors impacting recovery.

All three studies on intimate partner homicide by women indicate a connection between intimate partner violence and homicide. Emerging from this analysis is the noteworthy salience of intimate partner homicide. Also evident in the research are differences in race, weapon choice, prior arrest, offenders' and victims' ages and substance use as correlates of women's killing. What is problematic is that these studies lack clarity in some areas and are non-comprehensive in others. Studies are primarily descriptive and fail to offer tests on the competing and/or complementary theories of female homicide offending (such as those reviewed in Chapter II).

Theoretically-Based Studies of Female Homicide Offending

Jurik and Winn: A Test of Liberation, Gender Role and Self-Protection Theories

Jurik and Winn (1990) compare homicides of men and women along five dimensions: offender background, location of homicide, victim's relationship with the offender, situational dynamics, and methods/style of homicide. Beyond comparing the homicides of men and women, Jurik and Winn (1990) tested three theoretical explanations for female homicide: the liberation, gender role, and self-protection
models (reviewed in Chapter II).

Jurik and Winn (1990) analyzed the court records of 158 cases of homicide by men and women in Maricopa County, Arizona, between January 1, 1979 and December 31, 1984. The sample subjects consisted of 108 male-perpetrated homicides and 50 female-perpetrated homicides. African-American men and women and Hispanic men were overrepresented in the study sample in comparison to the racial composition of the Maricopa County population. As indicated by education, occupation, and employment status, men and women offenders were members of lower socioeconomic groups (Jurik & Winn, 1990). The data for the study were collected from presentence investigative reports (PSI) and other court information. These data included information on the race and gender of the victims and offenders, the various charges brought against the offender, and the case disposition. PSI reports include summaries of reports from police, eyewitnesses and the defendants (Jurik & Winn, 1990).

Jurik and Winn (1990) found results similar to those revealed in previous studies. For example, with respect to the relationship between the victim and offender, women (82% of cases) were more likely to kill a man than to kill a woman (Jurik & Winn, 1990). Additionally, women were more likely to kill male intimates in the context of economic dependence and past attacks. Women rarely killed with accomplices, and in the few existing incidents where they did, the co-defendant was a man with whom the woman was romantically involved. Also, African-American women offenders predominated in
comparison to other women. These results concur with those reported in the early writings of Wolfgang (1958). Jurik and Winn's (1990) research also supported the prevalence of the use of guns by women and their increasing importance in violent acts.

Even though the bivariate and multivariate logistic analysis yielded similar results to other studies, Jurik and Winn (1990) moved the research further by testing their results theoretically. Jurik and Winn found that there was little support for the liberation hypothesis and considerable support for the self-protection and gender role theoretical models.

Jurik and Winn (1990) brought many theoretical insights into the research on female homicidal behavior, nonetheless one should be cautious when looking specifically at PSI reports. Cases that are classified as unsolved or involving a fugitive are not found in these judicial statistics (Wolfgang, 1958). It was unclear in the Jurik and Winn (1990) study how the theoretical definitions were applied to the homicide scenarios. Limited sources, reliance on PSI reports, and imprecise application may result in less generalizability of their findings.

Goldstein (1985): Tripartite Model

Drugs have entered the debate on female homicidal behavior as a causal factor. "Women have been depicted as more active participants in selling and distributing drugs in the crack and cocaine economy of the late 1980's compared to previous drug eras" (Daly &
Maher, 1996, p. 468). Goldstein (1985) created a conceptual framework to determine the drug and homicide nexus. The conceptual framework consists of the ways that drugs and violent acts such as homicide are related in society. The conceptual framework is divided into three models: the psychopharmacological, economic compulsive, and systemic (Goldstein, 1985).

The psychopharmacological model suggests that some individuals, as a result of short or long term ingestion of specific substances, may become excitable, irrational, and may exhibit violent behavior (Goldstein, 1985, p. 494). In this model, violence may involve drug use by either the victim or the offender. The substance of focus in this model is usually alcohol, stimulants, barbiturates or PCP (Goldstein, 1985).

The economically compulsive model suggests that some drug users engage in economically oriented violent crime, e.g., robbery, in order to support costly drug use (Goldstein, 1985, p. 496). The most common victim of this type of violence is a person residing in the same neighborhood as the offender, who is frequently engaged in illicit activities themselves. Common targets for economic compulsive violence are "other drug users, strangers coming into the neighborhood to buy drugs, numbers runners, and prostitutes" (Goldstein, 1985, p. 496).

Systemic violence is defined as "the traditionally aggressive patterns of interaction within the system of drug distribution and use" (Goldstein, 1985, p. 497). Some examples (Goldstein, 1985) are
the following:

1. Disparity over territory between rival drug dealers.
2. Assaults and homicides committed within dealing hierarchies as a means of enforcing normative codes.
3. Robberies of drug dealers and the usually violent retaliation by the dealer or his/her bosses.
4. Elimination of informers.
5. Punishment for selling adulterated or phony drugs.
6. Punishment for failing to pay one's debts.
7. Disputes over drugs or drug paraphernalia.
8. Robbery violence related to the social ecology of coping areas. (p. 407)

This model has been tested by numerous studies. The following discussion of studies encompasses the research that includes the tripartite model.

**Goldstein, Brownstein and Ryan (1992): Empirical Test of Goldstein's Tripartite Model**

Goldstein et al. (1992) tested this model by looking at drug-related homicide in New York during 1984 and 1988. The study was designed to address two concerns: "(a) the need for a uniform and comprehensive definition of drug relatedness; and (b) the need for routine and systematic collection of data about drug relatedness of homicide" (Goldstein et al., 1992, p. 461). In answering both questions, the research involved two separate studies under the title of Drug-Related Crime Analysis-Homicide (DRCA).

The first study was designed to assess the usefulness of police records determining the relationship between drug use and trafficking and homicide (Goldstein et. al., 1992). Data were collected in 1986 from existing police records for all homicides "(N=1,768) committed in New York State in 1984 (DRCA-H1)" (Goldstein et al., 1992, pp. 462-463). Compilation of the data varied from
mail-in forms to researcher visitation. The goal was to collect information in a manner least disruptive of individual agency facilities, but would nonetheless enable the researchers to collect comparable and reliable data from the different departments (Goldstein et al., 1992).

Because the researchers could not access the NYC police department data on homicide, which accounted for 83% of the state homicides in 1984, the researchers had to revamp the DRCA and created the DRCA-H2 (Goldstein et al., 1992). The major difference found in Goldstein et al.'s second study (1992) was that psychopharmacological cases predominated in 1984 and systemic cases predominated in 1988. But, as stated by the researchers, it is important to point out that the two samples differ in terms of time, place, data collection procedures, and new developments in the illicit drug market. "Psychopharmacological homicides were most often alcohol-related, and systemic cases were most often cocaine (including crack) related" (Goldstein et al., 1992, p. 473). Goldstein et al. (1992) found that "homicides do occur as a result of perpetrator and/or victim inebriation" (p. 474). However, Goldstein et al. (1992) found that police records yielded little insight into the complexities of the drug/crime/violence nexus, making it difficult to assess the cause.

Brownstein, Shiledar Baxi, Goldstein and Ryan (1992): Drugs and Homicide

Brownstein et al. (1992) reanalyzed Goldstein et al. (1992)
data on the 414 psychopharmacological and systemic homicide events in New York City (1988) noted in the previous study. The focus of this study involved the analysis of 266 perpetrators and 236 victims (Brownstein et al., 1992). Brownstein et al. (1992) found that more than half of the homicides were drug-related; those that were not drug-related either took place at a known drug location, and these involved perpetrators and/or victims who were known by the police to have been involved with drugs and drug trafficking; or involved perpetrators and/or victims with prior official criminal records for drug sales or possessions. The study showed that lethal violence or homicide is focused in communities where people are directly related with drugs or drug trafficking (Brownstein et al., 1992).

Brownstein, Spunt, Crimins, Goldstein and Langley (1994): Race, Drugs and Homicide

Still utilizing the Goldstein (1985) typology, Brownstein et al. (1994) conducted in-depth interviews of nine African-American women homicide offenders. The subject pool was selected from inmates incarcerated in New York state prisons for homicides committed in 1984. The nine interviews were conducted in different prisons throughout New York State, and lasted from one hour to one and a half hours.

The study included questions focused on the following: "the homicide event, involvement of drugs in the event, and offender and victim's previous experience with drugs, drug treatment, and criminal behavior" (Brownstein et al., 1994, p. 104). Because the study
had both open- and closed-ended questions, the participants were able to provide details concerning the killing, participant involvement, as well as about their experiences with drugs, crime and violence prior to the event.

Data that could be quantified were coded into a computerized file that also included prior criminal history data, and information from official corrections and criminal justice records (Brownstein et al., 1994). Beyond this information, detailed narratives, both in written and computerized form, were compiled using the responses to open-ended questions (Brownstein et al., 1994).

After the analysis of the nine cases, Brownstein et al. (1994) found that "there were only two cases in which the woman killed a spouse or intimate after a period of abuse" (p. 108). Because there were only two cases of this type, Brownstein et al. (1994) focused mostly on "the importance of the drugs and alcohol and the patterns of homicide" (p. 108).

Brownstein et al. (1994), using the tripartite model (psychopharmacological, economic compulsive and systemic), argue that female homicide cases may involve more economic compulsive cases with the growth in involvement of women with crack cocaine. But because of the limited subject pool, Brownstein et al. (1994) emphasized the need for more research that looks at alternative explanations for the varying and changing patterns of female homicide in relation to changing patterns of drug involvement by women, particularly in terms of the economic system through which drugs are bought and
sold.

The theoretical (tripartite) work of Goldstein et al. (1992) and of Brownstein et al. (1992, 1994) demonstrate the need to explore the connection between drugs and alcohol and homicide. The research has not yet provided definitive results concerning the role of drugs and alcohol in women's homicidal behavior. Goldstein et al. (1992) examined the police records and found no evidence of the drug, crime and violence relationship. However this lack of connection could be attributed to the limited time frame of the analysis. A relationship could still easily be found in a longitudinal rather than a cross-sectional analysis.

Brownstein, Spunt, Crimmins, Goldstein and Langley (1995): A Theoretical Connection

The final study explores a new theoretical angle on the changing patterns of lethal violence by women. Brownstein et al. (1995) connected the conceptual typology to theories of female homicidal behavior. Brownstein et al. (1995) examined women who had killed in circumstances related to a drug market economy rather than those who had killed in a domestic setting. The drug market was chosen because of the recent introduction of crack, but also because: "1) research has shown a connection between the crack markets and lethal violence and 2) it is relatively easy to create a crack market with a high profit" (Brownstein et al., 1995, p. 475). Crack dealings give women economic opportunities, which tended to put them in situations which were previously limited to men. The focus of the
study was not on the opportunities available to women, rather they 'examine situations in which women used lethal violence in relation to the drug market and ask whether or not they killed in relation to an economic interest related to the market' (Brownstein et al., 1995, p. 475).

The sample for this study came from a larger sample of 300 respondents identified by the State Department of Correctional Services of individuals residing in New York State who were either in the prison or on parole. The respondents were asked 'detailed closed and open-ended questions about their prior involvement with drugs and drug treatment, previous experiences as victims of violence or as violent offenders, prior participation in crime, and the homicide event itself' (Brownstein et al., 1995, p. 476). To supplement their data, the authors obtained information from the New York State Department of Correctional Services (DOCS). The DOCS includes information from the Emergency or Crisis (EOC) is about the participants and the incidents themselves (Brownstein et al., 1995).

For this study, Brownstein et al. (1995) focused on 19 cases in their sample that were related to participation of the respondents or their victims in the drug business (i.e., systemic). The 19 cases were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

An incident was classified as systemic if the respondent said yes to the question, Do you think the homicide was in any way related to the drug business [If yes] How was it related? Second, an incident was classified as systemic if the respondent said that it was related to the victim's involvement in the drug business, she was asked, Would you say the homicide was in any way related to the victim's drug or alcohol involvement [If yes]. How was it related? (p. 478).
Using the nineteen cases, Brownstein et al. (1995) tested liberationist (Adler) and gender-based perspectives (Hoffman-Bustamante) by focusing on the following points:

1) motives of the killing with an emphasis on economic motives and whether economic contexts were conducive to economic motives; 2) examination of the crack market with an emphasis on the opportunities available to young entrepreneurs and violence associated with protection of crack market interest; and 3) examination of women who had an economic interest in a drug market situation were asked whether they killed in relation to that interest. (p. 478)

Based upon the nineteen cases, Brownstein et al. (1995) found that "some of the women in a drug market economy killed to protect or extend their interest in the economy" (p. 492). Of the nineteen cases, thirteen of the women had a personal interest in the drug market economy. These women were stratified as follows: "four women killed in economic interest, four killed in a shared interest with a partner, and three killed in someone else's interest" (Brownstein et al., 1995, p. 492). Of the women who were defined as involved in the drug business and who killed for an economic reason, "five killed because of anger, three in self-defense, one while scaring someone, and one to stop abuse" (Brownstein et al., 1995, p. 493).

In testing gender-based and liberationist perspectives, Brownstein et al. (1995) found that women who kill do so for purposes unrelated to their gender. Brownstein et al. (1995) found that women kill in order to protect their interests, and the drug environment creates an opportunity for women to act in their own self-interest. They often act in terms of their relationship to a man, killing on behalf of a man or out of fear of a man. These actions indicate
that gender does not necessarily alter the dynamics of the drug market economy (Brownstein et. al., 1995).

Conclusion

This body of research suggests that there may be some fundamental differences between the homicidal behavior of males and females, intimate and non-intimate partner homicide, white and African-American women offenders. Tests of theories of female homicide are scarce. In particular, no studies were found that tested more recent theories that include the dynamics of race, class and gender to explain female homicide behavior. As described in the next chapter (IV), the present study aims to provide a more comprehensive profile of African-American and white homicide offenders and to explain their homicidal behavior. The following table (Table 2) summarizes the key elements of Chapter III. The table includes the researcher, year of the study, salient variables and location of the study.

Table 2
Summary of Key Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salient Variables</th>
<th>Location of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Race, sex, age, method (knife), place and motive, alcohol, Victim-offender relationship, prior arrest</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goetting</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Victim-offender relationship, circumstances of offense, prior arrest, method (gun)</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salient Variables</th>
<th>Location of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Age, race, accomplice (s), victim-offender relationship, concurrent felonies, method (knives)</td>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>1990a</td>
<td>Race, method (knives), Victim-offender relationship</td>
<td>6 cities (Atlanta, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, New York, Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>1990b</td>
<td>Substance use, method (gun), place and location</td>
<td>6 cities (Atlanta, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, New York, Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne and</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Compares rates of homicide between couples in married and nonmarital relationships</td>
<td>1976-1987: Supplementary Homicide Data Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Race, age, victim-offender relationship</td>
<td>Tucaloosa County, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Keefe</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Compared battered women incarcerated for killing/seriously assaulting their abuser with those battered women incarcerated for other offenses</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurik and</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Test of liberation, gender role and self protection theories</td>
<td>Maricopa County, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein et al.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Tripartite Typology</td>
<td>New York State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownstein et al.</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Tripartite Typology</td>
<td>New York State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownstein et al.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Tripartite Typology, gender role, liberationalist</td>
<td>New York State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

THE RESEARCH LITERATURE AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

A primary objective of this research is to develop a comprehensive picture of homicide offending by African-American and white women. A second objective is to test a theoretical model of African-American and white women's homicidal behavior. A secondary analysis of homicide data from Chicago will be used to develop this portrait. It is beyond the parameters of the present research to incorporate all the variables identified in the theoretical and empirical literature. Those selected for scrutiny are based on the theoretical perspectives developed by Wilson (1987, 1996), Simpson (1991) and Ogle et al. (1995). The first section of this chapter is a discussion of the characteristics of female homicide offenders and homicidal incidents. The second part develops a multivariate model incorporating the work of Wilson (1987, 1996), Ogle et al. (1995) and Simpson (1991) in order to create a clearer picture of female homicidal behavior.

Distribution of Women Homicide Offenders by Race

As indicated in Chapters II and III, there is a difference in the rates of homicides committed by African-American and white women. Simpson (1991) stresses that the rates of violence in lower class African-American communities compared with white communities
can be attributed to the higher level of everyday violence. Wilson (1996) extends this argument elaborating on the class variable in his discussion of the truly disadvantaged. He states that "neighborhoods plagued by high levels of joblessness are more likely to experience low levels of social organization or different kinds of social organization: the two go hand and hand" (p. 21). As a result, these particular poverty stricken areas have been found to have problems ranging from neighborhood deterioration to drug trafficking (Wilson, 1996). Wilson (1996) found that by 1991, close to half of the nation's poor lived in inner cities and that poverty was concentrated in the African-American community and among other minority groups (i.e., Latino, Asian) (Wilson, 1996). Because of the high levels of poverty and violence in African American communities, it is reasonable to expect that African-American women will commit a higher proportion of homicides than white women.

Simpson (1991) and Wilson (1997) illustrated the changing environment of the inner city lower class African-American communities. Cities experienced numerous structural changes with the onset of the crack epidemic that began in the late 1980's and continues forward to this day (e.g., neighborhood deterioration and African-American middle-class flight). This is illustrated by the following statement by an elderly African-American woman as she reflects changes in the South Side of Chicago over a forty-year period (Wilson, 1996):

'I've been here since March 21, 1953. When I moved in, the neighborhood was intact. It was intact with homes, beautiful
homes, mini mansions, with stores, laundromats, with cleaners, with Chinese [cleaners]. We had drugstores. We had hotels. We had doctors over on Thirty-ninth Street. We had doctors' offices in the neighborhood. We had the middle class and upper middle class. It has gone from affluent to where it is today. And I would like to see it back, that we can have some of things we had. Since I came in young, and I'm a senior citizen now, I would like to see some of the things come back so I can enjoy them like we did when we first came in. (p. 3)

As a result of the varying changes in their respective communities, African-American and white women experience different intensities and degrees of stress. Ogle et al. (1995) emphasize that "women with lower social status experience higher stress, on average than women with higher social status" (p. 179). Research has indicated that African-American women are "more likely to be poor than are white women" (Cantanzarite & Ortiz, 1998, p. 150). One-third of African-American women have incomes below the poverty level and are single parents (Jewel, 1993). Simpson (1991) and Wilson (1987, 1996) note that the marriageable pool of eligible African-American men for African-American women has decreased due to death, drug addiction, prison, or unemployment.

Combining the past research as indicated above and Ogle et al.'s (1995) theory, both would indicate that as time has progressed and communities have changed, lower class African-American women have experienced different levels of stress than their white counterparts. Therefore, African-American women's representation among female homicide offenders would be expected to increase over time, as a result of the increased stress experienced from the structural changes, the increased poverty, diminished social supports, de-
creased marriageable pool of men and the onset of the crack epidemic during the late 1980's.

A distinction is noted in the research literature on the type of female homicidal behavior that occurred during the pre-and post-crack epidemic periods. With the increased level of stress due to the crack epidemic, Ogle et al. (1995) would suggest that intimate partner homicide would increase among African-American women. Numerous studies have found a higher rate of intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide among women offenders in general. Combining the theoretical literature and past research (Simpson, 1991), African-American women would be expected to have an increase in intimate partner homicide during the crack-epidemic; an increase that is more pronounced for African-American women than it is for white women because of the greater amount of stresses in African-American women's lives.

Brownstein et al. (1995) point to a different issue as they questioned "to what extent do varying patterns of involvement with drugs and alcohol relate to varying patterns of involvement in homicide?" (p. 101). Their research suggests a connection between drugs and homicide. Brownstein et al. (1995) examined women who killed in circumstances related to a drug market economy rather than those who kill in domestic settings. One of the premises of this research was that crack dealings gave women economic opportunities which were previously limited to men. Brownstein et al. (1995) found that women in the drug market economy participated in the killing of indivi-
duals to protect or extend their interest in the economy. Following this argument, and contrary to the predictions from Ogle et al. (1995), the influx of the crack epidemic combined with African-American women's involvement in the drug economy would suggest an increase in the occurrence of non-intimate partner homicide among African-American women during this time period. Following both Simpson (1991) and Brownstein et al. (1995), it would be expected that during the crack-epidemic, African-American women would commit more non-intimate partner homicides than white women. The hypotheses derived from these works are the following:

Hypothesis #1: African-American women will commit a higher proportion of homicides than white women.

Hypothesis #2: During the crack-epidemic, there will be an increase in intimate partner homicides that is greater for African-American women than for white women (ala Ogle et al., 1995).

Hypothesis #3: During the crack-epidemic, there will be an increase in non-intimate partner homicides that is greater for African-American women than for white women (ala Brownstein et al., 1995).

Characteristics of Female Homicide Offenders and Their Homicidal Incidents

The purpose of this section is to develop hypotheses related to the profiles of African-American and white female homicide offenders. Researchers have examined the following characteristics of female homicide offenders, their victims, and their homicidal inci-
dents: race and sex of the victim; prior arrest of the offender and victim; alcohol use by the offender and victim; weapon choice; and age of the offender and victim. The following section will outline the findings in each of these subsections and develop hypotheses concerning changes in these characteristics over the time before and since the onset of the crack epidemic.

**Race and Sex of the Victim**

Research indicates that female homicide offenders kill both men and women. However, research also indicates that female homicidal behavior is usually intersexual and intraracial. Thus, women typically kill men of their own race. Research also suggests that women typically kill an intimate partner, another acquaintance, or a family member, but rarely a stranger (Browne, Williams & Dutton, 1999). This can be theoretically explained by the work of Ogle et al. (1995). According to their model, social isolation "usually limits the choice of targets for the angry aggression" (p. 184). In other words, the individual strikes at the closest object in the environment. This is further supported by the number of crimes committed by the truly disadvantaged directed at other truly disadvantaged people (Ogle et al., 1995). Studies have specifically shown a higher rate of victimization and offending among African Americans than their white counterparts (Hawkins, 1999). Hawkins (1999) states that the "literature is replete with studies at the national, state and local levels that document comparatively high rates of
homicide among some ethnic, racial, and class groups and lower rates among others* (p. 143). Because of this, African-American women dominate the ranks of female homicide offenders. Based on both the theoretical and empirical literature, it may be inferred that African-American males would be the victims in a higher proportion of African-American female homicides.

**Intimate Versus Non-Intimate Partner Homicide**

Because of the numerous studies of intimate versus non-intimate homicides by women, it would be expected that African-American males would be the victims of a higher proportion of intimate partner homicides. But Brownstein et al.’s (1994, 1995) research implies that with the inclusion of drugs, the number of non-intimate partner homicides may increase. Because of the increase of non-intimate partner homicides, African-American men may not have the highest proportion of non-intimate partner homicides during the crack-epidemic. Block (1990) supports this argument, stating that with multiple offenders or in concurrent felonies, whites are victimized more than their African-American counterparts. Mann (1990) also found that "minorities were more often the victims of women who killed in domestic situations, while non-minorities were more likely to be killed in non-domestic situations" (p. 186). Based on this research, during the crack-epidemic, it may be inferred that non-African-Americans would be the victims of a higher proportion of non-intimate partner homicides. The hypotheses derived from this
literature are the following:

Hypothesis #4: There will be a significant relationship between the race/sex of the victim and the race of the offender, with most homicides being intra-racial and inter-sexual.

Hypothesis #5: Because of the prevalence of African-American female offenders, it is expected that African-American males would be the victims in a higher proportion of homicides committed by African-American women.

Hypothesis #6: During the crack epidemic, there will be a significant relationship between the race/sex of the victim and non-intimate partner homicide versus intimate partner homicide, with non-African-American males (white and other) being the victim in a higher proportion of non-intimate partner homicides.

Prior Arrest of the Offender and Victim

Prior Arrest of the Offender

Research indicates that the female homicide offender is likely to be a first time offender. O'Keefe (1997) found that 80% of women who killed/seriously assaulted their abuser had no previous record. These results can be explained theoretically by Ogle et al. (1995). According to their model, as outlined in Chapter II, individuals manage the overcontrolled personality with coping mechanisms, so that the individual engages in much less violence and aggression overall than others (Ogle et al., 1995). But intense stress combined with baseline stress (as described in Chapter II) can over-
whelm the overcontrolled personality causing the individual to erupt in an intense moment of rage. Hence, the occurrence of female homicidal behavior often occurs in the absence of a prior arrest record for that particular female. Ogle et al.'s (1995) theory suggests that women who kill their intimate partners should be less likely to have a prior arrest. Thus, it would be expected that women homicide offenders would not have a significant number of prior arrests, particularly for violent offenses.

Race, Crack and Prior Arrest of the Offender

Research also indicates that African-American women who kill have arrest records. "Research in which African-Americans have been or can be examined as a group reveals that African-American women who kill have more extensive criminal histories than do their non-African-American counterparts" (Mann, 1990a, p. 183). This difference in prior arrest of the offender could be attributed to the increased violence and the crack epidemic in the inner city African-American community (Simpson, 1991). It could also be attributed to discrimination against African-American women in the criminal justice system. "Researchers concluded that white women were treated more liberally than African-American women when police discretionary power not to arrest was involved" (Mann, 1997, p. 121). African-American women have been found to have increases in the rates of prior arrest, but usually for non-violent drug offenses (Mann, 1997). Drug convictions have caused African-American women's im-
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prisonment rates to skyrocket. The increases in women's arrest and incarceration rates have been attributed to their increased use of drugs and their drug related crimes (possession, selling and petty theft) (Mann, 1997). Therefore, it would be expected that African-American women would have significantly more prior arrests than their white counterparts. Following Simpson (1991), it would be expected that during the crack epidemic, African-American women would show more prior arrests, and the strength of the relationship would be more pronounced. The hypotheses derived from this are:

Hypothesis #7: There will be a significant relationship between the prior arrest record of the offender and intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide, with women who kill their intimate partner being less likely to have a prior arrest record, especially for violent crimes.

Hypothesis #8: There will be a significant relationship between the race of the offender and prior arrest record of the offender, with African-American women more likely to have a prior arrest record than white women offenders, especially for non-violent crimes.

Prior Arrest of the Victim

Research has found that the homicide victim usually has a previous arrest record. This result has been found in the context of intimate partner homicide beginning all the way back with the work of Wolfgang (1958). Wolfgang (1958) examined victim-precipitated
(VP) cases versus non-VP cases (as outlined in Chapter III). He found that in VP cases, "the victim is more likely than the offender to have a previous record" (Wolfgang, 1962, p. 395). He also found that a "significant association between VP victims and previous record of offenses against the person" (Wolfgang, 1962, p. 395). Therefore, the research implies that the victim of an intimate partner homicide has an arrest record because the victim probably has attacked the offender before the fatal incident. Thus, it may be inferred that male victims will have prior arrests for violent crimes, especially victims in intimate partner homicides. The one hypothesis in this section is:

Hypothesis #9: Among male victims, there will be a significant relationship between intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide and the prior arrest record of the victim, with male victims of intimate partner homicides being more likely to have prior arrests for violence than male victims of non-intimate partner homicides.

Alcohol Use

Alcohol use in homicide incidents is not a new phenomenon. Blout et al. (1994) emphasize that the victim and offender's drinking should be considered in order to determine the role of alcohol for women who kill. Brownstein et al. (1994) found that research has underestimated the involvement of alcohol in the killing or in the life of women who have killed. Browne (1997), following Walker
(1984) states that research shows an increase in offenders' "intake of alcohol and other drugs as a way of coping with the terror of assaults, grief over changes in the relationship, anticipation of future attacks, and physical pain or injury" in domestic violence situations (p. 63).

As indicated by Parker (1995) the disinhibition of the offender "suggest that the impact of alcohol on behavior is to remove the effect of social inhibitions that otherwise restrict or prohibit behaviors contrary to important social norms" (p. 6). Thus, the disinhibition of the offender would create a higher likelihood of intimate partner homicide. Following this argument, Ogle et al.'s (1995) model would suggest that the stress of a domestic violence environment would increase the likelihood of female homicidal behavior (Browne, 1987). More specifically, the offender may use alcohol to cope with domestic violence. Alcohol use unlocks the overcontrolled personality that usually keeps women from striking back at their batterers. This produces the sudden eruption of violence resulting in an intimate partner homicide. Thus, alcohol use by the offender may play a critical role in the production of intimate partner homicides. Combining the stress of domestic violence with the overcontrolled personality and alcohol use of the offender, the female's inhibitions are lowered in a domestic violence situation resulting in a higher incidence of female homicidal behavior against the intimate partner. It is reasonable to suggest that heavy use of alcohol by the offender would make it difficult to find alternative
ways to cope with an abusive partner (Blout et al., 1994). Therefore, it would be expected that there would be a significant relationship between the alcohol use of the offender and intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide.

Numerous studies also indicate alcohol use by the homicide victim. Mann (1990a) found that 48.1% of the victims had been drinking prior to the homicide. O'Keefe (1997) found that 50% of batterers abused alcohol daily and over two-thirds abused hard drugs. In intimate partner homicides, Browne (1997) found that alcohol use "provides women with some sort of explanation for their partners aggression, believing alcohol is responsible gives them hope that violence will cease if only their mates would stop drinking" (p. 63). Another dynamic involved here is that the batterer is given the right to "drink at will regardless of consequence" (Ptacek, 1997, p. 119). This type of environment provides for the batterer a time-out from socially acceptable behaviors. Therefore, it would be expected that there would be a significant relationship between the alcohol use of the victim and intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide. Two hypotheses are derived from these considerations:

Hypothesis #10: There will be a significant relationship between the alcohol use of the offender and the probability of an intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide, with alcohol use by the offender increasing the probability of an intimate partner homicide.

Hypothesis #11: There will be a significant relationship between the alcohol use of the victim and the probability of an in-
timate versus non-intimate partner homicide, with alcohol use by the victim increasing the probability of an intimate partner homicide.

Based on the literature review, it would seem feasible to explore the connection between intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide and drug use. But in the exploratory analysis of the drug use items in the Chicago dataset, many of the cases did not identify whether the victim, offender or both had been using drugs (90.6% of the drug use with drug motive variable and 64.2% of the drug and/or liquor use with drug motive variable had missing information). Therefore, I was unable to explore the relationship of drugs to female homicide offending in the present study.

**Weapon Choice**

Research has indicated a relationship between choice of weapon and female homicidal behavior. Typically, the weapon choice of most women homicide offenders has been a knife. Goetting (1988) correlated this result with women's traditional role of food preparation, which makes women more comfortable with knives than with guns. But numerous studies (Mann, 1990; Brownstein et al., 1994) have indicated an increase in the variety of weapons chosen by female homicide offenders. As America becomes more urban and violent, many individuals are turning to guns for protection against other people (Cook & Moor, 1999). A women describes her life (Wilson, 1997) in the inner city of Chicago:

See, this is a violent neighborhood. You always hear somebody gettin shot, just about every day or something like every
night. Because you know, like I said, I see people are crowded up together, especially in the high rises. I would say it drags you down, because, you know, when people get crazy and everything, it'll drag you down. They gonna robbin you, you know, tryin to beat you. They don't wanta work, you know, they'd rather for you to work and then wait for you, you know, to get your paycheck so they can rob you or something. (p. 6)

Violence combined with race of the offender could have an impact on the choice of weapon by the offender. Wolfgang (1958) found that stabbing with a kitchen knife was the primary method of killing for African-American females. However, guns, according to Mann (1990), "have replaced cutting instruments as the weapon of choice" (p. 191). Research beyond this work, however, has found mixed results concerning the weapon choice of African-American women homicide offenders. Therefore, it would be expected that there would be a significant relationship between weapon choice and race of the offender, with African-American women being more likely to use a gun than white women.

Ogle et al. (1995) defined a homicide as an event that occurs at a spontaneous moment. As a result, according to Ogle et al. (1995), the offender would attack using something in her immediate environment, hence the use of a knife since women's role is typically in the home environment. Tonry (1995), however, found that crime, guns, gangs and drugs ravage inner city areas of African-American communities. As the community changes for African-American women, guns became predominant and more accessible in the community. Following Ogle et al. (1995) and Tonry (1995), it would be expected that as the environment changed for African-American female offend-
ers, they would choose guns more often than knives. Therefore, it would be expected that during the crack epidemic, there would be a significant relationship between the race of the offender and guns, with African-American women choosing guns more often than knives. This leads to two hypotheses:

Hypothesis #12: There will be a significant relationship between the race of the offender and weapon of choice with white women using a knife and African-American women using a gun.

Hypothesis #13: There will be a significant relationship between race of the offender and weapon choice, with African-American women becoming more likely to use guns than knives after the onset of the crack epidemic.

Age of the Offender

Block (1990) found that the average age of the white female offender (age 34) is older than the average age of the African-American female offender (age 30.4). This disparity in age could be a result of African-American women's involvement in the criminal justice system. Arnold (1995) argues that for "young African-American girls from lower socioeconomic classes, involvement in precriminal behavior may be viewed as active resistance to victimization" (p. 137). As a result of this active resistance to victimization, lower class African-American girls participate in criminal behavior that activates the criminal justice system. Once the criminal justice system is set into motion, criminal behavior becomes
the norm and a rational coping strategy (Arnold, 1995). Ogle et al.'s (1995) theoretical model is consistent with this argument. Following their model, the overcontrolled personality does not learn regulative rules (p. 185). Regulative rules govern how to control and direct anger. Because of limited experience, youthful offenders may have not developed the control and skills to direct their anger in a non-violent manner. As a result, youthful offenders may be more likely to express their anger violently.

Ogle et al.'s (1994) model would also predict that African-American women of lower class socioeconomic status, usually experience higher stress levels due to single motherhood and poverty (Wilson, 1996, Simpson, 1991). Younger lower class African-American women would be experiencing more stress because of such circumstances in their environment, increasing the probability of female homicidal behavior. Therefore, it would be expected that there will be a significant relationship between the age and race of the offender, with African-American females being younger than white female offenders.

Hypothesis #14: There will be a significant relationship between the age and race of the offender, with African-American females being younger than white female offenders.

Age of the Victim

Most offenders kill someone around their own age or slightly older. Block (1990) found that the offender and victim are usually
around the same age. Goetting (1988), on the other hand, found that victims in general are somewhat older than the offender. This could be due to the fact that women typically victimize their husband or lover, and in most traditional relationships, the male victim is usually older than the offender (Goetting, 1988). Therefore, it expected that there will be a significant relationship between the age of the offender and the age of the victim, especially in intimate partner homicides. The final bivariate hypothesis is:

Hypothesis #15: There will be a significant relationship between the age of the offender and the age of the victim, with the offender killing someone older in intimate partner homicide.

Theoretical Model

Research indicates that the probability of an intimate partner homicide committed by an African-American female is higher than the probability of an intimate partner homicide committed by a white female. Therefore, it would be predicted that the offender being an African-American woman is expected to increase the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide. But the research also indicates that the race of the offender may not be the only cause of an intimate partner homicide. To test this proposition, the study will examine the following causal model (see Figure 1).
The model is based on the combined work of Ogle et al. (1995), Wilson (1987, 1996) and Simpson (1991). The model also incorporates two concepts that are not included in the combined work of these three theoretical perspectives. These are alcohol use of the offender/victim and prior arrest record of the victim and offender.

The model includes six concepts. The first concept is the race of the offender. For this model, the race of interest is the African-American female. This concept will be operationalized further in Chapter V. The second concept in the model is the underclass context related to offenses as laid out by Wilson (1987, 1996). Because the dataset does not include class indicators for either the victim or offender, the underclass context of the area of the occurrence of the homicide is utilized in this study. The definition of this concept is based on the work of Wilson (1987, 1996) and is operationalized in Chapter V.

The third concept in the model is social disorganization. Social disorganization, briefly, according to Wilson (1987, 1996) is the deterioration of an area. This concept is operationalized in Chapter V. The fourth and fifth concepts are the unique contribu-
tions added by the researcher to enhance our understanding of female homicide offending. Past research indicates that alcohol use of the offender and/or victim could increase the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide. Research also indicates the correlation as outlined in Chapters II and III, between prior arrest record of the offender/victim and intimate partner homicide. Therefore, it would seem that the inclusion of both concepts would provide insight into the occurrence of intimate partner homicide. These two concepts are, therefore, included as part of the causal model. The last concept of the model is the type of homicide, which in this study is intimate partner versus non-intimate homicide. This concept is operationalized in Chapter V. Thus, Figure 1 includes race, underclass context, social disorganization, alcohol use of the victim and offender, prior arrest record of the victim and offender, and intimate partner homicide. Reading across the model in causal sequence, beginning with the race of the offender, the following section will outline the probability of the homicide being an intimate partner homicide. Each of the concepts in the model produce either an increase (+) or decrease (-) in the probability of an intimate partner homicide. The race of the offender (i.e., being African-American) is predicted to significantly increase the probability of an intimate partner homicide.

The effect associated with the offender's race would decrease (meaning that the importance of the offender's race diminishes) when underclass context variables are added into the model.
Both the combined work of Simpson (1991) and Mann (1990b) allude to the prediction that the female homicide offender may not only be African-American, but she may also be part of the lower social economic class. However, as the model shows, the effects of offender's race on the probability of intimate partner homicide is expected to be substantially mediated by the intervening variables in the model-underclass context, social disorganization, victim and offender alcohol use and victim/offender prior arrest records. According to Ogle et al. (1995), Wilson (1987, 1996) and Simpson (1991), being an African-American women increases the likelihood of underclass status and living in a socially disorganized neighborhood. Further, Ogle et al. (1995) argue that women living under such conditions are more likely to experience high levels of stress. In turn, as I argued earlier, women under high levels of stress are more likely to use/abuse alcohol as a coping mechanism which releases the overcontrolled personality and a violent eruption where the target is the intimate partner.

In addition, being African-American increases the probability of both the victim and the offender having a prior arrest record which, in the case of the victim having a prior record of violence increases the probability of an intimate partner homicide. Thus, the direct effect of the race of the offender on the probability of an intimate partner homicide should be diminished due to the effects of race on the mediating factors. Using Wilson's (1987) distinctions of underclass context variables (the truly disadvantaged, which will
be elaborated upon in Chapter V) it would be predicted that the inclusion of the underclass context variables would decrease the impact of race on the occurrence of intimate partner homicide.

The underclass context previously mentioned, based on Wilson's (1987) definition of the truly disadvantaged, is anticipated to increase the likelihood of alcohol use as well as the probability of a prior arrest record of the victim and offender. Wilson (1987, 1996) defines the subculture of the truly disadvantaged as a network of limited opportunities. Often, if an individual does not have legitimate opportunities, she/he often either turns to alcohol use to alleviate the stress of the situation, or to illegitimate opportunities to survive in their environment. Hence, the use of alcohol to alleviate stress or commission of prior crimes to try to subsidize one's income can be expected to escalate in probability. The effects of the underclass environment on intimate partner homicide are mediated by both alcohol use by the victim and/or offender and the victim's and offender's prior records.

Beyond defining the characteristics of the truly disadvantaged, Wilson (1996) outlines the structural/environmental plight of the truly disadvantaged. He elaborates upon the disappearance of jobs and consequences affecting "both social and cultural life of the residents" (p. xix). What results is a community plagued by middle and working class flight and neighborhood deterioration. Because of these types of environmental changes, Brownstein, et al. (1995) describes the presence of a new breed of female homicide
offender. This new breed exists because of the new drug market (crack cocaine) and has a higher likelihood of committing a non-intimate partner homicide, owing to the drug economy versus personal circumstances and exigencies. Combining Wilson (1987, 1996) and Brownstein, et al. (1995), it would be expected that social disorganization would decrease the likelihood of the homicide victim being the intimate partner of the offender. Therefore, social disorganization can be expected to have a dampening effect on intimate partner homicide. Instead, social disorganization is expected to increase the probability of women killing victims other than their intimate partner.

Examining prior theory and research helps to provide further insight into the expectations within the model just described. The interpretations offered break apart or separate the nature of the influence of alcohol use by offenders in relation to victims, and of prior arrest records of offenders in contrast to victims.

One distinction that can be refined within the model relates to prior arrest record of the offender versus victim. As outlined in Chapter II, according to Ogle et al. (1995), a homicide will happen as a result of the eruption of the overcontrolled personality. The homicide occurs at a spur of the moment. Because the event occurs at an eruption rather than a planned event, the offender typically has no prior arrest record. Offenders who commit intimate partner homicides tend not to have criminal histories, while offenders who do have such histories are more likely to kill victims.
other than their intimate partner. Therefore, the absence of offender prior arrest records would increase the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide, and the existence of offender prior arrest record would decrease the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide.

Research also indicates a link between the prior arrest record of the victim and homicide. Prior arrest of the victim, especially for violent crimes, as outlined in Chapter II, is believed to be predictive of earlier domestic violence occurrences. This correlates with the prior record of the offender and thus the final fatal event resulting from a "last straw" situation. Past research indicates that the homicide may be the only alternative for the offender to stop domestic violence.

The next concept in the model is alcohol use. Combining both Simpson (1991) and Parker (1995), alcohol use can be seen as a means used by African-American women to cope with the high levels of stress associated with race, class and gender. For women, according to Ogle et al., (1995), alcohol use overcomes the overcontrolled personality's inhibitions towards violence, resulting in explosive homicidal aggression against the intimate partner. The theoretical model of Ogle et al. (1995) would suggest that the stress of a domestically violent environment would increase the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide by a female offender. Thus, the offender may use alcohol to cope with the domestically violent situation. Therefore, the effects of the race of the offender on intimate
partner homicide can be expected to be substantially mediated by alcohol use by the victim and prior arrest record of the offender.

Parker (1995) also indicates a correlation between alcohol use of the victim and homicide. The use of alcohol by African-American males can be seen as a coping mechanism to deal with class and racial oppression, which in turn leads to violent abuse of the intimate partner. Alcohol may be used by the victim and offender or both, and in any case operates to increase the likelihood of violence, and the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide. Therefore, it would be expected that the alcohol use of the offender or victim or both would increase the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide.

There are three dimensions that deserve to be underscored with regards to the multivariate model. The first is that multivariate analysis is designed to test whether the net effect of the race of offender decreases when adding each of the respective intervening variables. Put differently, the model is based on the expectations that the model will add to the understanding of African-American women's homicidal behavior in intimate versus non-intimate contexts because it will simultaneously examine the impact of race vis-à-vis other expected causes.

The second noteworthy point is that this study performs a separate analysis of the underclass context variable in terms of the total population versus African-American population characteristics providing for a more refined, in-depth assessment of what is meant
by the concept of underclass. When measuring the underclass context, the analysis should include the characteristics of the total population, but it should also examine characteristics that are distinct to the African-American population. Wilson (1987, 1996) identifies the characteristics of the truly disadvantaged population in general terms, but another distinction in his work is that he states that the truly disadvantaged are usually African-American. Thus, from Wilson's (1987) work it is unclear whether characteristics of the underclass should be measured for the entire population living in the census tract/neighborhood, or whether, instead, only characteristics of African American residents should be used. Therefore, it would be predicted that the study might miss valuable insight into the nature of the underclass without looking at both the characteristics of the total population, and compare/contrast these to the African-American population considered separately. This needs to be investigated in order to assess the "meaning and significance of race in certain situations" (Wilson, 1996, p. xiv).

The third noteworthy aspect of the model is that it examines the two time periods, the pre-crack time frame spanning January 1980-March 1985, and the during/after crack period extending April 1985 to December 1995. This will be justified in the next chapter, but succinctly here, the advent of crack cocaine can be expected to differently impact the African-American and white communities, the underclass, the level of social disorganization of an area, alcohol use and accumulated records of arrest in intimate versus non-inti-
mate homicide cases. The onset of crack and the period of the crack epidemic brought about significant social changes. Substance use and the fear it engenders cripple our society, threatening personal freedom, and fraying the ties that are essential for healthy communities. It seems as if no corner of the United States is safe from increasing levels of substance use. Parents are afraid to let their children walk to school alone. Children hesitate to play in neighborhood playgrounds, and the elderly lock themselves in their homes.

Based on such vast changes, and upon the literature review, there needs to be some distinctions made in the pre-crack and crack periods. One of the major distinctions relates to the expectations that alcohol use and prior arrest record of the offender will have a stronger effect in the crack period versus the pre-crack period. The theoretical model would suggest that the impact of crack in inner-city neighborhoods on underclass women and their propensity to use alcohol to cope, would loosen their inhibitions to commit violent acts, thus resulting in different effects of the variables in the model during the crack period versus the pre-crack period.

The second major distinction concerns the expectations regarding the victim's prior arrest for violence over the two time periods. It is expected that prior arrest record of the offender will have a stronger effect in the crack period than the pre-crack period. The increased stresses would likely increase violence and hence the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide. Since the dataset
encompasses the pre-crack and crack epidemic years (1980-1995), the research would be remiss if it failed to examine the model over the two time periods. Hence, the integrated model will be assessed in overall terms, and then compared for the pre-versus-crack epidemic time frames.

In conclusion, this chapter outlines the bivariate and multivariate models. Chapter V will explain the measures and analytical methods used in the study.
CHAPTER V

METHODS AND ANALYTIC TECHNIQUES

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the methods and analytical strategy for the present study. The chapter specifically outlines the procedures used to develop the more comprehensive picture of females who kill, to access the theoretical perspectives, and to develop an integrated model of intimate partner homicide. The chapter is divided into three sections: the homicide data set, the variable selection and operationalization, and the analytical techniques employed in this study.

The Chicago Homicide Data

The data used in the present study were extracted from the study, Homicides in Chicago, 1965-1995, collected under the leadership of Dr. Carolyn Rebecca Block (ICPSR-Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research # 6399). The study contains information on all homicides recorded by the Chicago Police Department between 1965 and 1995 except justifiable homicides (e.g., killing in the line of duty, or in self-defense). The homicides are explored longitudinally in the Chicago area over a thirty-year time span.

The dataset contains detailed information from 1965 to 1995 on over 100 variables and nearly 23,000 homicides (Christakos & Block, 1996, p. 1). The dataset provides the following information:
the relationship of victim to offender; whether the victim or offender had previously committed a violent or nonviolent offense; time of occurrence and place of homicide; type of weapon used; cause and motivation for the incident; whether the incident involved drugs, alcohol, gangs, child abuse, or domestic relationship; if or how the offender was identified; and information on the death of the offenders. Geographic variables include the census tract, community area, police district and police area. Demographic variables such as age, sex, and race of each victim and offender are also provided.

The data collection in the Chicago study involved two stages. In the first stage, the detective division staff filled out a Murder Analysis Report (MAR) in the crime analysis unit, which was later converted to an automated computer system. The details of the homicide are defined at the police investigation stage without regard to the outcome of the case. The MAR identifies/compiles various factors of the case (e.g., relationship, location). Unlike the legal requirements, the justification for the preponderance of evidence standard for the police is not similar to the standard of proof required for the courts. The data were then separated into two files, a file containing offender demographics, and a second file containing the victim demographics and other variables (Christakos & Block, 1996).

The second stage involved coders using a coding system similar to that used by the detective unit, to code the information originally retrieved from the MAR. The coder received two separate files (offender and victim file) from the Chicago Police Department (CPD) (Christakos & Block, 1996). Coders crosschecked information in the computer system "to the MAR for each case and added additional
variables, additional codes and narratives* (Christakos & Block, 1996, p. 3). When some ambiguity existed, the crime unit advised coders of the correct codes and definitions (Christakos & Block, 1996). A unique identifier connects the two data files for each victim, which is the homicide number (HOMINUM).

Extraction of the data from the Chicago file used in the present study included three stages. First the data were changed to an offender-based file. Second, African-American and white female homicide offenders were selected out of the dataset. And third, the dataset drawn for use was limited to 1980 through 1995. Each of these stages is discussed below.

Offender-Based File

The Chicago homicide data file contains one record for each homicide victim. Offender information for up to five offenders is included in each victim record. For the present study, an offender-based file was necessary where there would be a record for each offender and victim pair. Converting the victim-based file to an offender-based file required six steps.

First, cases where one or more of the five offenders were females were selected using the SELECT CASES/SELECT IF menu option in SPSS for Windows and the five offender sex variables (OFN1SEX through OFN5SEX). This deleted cases where all offenders were males, or where the case was unsolved, and hence the sex of the offender(s) was unknown. This resulted in a file with 2,770 homicide victims
where at least one of the offenders was a woman.

Second, five separate files were saved each containing the offender variables for one offender and all of the other variables on the victim record. For example, the first file contained the offender variables for the first offender (e.g., race of the offender #1, sex of the offender #1, age of the offender #1, offender #1 relationship to the victim, etc.) and all other variables of the victim record. Each of these five files contained 2,770 cases.

Third, the five files were sequentially concatenated using the DATA/MERGE FILE/ADD CASES menu options in SPSS. This resulted in a file containing 13,850 records representing homicide victim/offender pairs.

Fourth, the file was sorted by homicide identification number in order to bring together the five offender records for each homicide victim. Many of these records contained missing data on the offender variables since most homicide victims were killed by fewer than five offenders.

Fifth, the file was saved excluding records where the offender was either male or the offender sex was missing, indicating that the offender variables were missing data due to the fact that the victim was killed by fewer than five offenders. This resulted in a file with 2,872 female offender/victim pair records.

Finally, a case weighting variable was computed to correct for the fact that an offender appears multiple times in the data set if there are multiple offenders. Weighting the case by the reciprocal
of the number of victims results in the correct number of cases being used in the analyses. This results in a weighted sample size of 2,788 cases/offenders. Further restricting the sample to homicides committed by African-American and white women between 1980 through 1995 (see below), results in a final weighted sample size of 1,179 offenders. Some of the bivariate and multivariate analysis will show a larger sample size because SPSS does not weight cases in all procedures. A larger sample size could also be accounted for because some of the offenders killed more than one victim, thus accounting for a varied sample size in this study.

African-American and White Female Homicide Offenders

To extract African-American and white female homicide offenders, I used SXRAC, which combines the gender and race/ethnicity of the offender. Using the select cases menu option in SPSS for windows, I selected out cases coded as female African-American and female white and deleted cases falling into all other race/sex categories.

1980-1995 Time Period

The data set included information for 1965 to 1995 (and the original study is still an ongoing project). At the start of this project the data were only available until 1995, hence this project has an ending date of 1995. The starting point of the project was based on the needs identified in past research. The research indicated a need for current but also for a longitudinal approach to fe-
male homicide offending. Thus, a fifteen-year time span was chosen to explore (longitudinal) differences over time. The fifteen-year time span (versus a thirty-year time span) was chosen because it allows the researcher to include a reasonable time frame in order to begin to create a clearer picture of differences and similarities between African-American and white female homicide offenders. Thus it seemed appropriate to start at the 1980 point instead of the 1965 starting point.

The 1980's were an era of turmoil on many different fronts ranging from the upheaval of many communities to changes in governmental programs. In the last few years, inner city neighborhoods have undergone a profound social transformation and Chicago is no exception. This transformation began in the late 1970's with the exodus of two social classes in the urban African-American community. These two social economic groups included the African-American-middle class, and working class. In no way am I implying that these two classes were alone responsible for upholding the African-American community's values, but a unified network of social norms and values was lost in the community with their exodus (Wilson, 1987, 1996). And "the removal of these two groups made it more difficult to sustain the basic institutions in the inner city (including churches, stores, schools, recreational facilities, etc.) in the face of prolonged joblessness" (Wilson, 1987, p. 144). This process affected such social networks as role models, access to jobs, and availability of marriageable partners.
The government also laid the foundation for many changes within inner cities, as seen in the presidential platform of Ronald Reagan. Reagan implemented across-the-board tax cuts, including domestic spending and social welfare cuts. During Reagan's first year in office "overall spending during his first term decreased by nearly 10 percent, and AFDC and food stamps spending declined almost 15 percent" (Culversen, 1998, p. 101). For example, Reagan systematically dismantled programs that provided birth control services to the poor. As a result, the poor could no longer control the size of their families. This resulted in not only over-population in poor areas, like those in Chicago, according to Wilson (1987, 1996), but also to decreases in the job market and increases in crime. Families that are struggling to survive can only survive and produce another generation of poor individuals.

Another development in the 80's was the prevalence of drugs. Recent literature has suggested that drugs are a more important indicator of crime than race. To expand the knowledge of the impact that the crack epidemic has on homicide, the present study looks at changes in patterns of female homicide offending and intimate partner homicide over this period of time pertaining to the onset of crack in Chicago.

To measure the onset of the crack epidemic, I first contacted the Chicago Police Department (CPD)-Narcotics Division (Richard Glasser--Program Analyst). As reported by the CPD-Narcotics Division, the crack epidemic began between 1988 and 1989. Wilson (1996),
confirming the CPD-Narcotics Division description, described the extent of the drug problem in Chicago as "moving upward in the early 1980's and accelerating after 1985" (p. 59). And, by "1990, the distribution and consumption of crack-cocaine had become widespread in the ghetto neighborhoods of Chicago" (p. 59). Finally, in an overview of the UCR in Chicago, the crime index indicates that drugs typically related to such crimes as burglaries, petty theft. According to the UCR of Chicago these crimes increased dramatically after June, 1988.

Based on the insights gleaned from Wilson (1996), the UCR, and CPD-Narcotics Division, I used the INJYEAR and INJMONTH variable to date the onset of the crack epidemic in Chicago. The INJYEAR variable is a two-digit code (65, 66, 67 etc.) of the year of the homicide incident. The INJMONTH variable identifies the month of the occurrence of the incident. Sorting the cases by both variables, all time periods were checked by year and season to develop time period relating to the crack epidemic. This resulted in dichotomizing the data into two time periods, January 1980-March 1985 and April 1985-December 1995. Thus, the new variable (CRACK) was created with the following categories: January 1980-March 1985 = 0; April 1985-December 1995 = 1.

Unfortunately, this is the only variable that could be used in this research to explore the relationship of drugs to female homicidal behavior. The researcher explored numerous avenues to analyze the connection between drugs and homicide. Two variables in the
dataset that reflect drug use at the time of the incident were unusable (DRUGTOT and INTOXT). DRUGTOT is defined as drug use with drug motive. The initial analysis found that 90.6% of the cases were in the no information/no evidence category for DRUGTOT, and thus the variable is unusable. INTOXT is defined as the drug and/or liquor use with drug motive. The initial analysis found that 64.2% of the cases were in the no evidence, were lacking information category on INTOXT, thus this variable is unusable. Therefore, the effect of drugs will be only discussed in the context of the pre-crack period and crack period.

Variable Selection

Intimate Partner Homicide

The topic of intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide is particularly complex and has generated considerable controversy. Several recent studies have concluded that the key variable for understanding the variation in homicide rates across time and place for female homicide offenders is whether the homicide is an intimate rather than non-intimate partner homicide. Research also suggests that the victim-offender relationship is crucial to unlocking the mystery of why women kill. This suggests that intimate partner homicides may differ from homicides of other family members, friends, acquaintances, and/or strangers.

Ogle et al. (1995) would also suggest, as outlined in Chapter II, that with increased stresses, intimate partner homicides would
increase, during times like the crack period. The overcontrolled personality would have a higher likelihood of erupting, due to the increased stresses experienced by women. However, Brownstein et al. (1995), as outlined in Chapter III, would suggest that non-intimate partner homicide would increase because of the new breed of female homicide offenders. This new breed is killing in the drug market and the victim is a not an intimate partner.

To measure intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide, I chose the variable that examines intimate partner homicide (DOMESTIC). The DOMESTIC variable (Christakos & Block, 1996) is defined as the following:

> all intimate partner relationships (e.g., husband/wife; common-law husband/wife; ex-husband/wife, boyfriend/girlfriend; ex-boyfriend/girlfriend; ex-common-law husband and wife, and homosexual couples). It does not include homosexual acquaintances. (p. 67)

The DOMESTIC variable includes the following categories: Other relationship, man kills woman, woman kills man, homosexual couple female (versus acquaintances), and homosexual couple male (versus acquaintances). The rationale for dichotomizing this variable is that the study focuses on intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide. Therefore, I created a dummy variable that dichotomized DOMESTIC into women who killed an intimate partner (male or homosexual female) versus all other relationships. In the exploratory analysis of the variable, there were two cases of man kills women which were dropped from the analysis. This error could have occurred as a result of the following two reasons. Either the sex of offender was
miscoded or coders mistakenly coded the male partner in a homosexual couple as man kills women. As a result, the intimate partner variable (IPHOM) was created and coded as the following: women/intimate partner homicide = 1; all other relationships = 0.

There are several additional variables that were selected based upon the theoretical and research literature. These are race of the offender, race and sex of the victim, prior arrest of the victim and offender, alcohol use, weapon choice, and age of the victim and offender.

Race of the Offender

Because this study examines only African-American and white female homicide offenders, both the female African-American and white female were coded as the following new variable (OFSXRAC): African-American female homicide offender = 1; and white female homicide offender = 0.

Race and Sex of the Victim

Women typically kill men of their own race. The variable that examines both the race and sex of the victim is the SEXRAC variable. The variable includes the following categories: Missing, Female African-American, Male white, Female Latino, Male African-American, Female Other, Male Latino, Male unknown, Male other, Female unknown, and Female white.

Based on the initial analysis of this variable indicating
smaller numbers in some of the categories, I collapsed the variable into the following categories for the bivariate analysis: Female African-American, Female other, Male white, Male African-American, Male other, and Female white.

Prior Arrest of the Victim and Offender

Mixed results exist in past studies on whether the offender has a previous arrest record. The only variable in the Chicago data that measures prior arrest of the offender is PRIOROF. The PRIOROF consists of the following categories: Prior record, other (not crime against persons); Prior record, violent (crime against persons); and Missing.

Research indicates that the victim usually has a prior arrest record. The variable that measures the prior record of the victim is the PRIORVIC variable. The PRIORVIC variables consists of the following categories: Prior record, other (not crime against persons); Prior record, violent (crime against persons); and Missing.

In the initial examination of prior record variables PRIOROF and PRIORVIC, numerous cases in both variables were found in the missing category. The guideline for coding values missing and unknown (Christakos & Block, 1996) is that "where information for a variable is not available, either because the information is not known to the police according to the MAR, or because the variable does not apply to the circumstances" (p. 4).

Based upon this criterion and the coder cross-checking pro-
cess, the missing values for this study will be treated as no record reported for the victim or offender. Based on the coder's outline, the victim or offender could possibly have a record in another district or state. Therefore, for this study, I recoded categories for both variables as the following: prior record, other (not a crime against the person) = 0; prior record, violent (crime against person) = 1; no record reported = 2.

For the logistic regression, I created a dummy variable for both the offender and victim which yielded the following: record (other or violent) = 1 and everything else = 0. This resulted in a set of four dummy variables. While all of the variables are only crude measures of criminal history, they can partially capture the criminal history of the offender and victim. Unfortunately, better measures of criminal history do not exist in the Chicago homicide data file.

Alcohol Use

Research indicates the need to investigate the role of alcohol in the commission of homicide. The variable that measures alcohol use by the offender and victim prior to or during the homicidal incident is INTXUSED. The following are the categories for this variable: No information; Yes, offender; Yes, victim; Yes, both; No, neither; Yes, undetermined who; No, victim; and no offender information.

Unfortunately, in the exploratory analysis of INTXUSED, many
of the cases did not identify whether the victim, offender, or both had been drinking (i.e., 13.9% of the YES, who category). Therefore, I created a variable to test the alcohol-related hypothesis that has the following categories: Yes, offender; Yes, both; Yes, victim; and No, neither.

For the multivariate analysis, I created a dummy variable (INTXUSED2) collapsing all of the categories into the following: yes categories = 1; and no categories = 0 with no information removed from the categories. Again, reiterating Chapter IV, the drug variable was unusable, therefore it is not included in this study.

**Weapon Choice of the Offender**

To identify the weapon choice of the offender, I used the WEAPON variable. The WEAPON variable identifies the type of weapon used to kill the victim. The WEAPON variable has the following categories: Mystery; Knife, sharp instrument; Semi-/Fully-automatic; Club, blunt instrument; Handgun (non-automatic); Arson; Rifle (non-automatic); Other weapon; Shotgun (non-automatic); Hands, fists, feet; and Firearms type unknown.

In the preliminary analysis of the WEAPON variable, the following results were found: 47% of the female offenders used a knife/sharp instrument, 28% used a handgun, 4% other firearms, with the rest of the cases distributed across other weapon types. These results concur with the findings of past research. Since the majority of offenders (79%) chose a gun or a knife, I collapsed the weapon
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variable into three categories for tabular analysis: (1) knife, (2) handgun, and (3) all other weapons.

**Offender and Victim's Age**

To examine the offender's and victim's age, I used the offender's age (OFNAGE) variable and the victim's age (VICAGE) variable. For the tabular analysis, I collapsed the age variable according to past research. Numerous studies indicate that women commit their crimes in their early 20's and early 30's. Following this finding on homicide offenders and measures used in past studies, I collapsed both the victim and offender age variables into the following categories: 0-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45+.

**Methods of Analysis**

**Bivariate Analysis**

For hypothesis number one, a frequency distribution was generated. Because I am comparing proportions, a z-test was computed "to determine whether the observed difference between sample proportions could occur by chance in the populations from which the samples were selected" (Bohrenstedt & Knoke, 1988, p. 199). For hypotheses number two through number fifteen, crosstabulations were used in the present study. Because the data are categorical, chi-square will be utilized to determine the statistical significance of the relationship. All statistical tests employ the standard alpha, p < 0.05, probability level to determine the statistical significance of
the findings. Goodman and Kruskal's Tau will be utilized in the study because the data are nominal or nominal and ordinal. Utilizing Goodman and Kruskal's Tau, "the prediction can be randomly made in the same proportion as the marginal totals (Munro & Page, 1993, p. 87). Goodman and Kruskal's Tau measure how much the error rate decreases when additional information is added to the equation.

**Multivariate Analysis**

In section one, I will first discuss the measurement of each variable and the following section will explain the multivariate procedures. Operationalization of race of the offender, alcohol use, prior arrest and intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide was discussed in the earlier part of the chapter. The following section describes the measurement of underclass context and social disorganization.

**Underclass Context**

This study, as is true of numerous past research studies, contains no socioeconomic data for the individual offender and the individual victim. Nonetheless, some proxy measures are available. One measure available here, and used in past research, relates to neighborhood characteristics. This has and can be employed to indicate some dimension of social class. One of the problems with identifying neighborhoods as the unit of analysis, however, is the identification of neighborhood boundaries. Neighborhoods have no
official territorial markings. However, the use of census tract data, as demonstrated by numerous previous studies (Blau & Blau, 1982; Messner & Tardiff, 1986), can be productively used to approximate neighborhoods and their boundaries.

Wilson (1987, 1996) explores the issue of neighborhood boundaries. As a result of his analysis, what emerged is a truly disadvantaged population, one that experiences greater levels of both absolute and relative deprivation. Some examples are high rates of unemployment, welfare support, illegitimate births, and violence. Wilson (1987, 1996) defines the truly disadvantaged population as having the following characteristics: lower incomes, high unemployment rates, higher rate of female headed households, divorce, separation, unemployment, lack of educational skills, welfare recipients, and a lack of a marriageable male pool. The next section briefly describes each of these characteristics.

**Lower Income, Education and Unemployment**

According to Wilson (1987, 1996), the inner city of Chicago experienced a flight of industry into suburban areas, leaving many minority communities with a limited job pool. The urban community transformed from an industrial unit to a center of administration, information exchange and high order service provision (Wilson, 1987). As a result, the job market changed from jobs with lower education requirements to jobs with higher education requirements. The transformation polarized the labor market into a low-wage and a
high-wage sector (Wilson, 1987).

Another byproduct of this transformation, which Wilson describes with particular reference to Chicago, was the prevalence of a mismatch in educational level of minority residents and the requirements of the labor force (Wilson, 1987). With the limited job pool and higher educational requirements, the African-American community became a congested poverty-stricken community with a clear lower income distinction (Wilson, 1987, 1996).

Welfare Recipients, Female-Headed Households, Divorced/Separated Women

The inner city African-American community has been seriously impacted by the joblessness among African-American males. Wilson (1987, 1996) argues that a limited job market made African-American males less desirable as mates. Wilson (1987) measures this phenomenon using the male marriageable pool index (MMPI). The MMPI is the number of employed civilian men per 100 women of the same race and age group (Wilson, 1987). Wilson (1987, 1996) also argues, as corroborated by Simpson (1991) on this point, that as a result of joblessness, the absence of African-American economic power was replaced by the patriarchal state (Aid to Families with Dependent Children--AFDC, welfare, etc.). More and more individuals, and specifically more women, became dependent on the patriarchal state. What was prevalent in the community, as a result of joblessness, was a deterioration of the familial social organization. As a result, marital instability increased, which resulted in increases in fe-
male-headed households, divorce, separation and out-of-wedlock birth.

More specifically, Wilson (1987, 1996) defines the social disorganization of the Chicago community as the opposite of social organization. Social organization (Wilson, 1996) is defined as the following:

1. The prevalence, strength, and interdependence of social networks;
2. The extent of collective supervision that the residents exercise and the degree of personal responsibility they assume in addressing neighborhood problems; and
3. The rate of resident participation in voluntary and formal organizations. (p. 20)

Thus, in Chicago Wilson (1987, 1996) finds that the migration of African-American middle class residents, and the flight of industry and business from larger cities into suburban communities resulted in the deprivation and decay of the urban community. A disadvantaged community remains that is replete with vacant housing, transient residents and a higher percentage of rental units.

Because Wilson's (1987) focus was Chicago neighborhoods, Wilson's distinctions will be the guide for selection of the census tract variables used to measure underclass context and social disorganization. The census tract information is collected from the Census Bureau. The Census Bureau (1993) produces published and unpublished statistics from its many censuses and surveys for large areas such as census regions, metropolitan areas, States, countries, and cities, and from the decennial census, for small areas down to the size of the block. Some of these geographic entities are legally defined, while others are established specifically for statistical purposes. The data for these entities may be presented in a hierarchical sequence an inventory listing or both. (p. 1)
Appendix A lists all possible variables in the census tract data that Wilson (1987, 1996) identified as relating to the social economic status of the truly disadvantaged and to the social disorganization of an area.

One of the problems that arises when considering so many potentially overlapping variables, as is true with the numerous variables associated with characteristics of the underclass and social disorganization that Wilson's (1987) work presents, is multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is defined as "a condition of high or near perfect correlation among independent variables in a multiple regression" (Knoke & Bohrnstedt, 1994, p. 527). To address multicollinearity, a factor analysis was conducted of the underclass context variables. This method was used to reduce the number of variables and come up with a single scale score representative of the underclass context in the neighborhood where homicides occurred.

Variables included in the factor analysis (and previously discussed in relation to the theoretical and research literature) were the following: family median dollar income, the percentage of female headed households, the male marriageable pool index, the percentage of families with incomes below the poverty level, percent unemployed, percent divorced, mean public assistance income, and average number of persons per household (Appendix B). Appendix B presents the underclass context (section b) variables used for the present study. Reiterating again, because of multicollinearity concerns, Appendix B was narrowed down from Appendix A based on common
sense and theoretical and research literature. Then based on Appendix B, I did a factor analysis to determine the underclass context variables for each table. The purpose of the factor analysis is to reduce the comparable variables to a single factor score.

**Factor Analysis**

The principal components method was used to extract linear combinations of the variables with eigenvalues $\geq 1.0$. The eigenvalue explains "the proportion of variance that the item and the factor have in common" (Munro & Page, 1993, p. 255). Hence, an eigenvalue of at least 1.0 would insure the proportion of the variance being explained by the factor analysis was substantial. When more than one factor met this criterion, the resulting factor matrix was rotated via varimax rotation to yield orthogonal factors and improve interpretability. Variables were retained in the analysis if their factor loading in the rotated solution was $\geq .8$ on one of the factors. A separate factor analysis was conducted for all years, and the crack and pre-crack time periods, and using characteristics of the entire population and then using the characteristics of only the African-American population. When determining the factor analysis of all years for both the total population and the African-American population, I combined both the census tract information for 1980 and 1990 and divided by two. Thus, a total of six-factor analyses were conducted for this project. The following section discusses the results of these factor analysis.
Underclass Variables

Table 3 presents the final results of the factor analysis of underclass variables for the years 1980-1995 using the underclass characteristics for all citizens in the census tract.

Table 3
Final Factor Analysis Results for Underclass Variables: Total Population Characteristics, 1980-1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underclass Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Median Dollar Income</td>
<td>-.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Female Headed Household</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MMPI</td>
<td>-.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent Below Poverty</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent Unemployed</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Wilson (1987, 1996), the variables used in the analysis included average family median dollar income, average percent unemployed, average percent divorced, average mean public assistance income, and average percent African-American. The rotated factor matrix from the initial analysis revealed two distinct dimensions. All variables except average mean public assistance had factor loading greater than .5 on the first dimension, while the only variable to load on the second dimension was the average percent divorced. The purpose of this process was to establish the distinct patterns
emerging from the factor matrix, so that the factor analysis would
determine certain variables that go with each other and certain
variables that should not be included in the model. Therefore, based
on these results, and the two distinctions in the model, I decided
to use the average percent divorced as a separate variable in the
logistic regression analysis.

In addition, I performed a second factor analysis removing
the average mean public assistance, because the factor loading of
average mean public assistance was less than .5. The results re­
vealed a single dimension with the average percent African-American
having a much lower factor loading (.710) than the other variables.
Because of this distinction I dropped the average percent African-
American, repeated the factor analysis, and obtained the final re­
results given in Table 3. The factor scores from the final solution
and the average percent divorced serve as the measure of underclass
context in the logistic regression analyses for the years 1980
through 1995 (see Table 28 in Appendix D).

Table 4 presents the final results of the factor analysis of
underclass variables for January 1980 through April 1985 using the
underclass characteristics for all citizens in the census tract.
Utilizing Wilson (1987, 1996), the variables used in the analysis
included family median dollar income, percent unemployed, percent
divorced, mean public assistance income, and percent African-American. The rotated factor matrix from the initial analysis revealed
two distinct dimensions. All variables except average percent di-
vorced and average mean public assistance had factor loadings greater than .5 on the first dimension, while the only variable to load on the second dimension was the percent divorced. Based on these results, I decided to use the percent divorced as a separate variable in the logistic regression analysis.

Table 4
Final Factor Analysis Results for Underclass Variables: Total Population Characteristics, January 1980- April 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underclass Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Median Dollar Income</td>
<td>-.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Female Headed Household</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI</td>
<td>-.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Below Poverty</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Unemployed</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, I performed a second factor analysis removing the average mean public assistance. The results revealed a single dimension with the average percent African-American having a much lower factor loading (.560) than the other variables. Therefore, I dropped the average percent African-American, repeated the factor analysis, and obtained the final results given in Table 4. The factor scores from the final solution and the average percent divorced serve as the measures of underclass context in the logistic regression analyses for January 1980 through March 1985 (see Table 29 in Appendix D).
Table 5 presents the final results of the factor analysis of underclass variables for April 1985 through December 1995 using the underclass characteristics for all citizens in the census tract. Following Wilson (1987, 1996), the variables used in the analysis included family median dollar income, percent unemployed, average percent divorced, mean public assistance income, and percent African-American. The rotated factor matrix from the initial analysis revealed two distinct dimensions. All variables except average percent divorced and average mean public assistance had factor loadings greater than .5 on the first dimension, while the only variable to load on the second dimension was the average percent divorced. Based on these results, I decided to use the average percent divorced as a separate variable in the logistic regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underclass Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Median Dollar Income</td>
<td>-.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Female Headed Household</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI</td>
<td>-.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Below Poverty</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Unemployed</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, I performed a second factor analysis removing
the average mean public assistance. The results revealed a single dimension with the average percent African-American having a much lower factor loading (.390) than the other variables. Therefore, I dropped the average percent African-American, repeated the factor analysis, and obtained the final results given in Table 5. The factor scores from final solution and average percent divorced serve as the measures of underclass context in logistic regression analyses for April 1985 through December 1995 (see Table 30 in Appendix D).

Table 6 presents the final results of the factor analysis of underclass variables for the years 1980-1995 using the underclass characteristics for African-American citizens in the census tract. Utilizing Wilson (1987, 1996), the variables used in the analysis included family median dollar income, percent unemployed, percent divorced, and percent African-American. The rotated factor matrix from the initial analysis revealed three distinct dimensions. All variables except two loaded on the first and second dimensions, which was the average percent divorced and average percent African-American. Percent divorced was the only variable to load on the third dimension. Based on these results, I decided to use the average percent divorced as a separate variable in the logistic regression analysis.

In addition, I performed a second factor analysis removing average percent African-American. The results revealed two dimensions with percent female headed household and percent below poverty level as underclass context score one. And family median dollar in-
come and MMPI as underclass context score number two (Table 6).

Table 6
Final Factor Analysis Results for Underclass Variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underclass Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score One</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent of Female Headed Household</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent Below Poverty</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Median Dollar Income</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MMPI</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test whether the logistic regression should incorporate both scores, I performed a regression analysis testing the tolerance of the underclass Score One and Two and the other independent variables. For Score Two versus Score One, the tolerance levels for all variables were greater than .5 indicating that over half of the variation of each variable was independent of variation in the other predictor variables. Thus, the test revealed that Score Two can be included with the other variables. Therefore, the factor scores from the final solution and the average percent divorced serve as the measure of underclass context in the logistic regression analyses for the years 1980-1995 (see Table 31 in Appendix D).

Table 7 presents the final results of the factor analysis of underclass variables for January 1980 through March 1985 using the
underclass characteristics for African-American citizens in the census tract. Following Wilson (1987, 1996), the variables used in the analysis included family median dollar income, percent unemployed, percent divorced, and percent African-American. The rotated factor matrix from the initial analysis revealed three distinct dimensions. All variables except percent divorced and below poverty level loaded on the first and second dimension. Percent divorced was the only variable to load on the third dimension. Based on these results, I decided to use the average percent divorced as a separate variable in the logistic regression analysis.

Table 7


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underclass Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score One</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Median Dollar Income</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Female Headed Household</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Below Poverty</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent African-American</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, I performed a second factor analysis removing percent below poverty level. The results revealed two dimensions, which were converted to two scores. Score One included family median dollar in-
come and MMPI (Table 7). Score Two included female-headed household, percent below poverty level and percent African-American (Table 7).

To test whether the logistic regression should incorporate both scores, I performed a regression analysis testing the tolerance of the underclass Score One and Two and the other independent variables. In both cases, tolerance levels for all variables were greater than .5 indicating that over half of the variation of each variable was independent of variation in the other predictor variables. Thus, the test revealed that both scores can be included with the other variables. The factor scores from the final solution and the average percent divorced serve as the measures of underclass context in the logistic regression analyses for January 1980 through March 1995 (see Table 32 in Appendix D).

Table 8 presents the final results of the factor analysis of underclass variables for April 1985 through December 1995 using the underclass characteristics for African-American citizens in the census tract. Following Wilson (1987, 1996), the variables used in the analysis included family median dollar income, percent unemployed, percent divorced, and percent African-American. The rotated factor matrix from the initial analysis revealed three distinct dimensions. All variables except percent African American had factor loading greater than .5 on the first/second dimension, while the only variable to load on the third dimension was the percent divorced. Based on these results, I decided to use the percent divorced as a separate variable in the logistic regression analysis.
Thus, I performed a second factor analysis removing percent African-American. The results revealed two dimensions, which were converted to two scores. Score One included family median dollar income and MMPI (Table 8). Score Two included female-headed household, percent below poverty level and percent unemployed (Table 8).

To test whether the logistic regression should incorporate both scores, I performed a regression analysis testing the tolerance of the underclass Score One and Two and the other independent variables. After testing both Score One and Score Two, Score Two's tolerance levels for all variables were greater than .5 indicating that over half of the variation of each variable was independent of variation in the other predictor variables. Thus, the test revealed that Score Two can be included with the other variables. The factor scores from the final solution and the average percent divorced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underclass Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score One</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Median Dollar Income</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Female Headed Household</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Below Poverty</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Unemployed</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

serve as the measures of underclass context in the logistic regression analyses for the years 1980-1995 (see Table 33 in Appendix D).

Based on theory, common sense, and prior research, the following variables were determined to be representative of social disorganization within the census tract: percentage of rental units, percentage of vacant housing units, and percentage living in the same residence. Also when determining the social disorganization variables for the total population (1980-1995), I combined the census tract variables for both 1980 and 1990 and divided by two. The underclass variables and the social disorganization variables were tested for multicollinearity. In all cases, tolerance levels for all variables were greater than .5 indicating that over half of the variation of each variable was independent of variation in the other predictor variables. Thus, problems with multicollinearity are minimal. These tests of multicollinearity were performed for the total population, African-American population, and time periods, respectively.

Logistic Regression

In the multivariate analysis, the dependent variable is binary; therefore logistic regression is the appropriate statistical technique. Ordinary least square (OLS) would be inappropriate because it violates the BLUE (best linear unbiased estimates) criteria. There are three pitfalls in the use of OLS with a binary dependent variable. The first is that the predicted value may be
greater than 1 or less than zero, even though the probability must lie between 0 and 1 (Morgan & Teachman, 1988). Thus, there is not a normal distribution between the dependent variables and the predictor variables.

The second is the occurrence of heteroscedasticity (Morgan & Teachman, 1988). Heteroscedasticity occurs when the "estimated standard error of the coefficients is incorrect, leading to inappropriate conclusions regarding statistical significance" (Morgan & Teachman, 1988, p. 933). Heteroscedasticity will not occur in OLS regression when cases on the dependent variable are evenly split across the two categories. However, the greater the departure from a 50/50 split, the greater the heteroscedasticity. Therefore, it is advisable to use logistic regression rather than OLS when the dependent variable is not a 50/50 split. The third pitfall is that the "fitted relationship will be very sensitive to the values taken by the predictor variables" (Morgan & Teachman, 1988, p. 933). One of the main premises of the "OLS model is that an increase in the independent variable is accompanied with an increase in the dependent variable throughout the range of the predictor values" (Morgan & Teachman, 1988, p. 933). But if the values decrease at high and low levels of the independent variables this may not be a valid assumption and the results will be misleading (Morgan & Teachman, 1988, p. 933).

Logistic regression is able to address the pitfalls of OLS regression with a dichotomous dependent variable. For problem
one and two, logistic regression overcomes OLS by always predicting a probability between 0 and 1 and by "yielding unbiased estimates of the standard error of coefficients" (Morgan & Teachman, 1988, p. 933). In addressing problem number three, unlike OLS regression, logistic regression is able to account for "declining marginal effects in logistic regression without having to transform the scale of the independent variable" (Morgan & Teachman, 1988, p. 93).

Thus, logistic regression allows the researcher to "find the best fitting and most parsimonious model to describe the relationship between the dependent variable and a set of independent or predictor variables" (Munro & Page, 1993, p. 229). This will allow the researcher to test for the effects of each of the independent variables on the dependent variable while holding all other variables constant.

Logistic regression uses the maximum-likelihood estimation method, "which is the selection of coefficients that make the occurrence of an event most likely" (Norusis, 1990, p. 47). Logistic regression converts logit coefficients into odds ratio. An odds ratio is defined "as the probability of occurrence over the probability of the nonoccurrence" (Munro & Page, 1993, p. 233). Odds ratio are the antilogs of logit coefficients. In this study, the dichotomous predictors (race of the offender, alcohol use of the offender/or victim and prior arrest) indicate how much more likely an intimate versus a non-intimate partner homicide is for one category as opposed to the other category. For continuous predictors
(census tract variables), these coefficients indicate how much more likely an intimate versus a non-intimate partner homicide is when the predictor increases by one unit.

The results for each equation, in Chapter VII, include first the odds ratio (Odds). Odds show the degree to which the probability of the homicide being an intimate partner homicide is multiplied per unit change in the independent variable. Note that odds ratios greater than 1 indicate that the probability of the homicide being an intimate partner homicide is increased by the independent variable, while odds ratios less than 1 indicate that the probability is decreased. An odds ratio of 1 shows the probability is not affected by the independent variable. The logit coefficient (logit) represents the log of the odds ratio. The probability difference (Pr. Diff) is expressed as the percentage increase (+) or decrease (-) in the dependent variable per unit change in the independent variable. The statistical significance of these changes is given next to the probability difference.

In conclusion, this chapter outlines the methods and rationale for the present study. Chapter VI will present the results of the tabular analysis and Chapter VII will include the results of the multivariate analysis.
CHAPTER VI

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the results of the crosstabulation analysis. In presenting the findings, I will discuss the distribution of women homicide offenders by race, the characteristics of female homicide offenders, and their homicidal incidents.

Distribution of Women Homicide Offenders by Race

Table 9 presents the results of a frequency distribution of African-American and white female homicide offenders providing a test for hypothesis 1.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American Female</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>(1094)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(1179)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 29.409  p< .01

The results support hypothesis 1 indicating that African-American women (92.8%) commit a higher proportion of homicides than white...
women (7.2%). The results also indicate that the difference in proportions is statistically significant at the p<.01 (Z = 29.409).

Table 10 examines the impact of the crack epidemic on female homicidal behavior providing a test of hypothesis 2. The results indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between the race of the offender and time period ($\chi^2 = 7.366, p = .007$). However, the strength of the relationship is not strong ($r_b = .006$, $\lambda = .007$). The support for hypothesis 2 illustrates that African-American women's representation did increase among homicide offenders from 89.9% (pre-crack) to 94.2% (crack & after). In contrast, the percentage of white women female homicide offenders decreased with the onset of the crack epidemic, from 10.1% (pre-crack) to 5.8% (crack & after).

### Table 10
Crosstabulation of Offender's Race by Time Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-crack</th>
<th>Crack &amp; After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African-American Female</strong></td>
<td>89.9% (364)</td>
<td>94.2% (730)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Female</strong></td>
<td>10.1% (41)</td>
<td>5.8% (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100% (405)</td>
<td>100% (775)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 7.336, p = .007, r_b = .006, \lambda = .007$

Tables 11 and 12 examine what type of female homicidal behavior occurred during the pre-crack time period versus the crack
and after time period providing a test of hypotheses 2 and 3.

Table 11
Crosstabulation of Female Homicidal Behavior by Time Period by Race of the Offender--White Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate Partner</td>
<td>31.7% (13)</td>
<td>24.4% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Intimate Partner</td>
<td>68.3% (28)</td>
<td>75.6% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (41)</td>
<td>100% (45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

White Female - $\chi^2 = .562$  
$p = .453$

The literature offered two competing hypotheses concerning the effect of the crack epidemic on the distribution of intimate partner homicide and non-intimate partner homicide. Ogle et al. (1995), suggest that with the increased stress caused by the level of the crack epidemic, African-American female intimate partner homicidal behavior would increase during the time period after the onset of the crack epidemic (hypothesis 3). Brownstein et al. (1995), however, would suggest a new type of female homicidal behavior (hypothesis 4). Their model would suggest that the African-American female would be more involved in non-intimate partner homicide (rather than
intimate partner homicide) because of her involvement in the drug economy after the onset of the crack epidemic.

Table 12
Crosstabulation of Female Homicidal Behavior by Time Period by Race of the Offender--African-American Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race of Offender African-American Female</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Crack</td>
<td>Crack &amp; After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner Homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.4% (162)</td>
<td>42.2% (308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Intimate Partner Homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.6% (203)</td>
<td>57.2% (422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (365)</td>
<td>100% (730)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

African-American Female - $\chi^2 = .477$  $p = .490$

The results show no support for either hypothesis (African-American: $\chi^2 = .477$, $p = .490$; white female: $\chi^2 = .562$, $p = .453$). The rate of intimate partner homicide decreased over the two time periods for both African-American women (44.9% to 42.2%) and white women's (31.7% to 24.4%) homicide offenders. By way of contrast, non-intimate partner homicide increased for both African-American women (55.6% to 57.2%) and white women (68.3% to 75.6%). However, these results failed to be statistically significant.
Characteristics of Female Homicide Offenders and Their Homicidal Incidents

The following section examines characteristics of female homicide offenders and their homicidal incidents including: race and sex of the victim, prior arrest of the offender and victim, alcohol use, weapon choice and age of the offender and victim.

Race and Sex of the Victim

Table 13 contains a crosstabulation of the sex and race/ethnicity of the victim and the race of the female offender that provides tests for hypotheses 4 and 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Victim</th>
<th>Race of the Offender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-white</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-African-American</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(838)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-Other</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-white</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-African-American</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(182)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Victim</th>
<th>Race of the Offender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-Other</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(1095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 499.981 \quad p = .000 \quad \tau_b = .115 \quad \lambda = .000 \)

Consistent with hypothesis 4, these results show that there is a statistically significant relationship between the sex and race/ethnicity of the victim and the race of the female offender \( (\chi^2 = 499.981, p = .000) \). However, the nominal-level measures of association suggest that the relationship is not strong \( (\tau_b = .155, \lambda = .000) \).

As hypothesized based on the findings of past research, Tables 14 and 15 also show that the majority of homicides were intersexual and intraracial. Specifically, 76.5% of the homicides committed by white females had white victims, while 75.6% African-American female homicides had African-American victims.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that African-American males would constitute the highest proportion of the homicides committed by African-American women. The findings in Table 13 also provide support for this hypothesis. The majority (76.5%) of the victims of African-American women offenders was African-American males. White males were also the most frequent types of victim in homicides committed by white women. However, white males constituted only slightly more.
than half of the victims in white female homicides (55.3%).

Table 14

Crosstabulation of Type of Homicide by Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Victim by Time Period: Pre-Crack (Jan. 1980-March 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Victim</th>
<th>Intimate Partner Homicide</th>
<th>Non-Intimate Partner Homicide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male-White</td>
<td>9.7% (17)</td>
<td>9.1% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-African-American</td>
<td>89.7% (151)</td>
<td>58.9% (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-Other</td>
<td>2.6% (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-white</td>
<td>0.6% (1)</td>
<td>5.2% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-African-American</td>
<td>24.2% (56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (175)</td>
<td>100% (231)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Crack $\chi^2 = 66.780$, $p = .000$, $\tau_b = .085$, $\lambda = .000$

The final finding of note in Table 13 concerns women victims of female homicide offenders. White women were more likely to kill other women than were their African-American counterparts (26.0% for whites versus 18.1% for African-Americans), even within their own races (21.2% for whites versus 16.6% for African-Americans).
Table 15
Crosstabulation of Type of Homicide by Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Victim by Time Period: Crack & After (April 1985-December 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Victim</th>
<th>Type of Homicidal Behavior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate Partner Homicide</td>
<td>Non-Intimate Partner Homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-white</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-African-American</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(297)</td>
<td>(256)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-Other</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-White</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-African-American</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-Other</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(456)</td>
<td>(319)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crack & After $\chi^2 = 131.339$, $p = .000$  \(\tau_b = .107\)  \(\lambda = .000\)

Tables 14 and 15 examine the relationship between type of homicide and race and gender of the offender over time, testing hypothesis six. The results indicate that there is a significant relationship in both time periods (pre-crack: $\chi^2 = 66.780$, $p = .000$; crack & after: $\chi^2 = 131.339$, $p = .000$). There is not, however, a strong significant relationship between the two variables in either time.
period (pre-crack: \( r_b = .085, \lambda = .000 \); crack & after: \( r_b = .107, \lambda = .000 \)). In the pre-crack period, 9.7% of white males, 89.7% of African-American males and 0.6% of the remaining victims were involved in intimate partner homicide. From the pre-crack period to the crack period, intimate partner homicides increased for both the African-American males (89.7% to 93.1%) and the other males (0.6% to 1.9%), and decreased for the white males (9.7% to 2.8%). In contrast, non-intimate partner homicide decreased for both the African-American and white males. In the pre-crack period, 9.1% of white males were victims of non-intimate partner homicide, but it dropped to 8.3% in the later time period. In contrast, 58.9% of African-Americana males were victims of non-intimate partner homicide in the pre-crack period compared with 56.1% in the crack and after time period. The remaining group, however, increased from 32% to 35.5% in non-intimate partner homicides from the pre-crack to the crack and after period. These results did not support hypothesis 6 showing that African-American males represent a higher proportion of intimate and non-intimate during both time periods.

**Prior Arrest of the Offender and Victim**

Table 16 examines the relationship between the prior arrest record of the offender and type of homicide in order to test hypothesis 7. The results did not support hypothesis 7, indicating that there is not a statistically significant relationship between prior arrest record of the offender and female homicidal behavior \( \chi^2 = 2.561, p = \)
The table does indicate that of the 494 cases of intimate partner homicide, 268 had a prior arrest record. And of the 494 cases, 43.3% had a violent arrest record. Of the 686 cases of non-intimate partner homicide, 401 cases had a prior arrest record. And of the 686 cases, 45.3% of the cases had a violent arrest record.

Table 16
Crosstabulation of Female Homicidal Behavior by Prior Record of Offender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Record of Offender</th>
<th>Female Homicidal Behavior</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate Partner</td>
<td>Non-Intimate Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record, Other</td>
<td>10.9% (54)</td>
<td>13.1% (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record, Violent</td>
<td>43.3% (214)</td>
<td>45.3% (311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reported Record</td>
<td>45.7% (226)</td>
<td>41.5% (285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (494)</td>
<td>100% (686)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.561 \quad p = .278 \]

Table 17 is a crosstabulation of the relationship between female homicidal behavior and prior arrest record of the offender, testing hypothesis 8. In support of hypothesis 8, the results indicate that there is statistically significant relationship between the race of the offender and prior arrest of the offender (\( \chi^2 = 9.221, p = .010 \)). However, there was not a strong relationship between the two variables (\( \tau_b = .006, \lambda = .001 \)). The findings in Table 17 do not
confirm past research. Both African-American and white women had prior arrest records (57.8% for African-American women and 41.2% for white women). African-American women (45.5%) were much more likely to have a violent arrest record than white women (30.6%). However, the majority of white women had no reported record (58.8%).

Table 17
Crosstabulation of Prior Record of Offender by Race of the Offender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Record of Offender</th>
<th>African-American Female</th>
<th>White Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record, Other</td>
<td>12.3% (135)</td>
<td>10.6% (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record, Violent</td>
<td>45.5% (498)</td>
<td>30.6% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reported Record</td>
<td>42.1% (461)</td>
<td>58.8% (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (1094)</td>
<td>100% (85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 9.221 \quad \text{p} = .010 \quad \tau_b = .006 \quad \lambda = .001 \]

Tables 18 and 19 examine the relationship between the prior record of the offender and the race of the offender over time to assess hypothesis 9. The table indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship during the crack and after period \( (\chi^2=9.118, \text{p}=.010) \). However, the strength of the relationship is weak \( (\tau_b = .008, \lambda = .002) \). It was anticipated that there would be a significant relationship between these variables during the pre-
crack and the crack and after period, however results indicate there
is not a statistically significant relationship in pre-crack period
\((\chi^2 = 1.455, p = .483)\).

Table 18
Crosstabulation of Prior Record of Offender by Race of the Offender
by Time Period: Pre-Crack January 1985-March 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Record of Offender</th>
<th>African-American Female</th>
<th>White Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record, Other</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record, Violent</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reported Record</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(364)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 9.118\) \(p = .010\) \(\tau_b = .002\) \(\lambda = .001\)

Table 19
Crosstabulation of Prior Record of Offender by Race of the Offender
by Time Period: Crack and After April 1985-December 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Record of Offender</th>
<th>African-American Female</th>
<th>White Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record, Other</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record, Violent</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(357)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Record of Offender</th>
<th>African-American Female</th>
<th>White Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Reported Record</td>
<td>39.5% (288)</td>
<td>62.2% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (730)</td>
<td>100% (45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Χ² = 1.455  p = .483

In a closer examination, the tables indicate that the percentage of African-American women with violent records increased over time (38.7% to 48.9%), while the percentage of white women with violent records increased slightly (29.3 to 31.1%). The percentage of women with non-violent records decreased over time (13.7% to 11.6% for African-American women, 14.6% to 6.7% for whites).

Table 20 examines the relationship between the type of homicidal behavior and prior record of the victim, specifically assessing the prior arrest records of male victims and testing hypothesis 9. There is a statistically significant relationship between the variables (Χ²=93.089, p= .000). In this analysis, the present study supports hypothesis 9 that in intimate partner homicide, the victim usually has a violent record. The relationship, however, is weak (r=.045, p=.000). In the 686 cases of non-intimate partner homicide, 22.2% had "a non-violent record," 25.4% had a violent record and 52.5% had no reported record. In the 494 cases of intimate partner homicide, 28.3% had "a non-violent record", 46.4% had a vio-
lent record and 25.3% had no recorded record.

Table 20
Crosstabulation of Female Homicidal Behavior and Prior Record of Victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Record of Victim</th>
<th>Type of Homicidal Behavior</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate Partner Homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record, Other</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record, Violent</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(229)</td>
<td>(174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reported Record</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>(360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(494)</td>
<td>(686)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 93.089 \quad p = .000 \quad \tau_b = .045 \quad \lambda = .000 \]

Alcohol Use

Table 21 examines the relationship between the alcohol use of the offender and victim and type of homicidal behavior to test hypotheses 10 and 11. There is not a statistically significant relationship between the variables \((\chi^2 = 7.959, p = .093)\). The table reveals that almost 10% of the victims, 2% of the offenders, and 13.9% of both the offender and victim, used alcohol before or during the homicide incident, while in the 74.2% of the cases, neither the victim nor the offender used alcohol. In non-intimate partner homicide, the present study indicates that 6.1% of victims, 2.6% of the
offenders, and 12.4% both the offender and victim used alcohol before or during the homicide. In these cases of non-intimate partner homicide, 78.8% of neither the victim nor offender used alcohol.

Table 21
Crosstabulation of Female Homicidal Behavior and Liquor Use of Victim and Offender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquor use of Offender and Victim</th>
<th>Type of Homicidal Behavior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate Partner Homicide</td>
<td>Non-Intimate Partner Homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, victim</td>
<td>9.9% (39)</td>
<td>6.1% (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Offender</td>
<td>2.0% (8)</td>
<td>2.6% (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Both</td>
<td>13.9% (55)</td>
<td>12.4% (71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, Neither</td>
<td>74.2% (293)</td>
<td>78.8% (451)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (395)</td>
<td>100% (572)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 7.959 \quad p = .093 \)

Weapon Choice

Table 22 is a crosstabulation of the relationship between the race of the offender and weapon choice, which provides a test for hypothesis 12. The findings indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables \( \chi^2 = 27.412, p = .000 \). However, the nominal-level measures of association suggest
that the relationship is weak ($\tau_b = .012, \lambda = .000$). In the study reported here, knives (49.3%) were the most frequently used weapon for African-American women followed by other weapon (29.4%) and handgun (21.3%). In contrast, other weapons (56.5%) were the most frequently used weapon by white women, followed by knives (27.1%) and then handgun (16.5%).

Table 22
Crosstabulation of Race of the Offender by Weapon Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Choice</th>
<th>Race of the Offender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Female White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handgun</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(233)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(539)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(322)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(1094)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 27.412 \quad p = .000 \quad \tau_b = .012 \quad \lambda = .000$

Tables 23 and 24 examine the relationship between the race of the offender and weapon choice during the crack epidemic—testing hypothesis 13. The results indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between the variables during the pre-crack epidemic period ($\chi^2 = 13.303, p = .001$). However, the strength of the relationship is weak ($\tau_b = .012, \lambda = .000$). The results also indicate that during the crack epidemic there is a statistically significant
relationship between the two variables \( \chi^2 = 15.426, p = .000 \), but it is weak \( r_b = .017, \lambda = .000 \).

### Table 23
Crosstabulation of Race of the Offender by Weapon Choice by Time Period: Pre-Crack January 1980-March 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Choice</th>
<th>Race of the Offender</th>
<th>African-American Female</th>
<th>White Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handgun</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(166)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(364)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>13.303</td>
<td>( p = .001 )</td>
<td>( r_b = .012 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \lambda = .000 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 24
Crosstabulation of Race of the Offender by Weapon Choice by Time Period: Crack and After April 1985-December 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Choice</th>
<th>Race of the Offender</th>
<th>African-American Female</th>
<th>White Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(139)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handgun</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(373)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(218)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings show that during the pre-crack period, African-American women used knives (45.6%), other weapons (28.6%) and handguns (25.8%). White women used other weapons (56.1%), knives (24.4%) and handguns (19.5%). During the crack and after time period, African-American women used knives (51.1%), other weapons (29.9%) and handguns (19%). White women used other weapons (57.8%), knives (28.9%) and handguns (13.3%).

**Age of the Offender and Victim**

Table 25 examines the relationship between the race of the offender and the age of the offender testing hypothesis 14. There is not a statistically significant relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2 = 7.891$, p=.246). For both offenders, the median falls in the 25-29 category. The table also indicates that 26% of the African-American females and 16% of the white females are between the age of 30-39 and 18.3% of the African-American females and 25.2% of the white females are 40 and over.

The results seem to indicate that the African-American and white female offenders have similar distribution in the younger and older
age groups, but a distinction in the 30-39 age group (26% African-American and 16% white females).

Table 25
Crosstabulation of Race of the Offender by Age of the Offender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Offender</th>
<th>Race of the Offender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 0-19</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(164)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 20-24</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(225)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25-29</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30-34</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 35-39</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(113)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40-44</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 45+</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(1095)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.891 \quad p = .246 \]

Table 26 examines the relationship between the age of the offender and the age of the victim testing hypothesis 15. There is a significant relationship between the age of the offender and age of the victim (\( \chi^2 = 361.006, \quad p = .000 \)). However, the nominal-level measures of association suggest that the relationship is weak (\( r_b = .060, \quad r_c = .060, \quad r_d = .060 \)).
Women tend to kill victims who are the same age as themselves. Beginning at age 25, more than 20% of the victims of women offenders were 45 and older.

Table 26
Crosstabulation of Offender's Age by Victim's Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim's Age</th>
<th>0-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(179)</td>
<td>(239)</td>
<td>(242)</td>
<td>(179)</td>
<td>(120)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
<td>(141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²=361.006 p=.000 τb=.060 λ=.000

Table 27 summarizes the support or non-support of the fifteen hypothesis.
Table 27
Summary Table of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Support or Non-Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>Non-Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>Non-Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 10</td>
<td>Non-Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 11</td>
<td>Non-Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 12</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 13</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 14</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 15</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Based on the use of the crosstabulations, the predominant race of the offender is African-American in comparison to the white female homicide offender. African-American males constituted the highest proportion of homicides committed by African-American women.
White males were the most frequent type of victim for homicides committed by white women. White males, however only constituted more than half of the victims in white female homicide offenders. This study also found that both African-American and white female homicide offenders had prior arrest records, a point that does not confirm past research. The results indicate that African-American women typically use knives, while white women typically use some type of other weapon. Finally, the results indicate that there is a significant relationship between the age of the offender and the age of the victim. Women typically kill men who are the same age as themselves.
CHAPTER VII

FINDINGS--MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

The focus of this chapter is the test of the multivariate model outlined in Chapter IV. In this chapter the results of the multivariate analysis are presented in sequential order.

Multivariate Analysis--All Cases

Table 28 (see Appendix D) presents the results of the logistic regression of the intimate partner homicide dichotomous dependent variable (intimate partner homicide =1, non-intimate partner homicide =0) on measures of the offender's race (dummy variable, African-American=1, white=0), class context where the homicide occurred (underclass and percentage of those 16 years and older divorced), social disorganization where the homicide occurred (percentage of housing units that are vacant and the percentage of housing units that are rented), alcohol use by the offender and/or the victim (1), no alcohol use (0), and four dummy variables measuring the prior police records of the offender and victim (in all cases, 1=had prior record). The results in Table 9 are based on cases, 1980-1995, therefore measures of class context and social disorganization consist of the averages of these measures in 1980 and 1990 (see Chapter V for more details on these measures).

Equation 1 includes only the offender's race, while equations
2 through 4 successively add measures of underclass context, social disorganization, and alcohol use and prior records, respectively, consistent with the theoretical model described in Chapter IV. Equation 1 shows that the offender’s race has a statistically significant impact on the probability of intimate partner homicide (p<.01), consistent with both theoretical expectations. Specifically, the probability of the homicide of an intimate partner increases by 15.6% if the female offender is African-American as opposed to white. Equivalently, African-American women homicide offenders were 15.6% more likely than white women homicide offenders to kill their intimate partners rather than other victims. Reading across Equations 2 through 4 reveals the extent to which the effects of the offender’s race on intimate partner homicide are mediated by the intervening variables in the model. In Equation 2, the probability difference associated with the offender’s race decreases slightly from 15.6% to 14.9% when the class context variables are added, however, this result remains statistically significant (p<.01). When the effects of social disorganization are controlled in Equation 3, the probability difference for offender’s race declines further to 13.1%, but again, the effect of offender’s race on intimate partner homicide continues to be statistically significant (p<.01). However, adding alcohol use of the victim and/or offender and the offender’s and victim’s prior records to the model (Equation 4) reduces the probability difference associated with the offender’s race to 9.8% (i.e., a reduction in the effect of race of over 25%).
and the effects of race on intimate partner homicide are substantially mediated by increased alcohol use by the victim and/or offender, and the victim's and offender's prior records.

Turning to the effects of the class context where the homicide occurred, Table 28 (Appendix D) shows that both the presence of the underclass and percent divorced fail to have a statistically significant impact on the probability of an intimate partner homicide net of the effects of the offender's race (Equation 2). However, once the extent of social disorganization in the census tract where the homicide took place is controlled, the effects of both underclass and percent divorced significantly increase the probability of an intimate partner homicide (p<.05). The probability differences indicate that the probability of an intimate partner homicide increases 4% per unit increase in the underclass scale, while it increases by 1% for each unit increase in percent divorced. Finally, Equation 4 shows that the probability difference associated with the underclass scale decreases to 3.1% when alcohol use and prior record variables are added to the model and is only marginally significant (p<.10), while the probability difference for percent divorced declines only slightly to .9% and remains statistically significant (p<.05). Thus, the findings show that the effects of the underclass environment on intimate partner homicide are mediated by both alcohol use by the victim and/or offender and the victim's and offender's prior records, which is consistent with the theoretical model.

As anticipated theoretically, the results for Equation 3 and
4 in Table 9 show that social disorganization in the census tract where the homicide happened decreases the likelihood of the homicide victim being the intimate partner of the offender (p<.05). Net of the offender's race, class context, and alcohol use and prior records of the victim and offender, percent vacant units and percent of rental units in the census tract decreased the probability of an intimate partner homicide by .7 and .2%, respectively (see Equation 4).

Equation 4 in Table 9 reveals that, net of the offender's race, class context, and social disorganization, alcohol use by the victim and/or offender, and the victim's and the offender's prior records have statistically significant effects on the probability of an intimate partner homicide in the directions specified by the theoretical model. Consistent with the expectation that intimate partner homicides committed by women result from abusive relationships, when the victim has a violent criminal record, there is a 30.1% increase in the probability of an intimate partner homicide, a result that is statistically significant (p<.01) and the most important predictor of an intimate partner homicide. The probability of an intimate partner homicide is also increased by the victim having a non-violent criminal record (Pr. Diff=22.9%, p<.01) and the victim having such a record is the second most important factor leading to an intimate partner homicide. The results in Table 28 (Appendix D) show offenders with violent records were 8.3% less likely to kill a partner, while those with non-violent records were
10.7% less likely to do so. These results are statistically significant at the p<.01 and p<.05 levels, respectively. Consistent with the theory, alcohol use by either the victim or the offender at the time of the homicide significantly increases the probability of the death of the intimate partner of the female offender by 6.8% (p<.05).

The goodness of fit criteria indicate that the model in Equation 4 of Table 28 (Appendix D) fits the data reasonably well. The Hosmer-Lemeshow χ² goodness-of-fit test statistic failed to be statistically significant, indicating that observed probabilities do not differ significantly from the probabilities predicted by the model.

Table 29 in Appendix D presents the results of the logistic regression of intimate partner homicide on the independent variables. The results in Table 29 (Appendix D) are based on the January 1980-March 1985 pre-crack period, therefore measures of class context and social disorganization consist of 1980 variables (see Chapter V for more details on these measures).

Equation 1 includes only the offender's race, while equations 2 through 4 successively add measures of class context, social disorganization, and alcohol use and prior records, respectively, consistent with the theoretical model described in Chapter IV. Equation 1 shows that the offender's race does not have a statistically significant impact on the probability of intimate partner homicide. Reading across Equations 2 through 4 reveals the effects of the offender's race on intimate partner homicide is only significant at
the p<.10 level in Equation 2. However, this significance disappears when adding social disorganization variables, and is not significantly significant in the final model.

When examining the effects of class context where the homicide occurred, Table 29 (Appendix D) shows that both the presence of the underclass and percent divorced fail to have a significantly significant impact on the probability of an intimate partner homicide (Equation 2 through 4). The social disorganization variables failed to have a significantly significant impact on the probability of an intimate partner homicide.

Equation 4 shows that the prior record of the victim-violent (24%) or non-violent (19.5%)-significantly increases the probability of an intimate partner homicide. The results also indicate that the offender's violent prior record decreases the likelihood of a non-intimate partner homicide (13.5%), while the offender's non-violent record had no significant impact. In comparison to Table 28, Table 29 (Appendix D) shows that race of the offender is not a strong indicator of intimate partner homicide during the pre-crack period. Both tables, however, indicate the victim's violent record increases the probability of an intimate partner homicide, while the offender's violent prior increases the probability of a non-intimate partner homicide. However, in Table 28 (Appendix D), two distinctions occur. There is a significant relationship between alcohol use and the occurrence of an intimate partner homicide, and there is a statistically significant relationship found between offender other
prior record and the occurrence of a non-intimate partner homicide. These relationships fail to occur during the 1980-1985 pre-crack period (Table 29 in Appendix D). The goodness of fit criteria indicate that the model in Equation 4 of Table 29 (Appendix D) fits the data reasonably well. The Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2$ goodness-of-fit test statistic failed to be statistically significant, indicating that observed probabilities do not differ significantly from the probabilities predicted by the model.

Table 30 (Appendix D) presents the results of the logistic regression of intimate partner homicide on the independent variables in the model. The results in Table 30 (Appendix D) are based on the April 1985-December 1995 crack period, therefore measures of class context and social disorganization consist of the 1990 variables (see Chapter V for more details on these measures).

Equation 1 includes only the offender's race, while equations 2 through 4 successively add measures of class context, social disorganization, and alcohol use and prior records, respectively, consistent with the theoretical model described in Chapter four. Equation 1 shows that, unlike the pre-crack period, the offender's race has a statistically significant impact on the probability of intimate partner homicide ($p<.05$), consistent with both theoretical expectations. Interpreting Equation 2 through 4 reveals the extent to which the effects of the offender's race on intimate partner homicide are mediated by the intervening variables in the model. In Equation 2, the probability difference associated with the offende-
er's race decreases from 19% to 15.6% when the class context variables are added, and is not statistically significant. When the effects of social disorganization are controlled in Equation 3, the probability difference for offender's race declines slightly to 15.5%, but the effect of offender's race on intimate partner homicide is marginally significant (p<.10). Finally, when alcohol use and prior arrest are added to the model (Equation 4), the effect of race drops to 11.2% and this effect failed to be statistically significant. Thus, consistent with the theoretical model, the effects of race on intimate partner homicide are substantially mediated by alcohol use and prior arrest record.

Examining Equation 2 and 3, when adding the underclass context variables, the impact of the race of the offender decreases. But neither the underclass context or the percent divorced is statistically significant. However, when adding the social disorganization variables, the underclass context variable is statistically significant (p< .05) and the percent vacant housing is marginally significant (p< .10).

Alcohol use was not significant in the pre-crack period, but it is in the crack period, indicating that more individuals may be turning to alcohol to alleviate stress. The victim having a prior record increases the probability of an intimate partner homicide by 33.8%. As expected, this effect is a lot higher than in the pre-crack period when it was 24%. The effect of victim's prior non-violent record also increases across the two-time periods (19.5%
versus 24.5%). The goodness of fit criteria indicate that the model in Equation 4 of Table 30 (Appendix D) fits the data reasonably well. The Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2$ goodness-of-fit test statistic failed to be statistically significant, indicating that observed probabilities do not differ significantly from the probabilities predicted by the model.

When examining all three tables (28, 29, 30 in Appendix D), these tables indicate that victim's prior record increases the probability of an intimate partner homicide. Also that the victim's violent prior record increases from 30.1 when looking at the entire time period, 1980-1985, to 33.8% when examining the April 1985 to December 1995 crack period. The tables (28, 29, 30 in Appendix D) also indicate that the victim's prior record may be a better predictor of intimate partner homicide rather than the race of the offender. What is also interesting, which will be elaborated upon in Chapter VIII, is that alcohol use emerges as a statistically significant indicator of intimate partner homicide.

Table 31 (Appendix D) presents the results of the logistic regression of intimate partner homicide on the independent variables in the model. The results in Table 31 (Appendix D) are based on the entire time period, 1980-1995, therefore measures of class context and social disorganization consist of the averages of African-American measures in 1980 and 1990 (see Chapter V for more details on these measures).

Equation 1 includes only the offender's race, while equations
2 through 4 successively add measures of class context, social disorganization, and alcohol use and prior records, respectively, consistent with the theoretical model described in Chapter V. Equation 1 shows that the offender's race has a statistically significant impact on the probability of intimate partner homicide (p<.05), consistent with both theoretical expectations and the crosstabular analysis. Specifically, the probability of the homicide of an intimate partner homicide increases by 16% if the female offender is African-American as opposed to white. Equivalently, African-American women homicide offenders were 16% more likely than white women homicide offenders to kill their intimate partners rather than other victims. Reading across Equations 2 through 4 reveals the extent to which the effects of the offender's race on intimate partner homicide are mediated by the intervening variables in the model.

In Equation 2, the probability difference associated with the offender's race decreases slightly from 16% to 14% when the class context variables are added, however, this result remains statistically significant (p<.05). When the effects of social disorganization are controlled in Equation 3, the probability difference for offender's race increases to 18%, but again, the effect of offender's race on intimate partner homicide continues to be statistically significant (p<.05). However, adding alcohol use of the victim and/or offender and the offender's and victim's prior records to the model (Equation 4) reduces the probability difference associated with the offender's race to 15% (p<.05). Reading across Equation 2
through 4, Table 31 (Appendix D) also indicates that the underclass variable is not statically significant, rather characteristics of all residents rather than just those of African Americans have an impact on intimate partner homicide. Therefore, the underclass variables based on all residents (Table 28 in Appendix D) have a stronger effect on intimate partner homicide than underclass context of only African-Americans (Table 31 in Appendix D). As indicated by Equation 2 and 3, both the social disorganization variables and the class context variables did not have an impact on intimate partner homicide.

Examining Equation 2 through 4, Table 31 (Appendix D) shows that the prior violent and the prior other record of the victims increases the probability of an intimate partner homicide by 30% and 23%, respectively and these effects are significant at the $p<.01$ (Equation 4). Equation 4 also shows that at the $p<.05$ level, alcohol use of the victim/or offender increases the probability of an intimate partner homicide by 7%, while violent and non-violent arrest record of the offender decreases the probability of an intimate partner homicide by 8.5% and 11%, respectively. The goodness of fit criteria indicate that the model in Equation 4 of Table 31 (Appendix D) fits the data reasonably well. The Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2$ goodness-of-fit test statistic failed to be statistically significant, indicating that observed probabilities do not differ significantly from the probabilities predicted by the model.

Table 32 (Appendix D) presents the results of the logistic...
regression of intimate partner homicide on the independent variables. The results in Table 32 (Appendix D) are based on cases from January 1980-March 1985, the pre-crack period, therefore measures of underclass context and social disorganization consist of 1980 variables specific to African Americans (see Chapter V for more details on these measures).

Equation 1 includes only the offender's race, while equations 2 through 4 successively add measures of class context, social disorganization, and alcohol use and prior records, respectively, consistent with the theoretical model described in Chapter IV. Equation 1 shows that the offender's race does not have a statistically significant impact on the probability of intimate partner homicide, contrary to both theoretical expectations and the crosstabular analysis. Reading across Equations 2 through 4 reveals that percent rental housing units has a statistically significant relationship with intimate partner homicide.

Equation 4 indicates that prior arrest records of the victim and the offender have a statistically significant relationship with intimate partner homicide. The goodness of fit criteria indicate that the model in Equation 4 of Table 32 (Appendix D) fits the data reasonably well. The Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2$ goodness-of-fit test statistic failed to be statistically significant, indicating that observed probabilities do not differ significantly from the probabilities predicted by the model.

Table 33 (Appendix D) presents the results of the logistic
regression of the intimate partner homicide on the independent variables in the model. The results in Table 33 (Appendix D) are based on cases from April 1985-December 1995, therefore measures of class context and social disorganization consist of 1990 variables specific to African-Americans (see Chapter V more details of these measures).

Equation 1 includes only the offender's race, while equations 2 through 4 successively add measures of class context, social disorganization, and alcohol use and prior records, respectively, consistent with the theoretical model described in Chapter IV. Equation 1 shows that the offender's race has a statistically significant impact on the probability of intimate partner homicide (p<.05), consistent with both theoretical expectations. Specifically, the probability of the homicide of an intimate partner homicide increases by 19% if the female offender is African-American as opposed to white. Equivalently, African-American women homicide offenders were 19% more likely than white women homicide offenders to kill their intimate partners rather than other victims. Reading across Equations 2 through 4 reveals the extent to which the effects of the offender's race on intimate partner homicide are mediated by the intervening variables in the model. In Equation 2, the probability difference associated with the offender's race decreases slightly from 19% to 17% when the class context variables are added, this result is statistically significant. In Equation 3, offender's race increases and is statistically significant at the p<.05 level. In
Equation 4 however, race of the offender is not statistically significant and it decreases from 20% to 16%. Victim's prior arrest record (violent or other) and alcohol use by the offender of victim is statistically significant in Equation 4. The goodness of fit criteria indicate that the model in Equation 4 of Table 33 (Appendix D) fits the data reasonably well. The Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2$ goodness-of-fit test statistic failed to be statistically significant, indicating that observed probabilities do not differ significantly from the probabilities predicted by the model.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the six tables (see Appendix D), what is prevalent is that race does have a statistically significant impact on the probability of intimate partner homicide. What is ground breaking in this study is that the net of the offender's race, underclass context, and social disorganization, alcohol use by the victim and/or offender, and the victim's and offender's prior records have statistically significant effects on the probability of an intimate partner homicide in the directions specified by the theoretical model. This point will be elaborated upon in Chapter VIII.

When examining the pre-crack and crack and after time period, the victim's and offender's prior records have statistically significant effects on the probability of an intimate partner homicide in the directions specified by the theoretical model. This point will
be elaborated upon in Chapter VIII. Unlike the alcohol use of the
offender use of the offender and victim which is significant in the
pre-crack period, but is not statistically significantly in the

crack and after time period.

What was also significant in the analysis, is that victim’s

prior record, particularly for violence, was statistically signi-

ficant in all the models indicating a relationship between this

variable and intimate partner homicide. The last point was that

underclass variables based on all residents have a stronger effect

on intimate partner homicide than underclass variables based on

African-Americans, a point that will be elaborated upon in Chapter

VIII.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

In an effort to broaden the knowledge of the African-American and the white female homicide offender, the research described in the previous seven chapters was undertaken. The present chapter presents a discussion of the major findings from this research, along with concluding considerations. The discussion is divided into the bivariate results, the multivariate results, a theoretical evaluation, a discussion of the contribution and limitations of this research, and finally, recommendations for future research endeavors.

Bivariate Results

The tabular results from the bivariate analysis are divided into the following subsections: distribution of women homicide offenders by race, the race and sex of the victim, the prior arrest of the offender and the victim, alcohol use, weapon choice, and age of the offender and victim.

Distribution of Women Homicide Offenders by Race

Research indicates that African-American women dominate as female homicide offenders. This dates back as far as the work of Wolfgang (1958) and continues through present day. According to the
theoretical model, it was predicted that African-American women would predominate as female homicide offenders. The modern perspective attributes the difference in the rates of African-American women's homicides to experiences of stress, which are greater for African-American than for white women. One related distinction, illustrated in Chapter IV, was the distinction between African-American and white women's incomes, with the stress associated with these differences being greater with the lesser income levels characteristic of African-American women. According to Ogle et al. (1995), "women with lower social status experience higher stress, on average than women with higher social status" (p. 179). The present study was no exception to this past research. In fact it mirrored past research, in showing that African-American women dominate as female homicide offenders.

The research, however, also indicates that race but the corollary high stress and lower income levels may not be the only predictor of intimate partner homicide. This was illustrated in the multivariate analysis, which will be elaborated on later in the multivariate analysis section of this chapter.

Race and Sex of the Victim

Research indicates that the majority of homicides are intraracial and intersexual. Past research also indicates that non-white males dominate as victims (Mann, 1990b). The present study found that when looking at both the entire time period, and the pre- and
during/after-crack period, African-American males dominate as homicide victims. The results also indicate that the percentage of African-American male victims increased from the pre-crack period (January 1980-March 1985) to the crack time period (April 1985-December 1995). This result supports Ogle et al.'s (1995) argument (outlined in Chapter II) that the offender typically strikes out at someone in her environment, rather than at someone outside of her immediate environment.

Another interesting finding was that the white female homicide offender's homicide victims varied across intimate and non-intimate partner homicides. This might be attributed to the changing environment of white women. With the increase of white women in poverty, white women's environments may have become more similar to those of African-American women, leading to a more varied victim population. White and African-American women who commit homicides may, in actuality, live in the same neighborhood. If this is true, the white females' neighborhood may be more diverse than that of the African-American women, thus explaining the variety of homicide victims.

Prior Arrest of the Offender and Victim

The present study found no statistically significant relationship between female homicidal behavior and prior arrest of the offender. As indicated in Chapter IV, it was expected that there would be a relationship between the two variables. But the lack of stat-
istical significance could be due to the lack of detail in the crime data available. The data do not necessarily indicate the type of prior arrest, but instead, only distinguish whether the arrest was for violent or non-violent crimes.

However, there was a statistically significant relationship between the race of the offender and the prior arrest record, and that this relationship exists when looking at either the pre-crack or the crack period of time. Of interest was that the results indicated that both African-American and white women had prior arrest records. And when examining both time periods, both African-American and white women had increases in the violent arrest category as well as decreases in the other record arrest category. This indicates that African-American and white women homicide offenders may have more similarities than differences than the past research would lead us to expect. Thus the research would indicate that the distinction in the time periods illustrates that both women have similar patterns of prior arrest, and that the distinction is affecting both women similarly.

When looking at the prior arrest record of the victim, and more specifically at the prior arrest records of the male victims, the present study indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship between type of homicidal behavior and prior record of the victim. This supports past research suggesting that the offender may in fact be the victim of previous violence from the intimate partner. What has been alluded to in past research is that
the female homicide offender may be a victim of domestic violence, that the present homicidal event is really a culmination of past domestic violence situations, with provocation, self-defense, etc., turning the tables of victimization.

Alcohol Use

It was speculated that many of the cases would involve alcohol use of the victim and/or the offender (see both hypotheses twelve and thirteen). It was hoped that statistical support would expand the knowledge of the impact of alcohol on homicides. However, there was no statistically significantly relationship. Because of the non-distinctions in many of the cases (e.g., differentiating use of alcohol by offender vs. victim), any statistical significance (in the crosstabulation) may have been masked. In the collection of the original data, information was not provided to allow the determination of who was actually drinking in all of the cases. However, alcohol use by the offender, or victim, or both, proved to be statistically significant in the multivariate analysis. This makes it most unfortunate that the person who was doing the drinking could not be determined in this study.

Weapon Choice

Goetting's (1988) research indicated a shift in the weapon choice for female homicide offenders. In contrast to past research, Goetting (1988) found that women would use a gun more than a knife
as their weapon of choice. Mann (1990b) confirmed these results, indicating that African-American females kill with a gun rather than a knife. Jurik and Winn (1990) also support the prevalence of guns for women who kill. In the present study, the results of the trichotomized model (handgun, knife and other) indicated that handguns were the last choice for white women, and the second choice for African-American women. Because of the changing environment of the African-American women, it was predicted that African-American women would have a higher prevalence of the use of a gun versus the use of a knife. This study indicates, however, that the weapon of choice for African-American women was a knife, and the weapon of choice for white women was something other than a knife or a gun. Therefore, the overall findings supported Wolfgang's (1958) work showing the high prevalence of a knife over other types of weapons.

Age of the Offender and Victim

This research indicates that a significant relationship between the age of the offender and the race of the offender. This study also indicates that white women were slightly older than African-American women. The results also indicate that white women and African-American women have generally similar age distributions, and that the only race discrepancy occurs in the 30-39 age group.

Bivariate Summary

Considering all the research hypotheses and findings jointly,
the picture that emerges is that the woman homicide offender is an African-American woman who usually kills an African-American man, who is an intimate partner, using a knife as her weapon. The victim typically has a violent prior record. The African-American woman also typically has a violent prior record. When examining the pre-crack and crack period, African-American males increased in the prevalence of intimate partner homicides, and decreased in the prevalence of non-intimate partner homicides. Finally, also during the pre-crack versus the crack period, African-American women had a higher percentage of knife use (45.6% versus 51.1%), than gun or other weapon usage.

Multivariate Model

The multivariate analysis tested the model discussed in Chapter IV. Overall, the tables indicate that the net effect of the offender, the underclass context, social disorganization, alcohol use by the victim and/or offender, and the victim's and offender's prior records have statistically significant effects on the probability of an intimate partner homicide. These effects lie in the direction specified by the theoretical model.

The results of the multivariate model indicated findings in the directions specified by the theoretical model both in terms of distinction in time periods, and in distinctions in the underclass context variable.
Directions Specified in the Model

Tables 28 and 31 in Appendix D indicate that race has a statistically significant impact on the probability of intimate partner homicide. However, the net effect of the race of the offender decreases with the inclusion of additional variables (equation 4-both models).

Tables 28, 30 and 31 in Appendix D indicate the statistical significance of the alcohol variable in predicting the probability of an intimate partner homicide versus a non-intimate partner homicide. Interpreting these results, alcohol use was seen as a means used by African-American women to cope with the high levels of stress associated with race, class and gender oppression. Likewise, African-American men may use alcohol to deal with class and race oppression, and this alcohol use often leads to the violent abuse of the intimate partner. Thus, both these distinctions can be understood in relation to the increasing likelihood of an intimate partner homicide versus a non-intimate partner homicide.

The next finding was also consistent with the theoretical model. The research found that offenders who commit intimate partner homicides tend not to have criminal histories, while offenders who have criminal records are more likely to kill victims other than their intimate partner. As indicated by the Tables 28-33 in Appendix D, the results show that when the victim has a violent criminal record, there is a greater increase in the probability of an intimate partner homicide. This result was statistically significant as
well as the most important predictor in all of the Tables 28-33 in Appendix D. These results follow the work of Wolfgang (1958), and others, indicating that intimate partner homicides committed by women result from abusive relationships.

**Distinctions in the Time Periods**

During the two time periods, prior arrest of the offender was strongest in the crack and after time period, indicating that increased stress could increase the occurrence of intimate partner homicide, and thus, increase the likelihood of an intimate partner homicide. Tables 29, 30 and 32, 33 in Appendix D, confirming that the offender had no prior arrest record, support the results that the incident likely occurred as a result of the overcontrolled personality. Lastly, as indicated by the research, alcohol use by the offender and/or victim increases the probability of an intimate partner homicide during the crack and after time period.

**Underclass Context Variable**

The last noteworthy result from the multivariate analysis was that the underclass context is not race specific. In fact, the underclass context of the entire population is a better predictor of intimate partner homicide than the underclass context of the African-American population. This result provides support for Simpson's (1991) and Mann's (1990b) research, in so far as the African-American female is not only African-American, but also poor. Moreover
the underclass context may be a better predictor of intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide than race.

In conclusion the multivariate results indicate that the race of the offender is not the best predictor of intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide when all other considered variables are held constant. The victim's prior arrest record, by way of contrast, is perhaps the best predictor so far.

Theoretical Evaluation

Scholars have demonstrated that women's homicidal behavior is excluded from general inquiry in the field of criminology. Very few theoretical explanations exist of female homicide behavior. Smart (1976) stressed the link to stereotypical assumptions of female homicide behavior. A well-cited example is found in the interpretations of women's deviant behavior as linked to their desire to be the center of attention. Moving beyond the stereotypical playground is the model as developed here, based on the work of Simpson (1991), Ogle et al. (1995) and Wilson (1987, 1996). Each of these works moved beyond stereotypes by describing how race and gender are both important, how social class too plays a role, and how the deterioration of already marginalized groups-like those who are poor and African-American also matter in the study of criminal violence. The use of the combination of the three theoretical perspectives provided the present study an opportunity to move beyond even these most recent perspectives that break with the past myopic, stereoty-
pical conceptualization of female homicide offenders. This helps us to move beyond the simplistic notion that women who kill are mostly African-American. The more comprehensive portrait that takes into account some of the potential intersections of race with class and gender presents a more sound theoretical argument, which in turn facilitated a better understanding of the occurrence of female homicidal behavior.

One of the major weaknesses of even the combined work of these researchers was found to lie in the lack of inclusion of alcohol use and prior records of offenders and victims. But, as discussed in the literature review, alcohol use and prior criminal records provide important insight into the occurrence of homicidal behavior, perhaps especially in the case of women who kill. These variables proved to add significant insight into the occurrence of female homicidal behavior in the present study. Future work must include these variables in order to capture the essence of female homicidal behavior, particularly as this relates to intimate versus non-intimate killing by women.

Discussion of Contributions

Criminological research prior to the 1970's treated female homicide offenders as an additional, smaller component to projects focusing on males. In other words, females were appendages to the male dominated research, and never central to these investigations. To correct this myopic view, as well as to contribute to the under-
standing of women homicide offenders, this project focused on only women homicide offenders. This was done in order to develop insight in this important topic, and begin to unravel the causal factors underlying women's killing.

A second contribution of this research focuses on African-American and white women. Limited research exists which focuses on female homicide offenders, and even less on African-American women who kill. Too often research avoids the issues relating to African-Americans as compared to white women who kill, and the differences that may be correlated with their killings.

In addition to greater breadth in the variable selection (discussed above), the research also goes into greater depth in variable measurement, by operationalizing Wilson's (1987, 1996) notions of the underclass and social disorganization. This allowed the researcher to question whether or not race is the only significant indicator of intimate versus non-intimate homicide or instead, one of a host of influences. Moreover, the theory is also inclusive of the alcohol use and prior arrest records of the victims and offenders. These may be factors that mediate the effect of race on intimate partner homicide.

Limitations and Future Research Efforts

Limitations

The first limitation of this research that the study only focused on African-American and white women. While this constitutes a
contribution, it can be seen as a limitation. The use of another minority group may have added insight into the prevalence of African-American female homicide offenders vis-a-vis other racial/ethnic minorites. This researcher still believes that the inclusion of another group may have detracted attention away from the African-American female homicide offender--an already neglected group in the research literature--but this exclusion still stands as a drawback of the present study.

The second limitation of this lies in the use of the police files. The lack of details on a major independent variable--drug use--limited investigation and discussion of the potential significant role of this highly suspected variable. The literature implicates drug use/abuse by offender and their victims, but this study was most unfortunately unable to explore the correlations of female homicidal behavior and drug use.

Other limitations of the police files were there was no separation of alcohol use of the offender versus victim. The police file did not include social economic status of either the victim or the offender. These limitations could have yielded valuable information concerning the dynamics of the relationship between the offender and the victim.

The third is that since men were not included in the study, no comparison can be made between male and female homicide offenders. The study's primary goal was to focus on the need to develop a theoretical explanation of the female homicide offender, by only in-
vestigating female involvement in killings. The restriction to only female homicide offenders may have been useful, e.g., in revealing the effectiveness of an integrated, causal model of theory, but comparisons cannot be made between males and females.

The fourth limitation is the external and internal validity of the MAR (murder analysis report) as outlined in Chapter V. The question is whether the instrument is testing the objective reality of female homicide behavior, or the rate at which and ways in which police officers file reports of such behavior. This is not a serious limitation, however, because unlike other crimes, homicide foes leave physical evidence, a body, which reduces the discretion and variation in the classification of offenses.

Regardless of that which the MAR are actually measuring, a related limitation to this research that must be highlighted concerns the generalizability of the findings. Since a random, representative sample was not taken of homicide incidents, even in the Chicago area, the findings described here can only be taken as heuristic. They are highly useful in pulling together and integrating previous theoretical and empirical work, and in suggesting future research (as is described below), but they cannot be taken as indicative of patterns that may obtain outside cases included in the analyses conducted here.

Future Research

There are three main objectives that emerge as a result of
this research. Due to the strong effect of victim's priors or intimate partner homicide cases, the first need is to conduct more research and provide funding for programs dealing with domestic violence. This need becomes even more pronounced since the effect of the victim's prior arrest for violence increased during the crack epidemic (and after) period of time. The theoretical model that incorporates a combination of independent variables indicates that there is increased stress during this time crack and after time period. And because of this increased stress, it would seem appropriate to increase monies and programs that operate to aid women in domestic violence situations (e.g., shelters, court advocates, etc.). This is a more appropriate approach than using drastic measures to deal with domestic violence homicides, since it would help prevent (as opposed to reacting after the fact of) intimate killings tied to partner abuse in the first place. For example, a domestic violence ordinance is not available to all women in all counties. Instead, domestic violence is a misdemeanor/nuisance offense that is all too easily ignored in many jurisdictions.

Looking at the issue on a national level, this research would indicate a need to address and present clarification to the director Bonnie J. Campbell in the Violence against Women Office. What seems to be lacking in the program on a national level, is the inclusion of race, class and gender in addressing women's violence. The advisory council is inclusive of promoting greater awareness of the problem (religious organizations, colleges and universities, etc.)
but the question becomes the clarity of information. Until we stand as a community and address domestic violence, women may turn to alternatives to end their violent experiences.

Second, the research also dictates a "new breed" of female homicide offender, as illustrated in the multivariate models. This new breed of offenders is not killing in intimate partner homicides, but non-intimate partner homicides. As indicated by Brownstein et al. (1995), she may be killing as a result of the drug economy. Future research needs to explore this component and address the relationship between substance use and homicide, an aspect that could not be done with this research.

Additionally, there is a need to further elaborate and differentiate some of the research variables. For example, consider drinking. How did the homicide start? Maybe the research should include interviews with the offenders. Maybe the research should follow the lead of Brownstein et al (1994); maybe the best alternative to capturing the female homicide offender is to interview the subjects. Future research would most productively engage in triangulated methodology that encompasses not only quantitative, but also qualitative, techniques such as in-depth interviews. This process would empower the participants by providing them an opportunity for the expression of their own voice or views, which would not only help to explain the homicide incidents, but also provide an arena of real life actors who could discuss the connection between the variables we research and seek to understand, like alcohol and prior
arrest records and the killing of intimate partners. This may provide the ultimate insight to help end the guesswork involved interpreting the causal links between race, class and gender and homicidal behavior in intimate versus non-intimate contexts.
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CENSUS TRACT INFORMATION

Note: As it appears in census tract

**Location Characteristics**
- Square miles

**Age**
- All persons
  - 16 years and over

**Female**
- 16 years and over

**Household Type and Relationship**
- Persons per household
- Persons per family

**Family Type By Presence of Own Children**

**Families**
- Female householders, no husband present

**All Housing Units**

**Renter-occupied housing units**
- White
- African-American
- American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Other race
- Hispanic origin (of any race)
- White, not of Hispanic origin

**VACANCY STATUS**
- Vacant housing units
  - For sale only
  - For rent
  - Rented or sold, not occupied
  - For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use
  - For migrant workers
  - Other vacant
    - Boarded up
**ROOMS**  
1 room  
2 rooms  
3 rooms  
4 rooms  
5 rooms  
6 rooms  
7 rooms  
8 or more rooms  
Median, all housing units  
Mean, all housing units  
Median, occupied housing units  
Median, owner-occupied housing units  
Median, renter-occupied units  

**UNITS IN STRUCTURE**  
1 detached  
1 attached  
2  
3 or 4  
5 to 9  
10 to 19  
20 to 49  
50 or more  
Mobile home or trailer  
Other  

**Occupied Housing Units**  

**PERSONS IN UNITS**  
1 person  
2 persons  
3 persons  
4 persons  
5 persons  
6 or more persons  
Median, occupied housing units  
Median, owner occupied housing units  
Median, renter-occupied housing units  

**PERSONS PER ROOM**  
1.00 or less  
1.01 to 1.50  
1.51 or more  
Mean  

**VALUE**  
less than $20,000  
$20,000 to $39,999  
$40,000 to $59,999
$60,000 to $79,999
$80,000 to $99,999
$100,000 to $149,999
$150,000 to $199,999
$200,000 to $249,999
$250,000 to $299,999
$300,000 or more

Median (dollars)
Mean (dollars)

CONTRACT RENT

Specified renter-occupied housing units
Mean contract rent (dollars)
Mean contract rent (dollars)

With meals included in rent
Mean contract rent (dollars)

No meals included in rent
No cash rent

Social Characteristics of Persons

PLACE OF BIRTH

All persons
Native
Foreign born

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME AND ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH

Linguistically isolated households

Persons 5 years and over
In linguistically isolated households
Speak a language other than English
Do not speak English "very well"
Speak Spanish
Do not speak English "very well"

Linguistically isolated

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

Person 3 years and over enrolled in school
Preprimary school
Public school
Elementary or high school
Public school
College
Public school

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Persons 25 years and over
Less than 9th grade
9th and 12th grade, no diploma
High school graduate (includes equivalency)
Some college, no degree
Associate degree
Bachelor's degree
Graduate or professional degree
Percent high school graduate or higher
Percent bachelor's degree or higher

FERTILITY
Children ever born per 1,000 women 15 to 24 years
Children ever born per 1,000 women 25 to 34 years
Children ever born per 1,000 women 35 to 44 years

RESIDENCE
Persons 5 years and over
Same house
Different house in United States
Central city of this MSA/PMSA
Remainder of this MSA/PMSA
Different MSA/PMSA
Not in an MSA/PMSA
Abroad

URBAN, RURAL, AND FARM RESIDENCE
Urban population
In housing units on properties of less than 1 acre
Rural population
In housing units on properties of less than 1 acre
On farms

JOURNEY TO WORK
Workers 16 years and over
Car, truck, or van
Drove, alone
Carpooled
Public transportation (including taxicab)
Bus or trolley bus or streetcar or trolley car
Subway or elevated, railroad, or ferryboat
Walked
Other means
Worked at home
Persons per car, truck, or van
Mean travel time to work (minutes)

Departure Time From Work
5:00 am to 5:59 am
6:00 am to 6:59 am
7:00 am to 7:59 am
8:00 am to 8:59 am
All other times
Worked in PMSA of residence
  Chicago city (pt)
  Cicero town
  Skokie village
  Evanston city
  Elk Grove Village (pt)
  Schaumburg village (pt)
  Des Plaines city
  Remainder of Cook County
  Chicago city (pt)
  Downers Grove village
  Oak Brook village (pt)
  Elmhurst city
  Remainder of DuPage County
  Crystal Lake city
  Remainder of McHenry County

Worked Outside of PMSA of Residence
  Aurora-Elgin, IL PMSA
  Lake County, IL PMSA
  Joliet, IL PMSA
  Hammond city, IN
  Remainder of Gary-Hammond, IN PMSA
  Worked elsewhere

Labor Force and Disability Characteristics of Persons

LABOR FORCE STATUS
Persons 16 years and over
In labor force
  Percent of persons 16 years and over
Civilian labor force
Employed
  Employed
  Unemployed
  Percent of civilian labor force
Not in labor force
  Institutionalized persons
  Enrolled in school
  Noninstitutional persons 65 years and over, not enrolled in school

Females 16 years and over
In labor force

Percent of females 16 years and over
Civilian labor force
Employed
Unemployed
Percent of civilian labor force
With own children under 6 years
   In labor force
With own children 6 to 17 years only
   In labor force
Own children under 6 years in families and subfamilies
   All parents present in household in labor force
Own children 6 to 17 years in families and subfamilies
   All parents present in household in labor force
Persons 16 to 19 years
   Not enrolled in school
      Unemployed or not in labor force
   Not high school graduate
      Employed
      Unemployed
      Not in labor force

OCCUPATION AND SELECTED INDUSTRIES
Employed person 16 years and over
   Executive, administrative and managerial occupations
   Professional specialty occupations
   Technicians and related support occupations
   Sales occupations
   Administrative support occupations, including clerical
   Private household occupations
   Service occupations, except protective and household
   Farming, forestry, and fishing occupations
   Precision production, craft and repair occupations
   Machine operators, assemblers and inspectors
   Transportation and material moving occupations
   Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers
   Construction
   Manufacturing
   Transportation, communications and other utilities
   Wholesale and retail trade
   Finance, insurance, and real estate
   Business and repair services
   Professional and related services

CLASS OF WORKER
Employed person 16 years and over
   Private wage and salary workers
   Government workers
      Local government workers
   Self-employed workers

WORK STATUS IN 1989
Person 16 years and over who worked in
Usually worked 35 or more hours per week
   50 to 52 weeks
   40 to 49 weeks
   27 to 39 weeks
Usually worked 1 to 34 hours per week, 40 to 52 weeks

DISABILITY
Civilian noninstitutionalized persons 16 to 64 years
   With a mobility of self-care limitations
      With a mobility limitation
      In labor force
      With self-care limitation
   With a work disability
      In labor force
      Prevented from working
No work disability
   In labor force
Civilian noninstitutionalized person 65 years and over
   With a mobility or self-care limitation
      With a mobility limitation
      With a self-care limitation

WORKERS IN FAMILY
No workers
   Mean family income (dollars)
1 worker
   Mean family income (dollars)
2 or more workers
   Mean family income (dollars)

Income and Poverty Status

INCOME IN 1989
Households
   Less than $5,000
   $5,000 to $9,999
   $10,000 to $14,999
   $15,000 to $24,999
   $25,000 to $34,999
   $35,000 to $49,999
   $50,000 to $74,999
   $75,000 to $99,999
   $100,000 or more
   Median (dollars)
   Mean (dollars)
Families
   Median income (dollars)
   Males 15 years and over, with incomes
      Median income (dollars)
Percent year-round full-time workers  
Median income (dollars)
Females 15 years and over, with incomes  
Median income (dollars)
Percent year-round full-time workers  
Median income (dollars)
Per capita income dollars

**INCOME TYPE**
Households  
With earnings  
Mean earning (dollars)
With Social Security income  
Mean Social Security income (dollars)
With public assistance income  
Mean public assistance income (dollars)
With retirement income  
Mean retirement income (dollars)

**MEAN FAMILY INCOME IN FAMILY TYPE**
Families (dollars)  
With no children under 18 years (dollars)
No own children under 18 years (dollars)

Married-couple families (dollars)  
With no children under 18 years (dollars)
No own children under 18 years (dollars)

**POVERTY STATUS**
All income levels  
Families  
Householder worked  
With related children under 18 years  
With related children under 5 years
Married-couple families  
Householder worked  
With related children under 18 years  
With related children under 5 years
Female household, no husband present  
Householder worked  
With related children under 18 years  
With related children under 5 years
Unrelated individuals for whom poverty status is determined  
Nonfamily householder  
65 years and over  
Persons for whom poverty status is determined  
Persons under 18 years  
Related children under 18 years  
Related children 5 to 17 years
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Persons 65 years and over
Persons 75 years and over

**INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL**

**Families**
- Percent below poverty level
- Householder worked
  - With related children under 18 years
  - With related children under 5

**Married-couple families**
- Householder worked
  - With related children under 18 years
  - With related children under 5

**Female householder, no husband present**
- Householder worked
  - With related children under 18 years
  - With related children under 5

**Unrelated individuals**
- Householder worked
  - With related children under 18 years
  - With related children under 5

**Persons**
- Percent below poverty level
- Persons under 18 years
  - Related children under 18 years
  - Related children 5 to 17 years
- Persons 65 years and over
- Persons 75 years and over

**Ratio of income to poverty level**
- Persons below 50% of poverty level
- Persons below 125% of poverty level
- Persons below 200% of poverty level

**MEAN FAMILY INCOME BY FAMILY TYPE**

**Families (dollars)**
- With no children under 18 years (dollars)
- No own children under 18 years (dollars)

**Married-couple families (dollars)**
- With no children under 18 years (dollars)
- No own children under 18 years (dollars)

**Female householder, no husband present (dollars)**
- With no children under 18 years (dollars)
POVERTY STATUS
All income levels
Families
Householder worked
With related children under 18 years
With related children under 5 years

Married-couple families
Householder worked
With related children under 18 years
With related children under 5 years

Female householder, no husband present
Householder worked
With related children under 18 years
With related children under 5 years

Unrelated individuals for whom poverty status is determined
Nonfamily householder
65 years and over

Persons for whom poverty status is determined
Persons under 18 years
Related children under 18 years
Related children 5 to 17 years
Persons 65 years and over

INCOME IN 1989 BELOW POVERTY LEVEL
Families
Percent below poverty level
Householder worked
With related children under 18 years
With related children under 5

Married-couple families
Householder worked
With related children under 18 years
With related children under 5

Female householder, no husband present
Householder worked
With related children under 18 years
With related children under 5

Unrelated individuals
Householder worked
With related children under 18 years
With related children under 5

Persons
Percent below poverty level
Persons under 18 years
  Related children under 18 years
  Related children 5 to 17 years
Persons 65 years and over
Persons 75 years and over

Ratio of income to poverty level
Persons below 50% of poverty level
Persons below 125% of poverty level
Persons below 200% of poverty level

Selected Structural Characteristics of Housing Units
All housing units

YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT
1989 to March 1990
1985 to 1988
1980 to 1984
1970 to 1979
1960 to 1969
1950 to 1959
1940 to 1949
1939 or earlier

BEDROOMS
No bedrooms
1 bedroom
2 bedrooms
3 bedrooms
4 bedrooms
5 or more bedrooms

CONDOMINIUM HOUSING UNITS
Owner-occupied condominium housing unit
Renter-occupied condominium housing unit
Vacant condominium housing unit

SELECT STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS
Complete kitchen facilities
Source of water, public system or private company
Sewage disposal, public sewer
Locking complete plumbing facilities
  Owner-occupied housing unit
  Renter-occupied housing unit
  Occupied housing unit

HOUSE HEATING FUEL
Utility gas
Bottled, tank or LP gas
Electricity
Fuel, oil, kerosene, etc.
All other fuels
No fuel used

VEHICLES AVAILABLE
None
1
2
3 or more

Vehicles per household

YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT
Owner occupied housing unit
1989 to March 1990
1985 to 1988
1980 to 1984
1970 to 1979
1969 or earlier

Renter-occupied housing unit
1989 to March 1990
1985 to 1988
1980 to 1984
1970 to 1979
1969 or earlier

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
No telephone in unit

Householder 65 years and over
Owner-occupied housing unit
Locking complete plumbing facilities
No telephone in unit
No vehicle available

Complete plumbing facilities
1.00 or less persons per room
1.01 or more persons per room

Lacking complete plumbing facilities
1.00 or more persons per room
1.01 or more persons per room

Mean household income
Owner-occupied housing units (dollars)
Renter-occupied housing units (dollars)
Household income in 1989 below poverty level
Owner-occupied housing units
Renter-occupied housing units
**Financial Characteristics of Housing Units**

Specified owner-occupied housing units

**SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS**

With an mortgage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median (dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 to $399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400 to $499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 to $599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600 to $799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800 to $999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 to $1,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not mortgaged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median (dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 to $199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 to $299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 to $399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400 to $499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Less than 20,000</th>
<th>Less than 20%</th>
<th>20 to 24%</th>
<th>25 to 29%</th>
<th>30 to 34%</th>
<th>35% or more</th>
<th>Not computed</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $34,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35% or more
Not computed
Median
$50,000 or more
Less than 20%
20 to 24%
25 to 29%
30 to 34%
35% or more
Not computed
Median
Specified renter-occupied housing units

GROSS RENT
Less than $100
$100 to $199
$200 to $299
$300 to $399
$400 to $499
$500 to $599
$600 to $749
$750 to $999
$1,000 or more
No cash rent
Median (dollars)

HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Less than $10,000
Less than 20%
20 to 24%
25 to 29%
30 to 34%
35% or more
Not computed
Median
$10,000 to $19,999
Less than 20%
20 to 24%
25 to 29%
30 to 34%
35% or more
Not computed
Median
$20,000 to $34,999
Less than 20%
20 to 24%
25 to 29%
30 to 34%
35% or more
| Not computed | Median | $35,000 or more | Less than 20% | 20 to 24% | 25 to 29% | 30 to 34% | 35% or more | Not computed | Median |
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Description of Variables
## Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offender Race</td>
<td>Race for the same of offender, dichotomized into African American = 1/ white = 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>Intoxication of victim and offender, dichotomized into intoxication of both/ or either (yes)= 1/ non-intoxication of both/or either (no)=0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Prior Arrest Record</td>
<td>Offender prior arrest: other, dichotomized into other arrest=1/ all other=0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Prior Arrest Record (Other)</td>
<td>Victim prior arrest: other, dichotomized into other arrest=1/ all other=0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Prior Arrest Record (Violent)</td>
<td>Victim prior arrest: violent, dichotomized into violent arrest=1/ all other=0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Prior Arrest Record (Violent)</td>
<td>Offender prior arrest: violent, dichotomized into violent arrest=1/ all other=0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Underclass Context Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Family Median Dollar</th>
<th>Average median family income = (1980 median family income + 1990 median family income)/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Renter-Occupied Units</td>
<td>Average renter-occupied units = (1980 Renter-occupied units + 1990 renter-occupied units)/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MMPI</td>
<td>Average MMPI = (1980 MMPI + 1990 MMPI)/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average person per household</td>
<td>Average person per household = (1980) person per household + 1990 person per household)/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI</td>
<td>Unemployed males/ female population of same age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Median dollar income</td>
<td>Median family income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Per Household</td>
<td>No. person per household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### C. Social Disorganization Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Divorced</td>
<td>No. Persons divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Divorced</td>
<td>( \text{Average divorced} = \frac{(1980 \text{ Renter-occupied units} + 1990 \text{ renter-occupied units})}{2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied Units</td>
<td>No. renter-occupied units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Renter-Occupied Units</td>
<td>( \text{Average renter-occupied units} = \frac{(1980 \text{ Renter-occupied units} + 1990 \text{ renter-occupied units})}{2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>No. Vacant Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>( \text{Average vacant housing units} = \frac{(1980 \text{ Renter-occupied units} + 1990 \text{ renter-occupied units})}{2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Hypothesis #1: African-American women will commit a higher proportion of homicides than white women.

Hypothesis #2: During the crack-epidemic, there will be an increase in intimate partner homicides that is greater for African-American women than for white women (ala Ogle et al., 1995).

Hypothesis #3: During the crack-epidemic, there will be an increase in non-intimate partner homicides that is greater for African-American women than for white women (ala Brownstein et al., 1995).

Hypothesis #4: There will be a significant relationship between the race/sex of the victim and the race of the offender, with most homicides being intra-racial and inter-sexual.

Hypothesis #5: Because of the prevalence of African-American female offenders, it is expected that African-American males would be the victims in a higher proportion of homicides committed by African-American women.

Hypothesis #6: During the crack epidemic, there will be a significant relationship between the race/sex of the victim and non-intimate partner homicide versus intimate partner homicide, with non-African-American males (white and other) being the victim in a higher proportion of non-intimate partner homicides.

Hypothesis #7: There will be a significant relationship between the prior arrest record of the offender and intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide, with women who kill their intimate partner being less likely to have a prior arrest record, especially for violent crimes.

Hypothesis #8: There will be a significant relationship between the race of the offender and prior arrest record of the offender, with African-American women more likely to have a prior arrest record than white women offenders, especially for non-violent crimes.

Hypothesis #9: Among male victims, there will be a significant relationship between intimate partner homicide versus non-intimate partner homicide and the prior arrest record of the victim, with male victims of intimate partner homicides being more likely to have prior arrests for violence than male victims of non-intimate partner homicides.

Hypothesis #10: There will be a significant relationship between the alcohol use of the offender and the probability of an intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide, with alcohol use by the offender increasing the probability of an intimate partner homicide.
Hypothesis #11: There will be a significant relationship between the alcohol use of the victim and the probability of an intimate versus non-intimate partner homicide, with alcohol use by the victim will increase probability of an intimate partner homicide.

Hypothesis #12: There will be a significant relationship between the race of the offender and weapon of choice with white women using a knife and African-American women using a gun.

Hypothesis #13: There will be a significant relationship between race of the offender and weapon choice, with African-American women becoming more likely to use guns than knives during the crack epidemic.

Hypothesis #14: There will be a significant relationship between the age and race of the offender, with African-American females being younger than white female offenders.

Hypothesis #15: There will be a significant relationship between the age of the offender and the age of the victim, with the offender killing someone older in intimate partner homicide.
Appendix D
Tables 28-33
Table 28
Logistic Regression of Intimate Partner Homicide on Race, Class, Social Disorganization, Victim/Offender Prior Record, and Alcohol Use by the Victim and/or Offender at the Time of the Incident: 1980-1995, Underclass Based on Characteristics of All Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Eq.1</th>
<th>Eq.2</th>
<th>Eq.3</th>
<th>Eq.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-9320</td>
<td>-1.0858</td>
<td>-0.4706</td>
<td>-0.8012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Offender’s Race</td>
<td>1.9083</td>
<td>1.8453</td>
<td>1.7092</td>
<td>1.4873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Context:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclass</td>
<td>1.0088</td>
<td>1.1743</td>
<td>1.1330</td>
<td>1.1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Divorced</td>
<td>1.0196</td>
<td>1.0407</td>
<td>1.0378</td>
<td>1.0378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Disorganization:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Vacant Housing</td>
<td>0.9807</td>
<td>0.9807</td>
<td>0.9737</td>
<td>0.9737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Rental Housing Unit</td>
<td>0.9918</td>
<td>0.9918</td>
<td>0.9906</td>
<td>0.9906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use and Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use of Victim &amp;/or Offender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Violent Prior Record</td>
<td>4.0233</td>
<td>1.3921</td>
<td>2.6880</td>
<td>2.6880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Other Prior Record</td>
<td>2.6880</td>
<td>2.6880</td>
<td>2.6880</td>
<td>2.6880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Violent Prior Record</td>
<td>7.165</td>
<td>7.165</td>
<td>7.165</td>
<td>7.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Other Prior Record</td>
<td>6.463</td>
<td>6.463</td>
<td>6.463</td>
<td>6.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 1201
-2 Log Likelihood: 1595.326
Hosmer & Lemeshow (x² test): 10.8296(2115)

+(p < 0.10  *p < 0.05  **p < 0.01 [one-tailed tests])

[Probability Difference] = ((odds ratio/(1+odds ratio))-5)*100.
Table 29
Logistic Regression of Intimate Partner Homicide on Race, Class, Social Disorganization, Victim/Offender Prior Record, and Alcohol Use by the Victim and/or Offender at the Time of the Incident: January 1980-March 1985, Underclass Based on Characteristics of All Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Eq.1</th>
<th>Eq.2</th>
<th>Eq.3</th>
<th>Eq.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds</td>
<td>Logit</td>
<td>Pr. Diff.</td>
<td>Odds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.7490</td>
<td>-0.8098</td>
<td>-0.0402</td>
<td>-0.7490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender's Race</td>
<td>1.6868</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td>1.4583</td>
<td>1.6868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Context:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclass</td>
<td>0.8498</td>
<td>0.8498</td>
<td>0.8498</td>
<td>0.8498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Divorced</td>
<td>-0.1627</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>-0.0728</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Disorganization:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Vacant Housing</td>
<td>1.0054</td>
<td>0.9834</td>
<td>0.9834</td>
<td>0.9834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Rental Housing Unit</td>
<td>-0.0167</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
<td>-0.0167</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use and Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use of Victim/Offender</td>
<td>1.1663</td>
<td>1.1663</td>
<td>1.1663</td>
<td>1.1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Violent Prior Record</td>
<td>2.7944</td>
<td>2.7944</td>
<td>2.7944</td>
<td>2.7944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Violent Prior Record</td>
<td>2.2743</td>
<td>2.2743</td>
<td>2.2743</td>
<td>2.2743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Other Prior Record</td>
<td>5.752</td>
<td>5.752</td>
<td>5.752</td>
<td>5.752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 412 410 410 410
-2 Log Likelihood 550.820 546.015 541.340 515.925
Hosmer and Lemeshow (x2 test) 13.7368(0.089) 5 3358(0.7212) 4 2950(0.8296)

+p<.10  *p<.05  **p<.01 [one-tailed tests]

[Probability Difference=((odds ratio/(1+odds ratio))-5)*100]
Table 30

Logistic Regression of Intimate Partner Homicide on Race, Class, Social Disorganization, Victim/Offender Prior Record, and Alcohol Use by the Victim and/or Offender at the Time of the Incident: April 1985-December 1995, Underclass Based on Characteristics of All Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Eq.1</th>
<th>Eq.2</th>
<th>Eq.3</th>
<th>Eq.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.111</td>
<td>-0.986</td>
<td>-0.433</td>
<td>-1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s Race</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>1.906</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>1.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Context:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclass</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>1.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Divorced</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Disorganization:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Vacant Housing</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Rental Housing Unit</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use and Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use of Victim &amp;/or Offender</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>5.190</td>
<td>2.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Violent Prior Record</td>
<td>5.190</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>2.920</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Other Prior Record</td>
<td>2.920</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>-.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Violent Prior Record</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>-.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Other Prior Record</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>-.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 789 785 785 785
-2 Log Likelihood: 1043.459 1038.808 1034.690 946.045
Hosmer and Lemeshaw (x2 test): 3.7613(.8780) 4.3656(8227) 4.3571(8236)

*p<.10  **p<.05  ***p<.01 [one-tailed tests]

[Probability Difference]=(odds ratio/(1+odds ratio)-.5)*100.
Table 31
Logistic Regression of Intimate Partner Homicide on Race, Class, Social Disorganization, Victim/Offender Prior Record, and Alcohol Use by the Victim and/or Offender at the Time of the Incident: 1980-1995, Underclass Based on Characteristics of African-American Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Eq.1</th>
<th>Eq.2</th>
<th>Eq.3</th>
<th>Eq.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.9320</td>
<td>-0.7815</td>
<td>-0.6534</td>
<td>-0.9047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race:
- Offender's Race
  - Eq.1: 1.9083 [16]*
  - Eq.2: 1.814 [14]*
  - Eq.3: 2.1085 [18]*
  - Eq.4: 1.8321 [15]*

Class Context:
- Underclass
  - Eq.1: 1.0322 [0.79]
  - Eq.2: 1.0172 [0.43]
  - Eq.3: 0.9415 [1.5]
  - Eq.4: 0.9363 [0.81]

Social Disorganization:
- Percent Rental Housing Unit
  - Eq.1: 0.9946 [-1.14]
  - Eq.2: 0.9844 [-1.96]
  - Eq.3: 0.9139 [-1.32]
  - Eq.4: 0.9139 [-2.36]
- Percent Vacant Housing
  - Eq.1: 9.946 [-0.054]
  - Eq.2: 9.844 [-0.157]
  - Eq.3: 9.918 [-0.82]
  - Eq.4: 9.755 [-2.48]

Alcohol Use and Prior Record
- Alcohol Use of Victim &/or Offender
  - Eq.1: 1.3124 [7]*
  - Eq.2: 1.0820 [30]*
  - Eq.3: 2.1822 [23]*
  - Eq.4: 0.7094 [-8.5]*
- Victim Violent Prior Record
  - Eq.1: 4.0820 [30]*
  - Eq.2: 1.000 [23]*
  - Eq.3: 0.3433 [-8.5]*
  - Eq.4: 0.3433 [-8.5]*
- Victim Other Prior Record
  - Eq.1: 2.7182 [23]*
  - Eq.2: 1.000 [23]*
  - Eq.3: 0.3433 [-8.5]*
  - Eq.4: 0.3433 [-8.5]*
- Offender Violent Prior Record
  - Eq.1: 0.7094 [30]*
  - Eq.2: 0.3433 [-8.5]*
  - Eq.3: 0.3433 [-8.5]*
  - Eq.4: 0.3433 [-8.5]*
- Offender Other Prior Record
  - Eq.1: 6.421 [11]*
  - Eq.2: 4.429 [11]*

N: 1201
-2 Log Likelihood: 1595.326 (1201)
Hosmer and Lemeshow: 8.0634 (4273)

*p<0.10 **p<0.05 ***p<0.01 [one-tailed tests]

Probability Difference = (odds ratio/(1+odds ratio)- 5)*100.
Table 32

Logistic Regression of Intimate Partner Homicide on Race, Class, Social Disorganization, Victim/Offender Prior Record, and Alcohol Use by the Victim and/or Offender at the Time of the Incident: January 1980-March 1995, Underclass Based on Characteristics of African-American Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Eq.1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pr. Diff</th>
<th>Eq.2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pr. Diff</th>
<th>Eq.3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pr. Diff</th>
<th>Eq.4</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pr. Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.7490</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.0202</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Context:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclass (2)</td>
<td>1.1317</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>[+2.2]</td>
<td>.9425</td>
<td>-.0592</td>
<td>[-1.5]</td>
<td>.9684</td>
<td>-.0321</td>
<td>[-1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Divorced</td>
<td>.9850</td>
<td>.0152</td>
<td>[-.387]</td>
<td>1.0434</td>
<td>.0424</td>
<td>[+1.1]</td>
<td>1.0345</td>
<td>.0339</td>
<td>[+0.84]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Disorganization:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Rental Housing Unit</td>
<td>.9828</td>
<td>-.0174</td>
<td>[-.43]*</td>
<td>.9802</td>
<td>-.0200</td>
<td>[-.5]*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Vacant Housing Unit</td>
<td>1.0065</td>
<td>.0064</td>
<td>[-1.6]</td>
<td>1.0018</td>
<td>.0018</td>
<td>[+0.4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use and Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Violent Prior Record</td>
<td>2.7816</td>
<td>1.0230</td>
<td>[+24]**</td>
<td>2.7816</td>
<td>1.0230</td>
<td>[+24]**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Other Prior Record</td>
<td>2.2631</td>
<td>.8168</td>
<td>[+19]*</td>
<td>2.2631</td>
<td>.8168</td>
<td>[+19]*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Violent Prior Record</td>
<td>5.737</td>
<td>.5556</td>
<td>[-14]*</td>
<td>5.737</td>
<td>.5556</td>
<td>[-14]*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Other Prior Record</td>
<td>5919</td>
<td>.5245</td>
<td>[-13]</td>
<td>5919</td>
<td>.5245</td>
<td>[-13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 412 410 410 410
-2 Log Likelihood = 550.820 545.849 541.230 516.032
Hosmer and Lemeshaw (x2 test) = 5.495(.7036) 10.1460(25.49) 5.1342(7431)

*+p<.10   *p<.05   **p<.01 [one-tailed tests]

[Probability Difference]=((odds ratio/(1+odds ratio))-5)*100.
Table 33
Logistic Regression of Intimate Partner Homicide on Race, Class, Social Disorganization, Victim/Offender Prior Record, and Alcohol Use by the Victim and/or Offender at the Time of the Incident: April 1985-December 1990, Underclass Based on the Characteristics of the African-American Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Logit</th>
<th>Pr. Diff</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Logit</th>
<th>Pr. Diff</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Logit</th>
<th>Pr. Diff</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>Logit</th>
<th>Pr. Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-1.1112</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-1.0247</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-9.217</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-1.4268</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Context: Underclass</td>
<td>.9988</td>
<td>.0138</td>
<td>[-.03]</td>
<td>.9658</td>
<td>-0.0348</td>
<td>[-.9]</td>
<td>9217</td>
<td>-0.0815</td>
<td>[-.2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Divorced</td>
<td>1.0139</td>
<td>-.0012</td>
<td>[+0.35]</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>-8.8E-05</td>
<td>[-0.002]</td>
<td>1.0008</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>[-0.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Disorganization: % Vacant Housing Unit</td>
<td>.9927</td>
<td>-0.0074</td>
<td>[-.2]</td>
<td>.9964</td>
<td>-0.0036</td>
<td>[-.1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rental Housing Unit</td>
<td>.9981</td>
<td>-0.0019</td>
<td>[-.05]</td>
<td>.9884</td>
<td>-0.0117</td>
<td>[-.3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use and Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4033</td>
<td>.3388</td>
<td>[-8.4]*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use of Victim &amp;/or Offender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3112</td>
<td>1.6698</td>
<td>[+34.0]**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Violent Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0160</td>
<td>1.1039</td>
<td>[+25.1]**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Other Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7905</td>
<td>-0.2351</td>
<td>[-5.9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Violent Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7091</td>
<td>-0.3438</td>
<td>[-9.0]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Other Prior Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.043.459</td>
<td>1040.066</td>
<td>1039.030</td>
<td>947.381</td>
<td>10.5873(.2262)</td>
<td>11.0761(.1974)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


