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ABSTRACT

This research takes an exploratory and integrative approach to homicide within the Canadian city of Windsor. The use of police files provide the necessary data to be analyzed within the interpretive interactionism perspective.

Using a symbolic interactionist perspective, offenders' interpretations of the situations are investigated. The interplay of roles, audience and interpretation of the situation assist in explaining the complexity and intricacies of these violent encounters.

The behaviors and expectations within these violent interactions are further explained through the Subculture of Violence theory.

The understanding and integration of the two sociological approaches helps to uncover how the participants within homicide attach meaning to their epiphanies within Windsor.
This thesis is dedicated to my parents,
Bill and Joanne Davidson,
who have taught me the value of education
and supported me throughout my
academic endeavors.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is the combined effort of several individuals who contributed towards the final product. I now would like to take this opportunity to thank those individuals who were actively involved within this project.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis committee, Dr. Thomas Fleming, Dr. Mary Lou Dietz and Professor Brian Mazer. The committee exhibited a great deal of patience and support which was very much appreciated. Their academic knowledge, thought-provoking comments, and editing skills proved to be very valuable qualities, all of which contributed to the construction of this research. Finally, the friendliness and approachability displayed by the committee helped to ease some of the pressures experienced within the research process.

Next, I would like to thank all of the individuals from the Windsor Police Center who helped to make the project possible. Those individuals include Chief of Police James Adkin, Deputy Chief of Police Alec Somerville (now retired), and all of the detectives who assisted within the data collection process. Sue McMullen and the staff within Central Records are deserving of special attention. Day after day, they led the author to the research site to unlock the necessary information required for data collection.
My family and friends; faculty, colleagues and staff, are also to be thanked for their co-operation and guidance throughout the research experience.

Finally, I wish to thank Karen, who made me believe in myself and who unselfishly sacrificed her needs for mine.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS</td>
<td>xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF APPENDICES</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal History</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Study</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Interactionism</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. AN INVESTIGATION INTO A VIOLENT SUBCULTURE</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Life Experiences Conducive to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization of Violent Values</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. HOMICIDAL INTERACTIONS</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of the Situation</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Interplay of Roles and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of the Situation</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Interpretation of the Situation and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Dynamics of Interaction</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Implications</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Personal Reflection</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Homicides in Windsor for the Years 1969-1988 .................. 101
Victim Age .................................................. 102
Offender Age .................................................. 102
Gender of Victim .......................................... 103
Gender of Offender .......................................... 103
Race of Victim .............................................. 103
Race of Offender ........................................... 104
Occupation of Victim ...................................... 104
Occupation of Offender ..................................... 105
Homicides and the Day of the Week ......................... 105
Homicides and the Time of Day .......................... 105
Method of Assault .......................................... 106
Frequency of Homicide and City Section .................. 106
Population of City Sections ................................ 109
Low Income Incidence Rates and City Section ........... 109
Place of Assault ........................................... 110
Victim/Offender Relationship ................................ 110
Involvement of Drugs ...................................... 111
Involvement of Alcohol ..................................... 111
Homicide Followed by Suicide ................................ 111
Homicide Charges ........................................... 112
Disposition .................................................. 112
Prior Record of the Offender ........................................ 112
Type of Homicide ....................................................... 113
Motivation for Social Homicide ...................................... 113
Motivation for Felony Homicide ...................................... 113
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

City Section and Census Tracts ....................... 107
City Sections .......................................... 108
LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A ................................................................. 100
Appendix B ................................................................. 101
Appendix C ................................................................. 114
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Homicide, the taking of a human life, is a continuing facet of social life. From the 1960's, through to the 1980's, violent interactions resulting in death have doubled. (Boyd, 1988)

Criminal homicide is arguably the ultimate crime. It is certainly the most serious and most feared. Our intolerance of homicide is reflected through the dispositions handed down by judges to those who murder, as well as in the amount of time and money spent by policing agencies to investigate these acts of violence.

This study develops an exploratory and integrative approach to homicide and violent interactions in Windsor. Windsor has a reputation of being a 'blue collar' city because of the large number of automotive manufacturing and heavy industry jobs in the area. The neighboring U.S. city of Detroit Michigan, which until recently was labelled the 'murder capital of the United States' has, in comparison to Windsor, a very high rate of violent crime, including homicide. These two characteristics of Windsor, bordering a highly violent U.S. city and its industrial nature, make it a compelling location for a study of homicide.

Regardless of the rate at which people kill one another, homicide is a serious act and must be treated as such. It is a phenomenon rarely committed by a sociopath contrary to what many
may believe. Rather, it occurs amongst very ordinary people who may work with us or live beside us.

This pioneering study of murder in Windsor attempts to answer the following research question. How are homicide interactions constructed and given meaning to by its participants within Windsor?

This study will yield data which will enhance the academic literature, and may inform the community and law enforcement agencies.

LEGAL HISTORY

Within Canada, homicide is classified as either first degree murder, second degree murder, manslaughter, or infanticide. Confederation did not change the essential structure of the legal description of murder in Canada which was set out in the first Criminal Code of 1892. (Boyd. 1988) In 1961, the Criminal Code separated murder into capital and non-capital offenses. Capital murder occurred when either a police officer or prison guard was murdered; all other murders were classified as non-capital. The maximum penalty, upon conviction, for capital murder was the death penalty while the maximum penalty for non-capital murder included life imprisonment: (Martin's Criminal Code. 1968).

Between December 30, 1972 and January 1, 1974, the definition of capital murder reverted to what it had been in 1961, planned and deliberate murder, murder during the course of certain crimes, and murder of a police officer or prison guard. (Boyd. 1988:42)
The Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1976 witnessed the abolition of the death penalty and hence a change in the legal description of murder. Currently, homicide is classified either as culpable or non-culpable, the latter not being an offence. 'Culpable homicide is murder or manslaughter or infanticide'. (Martin's Criminal Code, c.222 ss.4, 1989:215) Murder is designated as first degree when it is planned and deliberate; when the victim is a peace officer or a permanent employee of a prison; or when committed during a hijack, sexual assault, kidnapping, or hostage taking situation. (Martin's Criminal Code,c.231 ss.2.4.5, 1989) Felony homicides, homicides which are committed during another crime, are often murders committed in the first degree. A robber who plans the elimination of a store clerk before entering the store, would be guilty of murder in the first degree. Murder in the second degree does not have to be planned and deliberate but is intentional. If, for example, an offender shoots an individual in the head at close range immediately following an argument, the offender may be guilty of murder in the second degree.

'Culpable homicide, that otherwise would be murder, may be reduced to manslaughter if the person who committed it did so in the heat of passion caused by sudden provocation.' (Martin's Criminal Code,c.232 ss.1, 1989:230) Manslaughter is not usually intentional. For example, it is often the result of intent to cause bodily harm that the individual does not realize is likely to cause death. Manslaughter may also be the result of reckless
conduct or situations where alcohol played a role.

A female person commits infanticide when, by a wilful act or omission, she causes the death of her newly-born child, if at the time of the act or omission she is not fully recovered from the effects of giving birth to the child, and by reason thereof or of the effect of lactation consequent on the birth of the child, her mind is then disturbed. (Martin's Criminal Code, c.233, 1989:233)

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

In Chapter I, I have attempted to introduce homicide and set the stage for this integrative and exploratory study. A brief discussion of the legal history of homicide has attempted to clarify the legal definition of homicide as depicted by our criminal justice system.

Chapter II will examine the theoretical framework chosen for the study. An integrative theory is proposed, combining the elements of The Subculture of Violence theory with Symbolic Interactionism. Understanding the interaction between the victim and the offender is essential to understanding a phenomenon such as homicide. It is also essential however, to understand that individuals bring to the interaction 'baggage', or past life experiences which may influence the decisions they make within the violent confrontation.

Chapter III then reviews past literature on homicide. General studies of homicide are first reviewed with an emphasis on Canadian material. Trends such as the age, sex, and social
class of the victim and offender are discussed. Other variables include method of assault, the involvement of drugs and alcohol, and the prior record of the offender. Studies focusing on the interaction between the participants of homicide are then reviewed.

Chapter IV reviews the method chosen for the study. In keeping within the framework of symbolic interactionism. interpretive interactionism is the most applicable method. The advantages and disadvantages of using document analysis are discussed followed by an examination of the experiences and problems within the data collection process.

Chapter V then begins a discussion of the findings of the study. A demographic investigation into a subculture of violence is outlined within this chapter. The key variables within a subcultural investigation include the age, sex, social class, race and prior record of the offender.

Chapter VI then discusses the findings of the victim and offender interactions. The interpretation of the situation, formed by the offender, is a key element for the understanding of violent interactions. It is also important to take into account the various roles being played by the participants at the time of the violent encounter. Different roles often have different expectations which can interplay with the interpretation formed by the offender. Towards the end of the chapter, the dynamics and stages of violent interactions are outlined.

Chapter VII is the concluding chapter of the study.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Many studies on violent crime in the past have either been too "macro" in nature or too "micro" in nature. The "macro" studies which have been primarily positivist studies, focus strictly on structure without giving any consideration to the fact that humans make choices and may alter their actions. (Amir, 1971; Pokorny, 1965; and Wolfgang, 1958) The "micro" studies or psychological studies, focus primarily on the personalities of violent offenders to try to uncover those traits which lead to violent behavior. (Megargee, 1966; Perdue and Lester, 1974; and Rawlings, 1973)

When trying to understand a behavior such as homicide, it would be fallacious to focus simply on the structural variables such as age, sex, race, and social class. It also would be fallacious to focus simply on personality traits of the offender.

A search for the causes of violence in interpersonal situations must include both the structural factors and the processual developments that occur within enduring dyadic relationships. It is their complimentarity that allows an examination of violent behavior in interpersonal situations. (Hepburn, 1973:427)

When two people come together to interact, they arrive with certain characteristics which have dramatic effects upon the interaction which is to take place. In the case of face to face
interactions within homicide, for example, the actual interaction may be influenced by whether one or both of the participants is high on drugs or is intoxicated on alcohol. If a participant has been subjected to a great deal of violence throughout his/her life, it will surely affect the way he/she reacts within a confrontation.

Structural variables such as age, sex, race and social class form the basis for a subculture of violence. This subculture of violence combined with Symbolic Interactionism forms the theoretical framework for this study.

It is crucial to remember that this study is primarily concerned with exploring and describing homicide interactions within Windsor. Theoretical and methodological ramifications thus arise. This study cannot fully analyze 'why' people kill. Perhaps in the future a study will be conducted where Windsor's killers are interviewed extensively and their social constructions of reality are presented. It is also important to remember that no study can obtain the victim's social construction of reality within homicidal interactions.

Before discussing the Subculture of Violence theory, it is important to distinguish between three different forms of subculture and select the one most appropriate for the current study.

There appears to be three major subcultural groups in most westernized societies that provides pro-violence values. These are, first, class-based, primarily lower class subcultures that support traditional male sex roles and the use of physical violence for control, punishment, and prestige. The second group are the licit occupational
subcultures that legitimize the use of violence in occupational contexts under specified conditions. Most important here are the branches of the government that allow violence to be carried to the extreme of killing. The third major subculture is the criminal subculture itself which supports and encourages the use of violence including killing. (Dietz. 1983:16)

I believe that a class-based subculture is the most appropriate for the examination of homicide. Past research has clearly established that offenders of homicide usually occupy the lower class. (Pokorny. 1965; Wolfgang, 1958)

The Subculture of Violence theory, as proposed by Wolfgang and Ferracuti suggests

There is a potent theme of violence current in the cluster of values that make up the life-styles, the socialization process, the inter-personal relationships of individuals living in similar conditions. (Wolfgang, 1967:8)

Wolfgang, in his Philadelphia study, found that many homicides occurred among the lower class and seemed to result from very trivial events that took on great importance because of mutually held expectations about how people should behave. (Vold and Bernard. 1986) Wolfgang and Ferracuti uncovered a set of values inherent within the subculture quite different from the dominant subculture. They valued honor more and human life less.

Violence within the subculture is not instinctive nor hereditary, but rather it is learned through the process of socialization with interacting groups. Through socialization, values such as 'toughness', 'masculinity', 'manhood', and 'face-saving', are learned at quite early ages.

Certain values, formed through socialization, create a
subculture within the larger society which supports conduct quite different from the larger culture. People involved in this subculture commit homicide often as a result of what appear to outsiders to be very insignificant events.

Quick resort to physical combat as a measure of daring, courage, or defense of status appears to be a cultural expression, especially for lower socio-economic class males of both races. When such a culture norm response is elicited from an individual engaged in social interplay with others who harbor the same response mechanism, physical assaults, altercations, and violent domestic quarrels that result in homicide are likely to be common. (Wolfgang, 1958:188)

Values within the subculture of violence are learned early. It is through the Transmission of Violence theory that these values are best explained.

Often physical punishment of children (especially lower class children) comes in the form of physical abuse. As Gelles indicates, demarcation of 'physical punishment' and 'physical abuse' is very ambiguous. (Gelles, 1985) Child abuse may be defined as 'a deliberate attack against a child resulting in physical injury perpetrated by any person exercising his responsibility as a caretaker'. (Marsden and Wrench, 1977:201)

In the book, *Families Canada*, Benjamin Schlesinger describes reported injuries stemming from child abuse or the 'battered child syndrome'.

The injuries include bruises and one or a combination of fractures of the arms, legs, skull or ribs. In many instances poor skin hygiene and some degree of malnutrition are also evident. X-rays of the child often reveal other fractures in various stages of healing, indicating that such abuse has been repetitive. Abuse of this nature is most severe, sometimes fatal, and is most often inflicted on children who are too young to speak, thereby ruling out their explaining how the injuries occurred. (Schlesinger,
Children subjected to abuse often learn or incorporate a value of violence as a normal social response.

Studies revealing a direct link between violent offenders and abuse as a child include Duncan et al. (1978), King (1975), Sendi and Blomgren (1975), and Ressler and Burgess (1985). Unfortunately these studies focus on small samples (N=6 to 30) of committed violent offenders.

In a larger study, Owens and Strauss (1975) examined the relationship between exposure to violence including committing violence, being a victim of violence, and observing violence as a child in relation to approval of violence as an adult. The authors concluded that the

amount of violence experienced in childhood by members of a society is one of the factors contributing to the development and maintenance of cultural norms supporting the use of violence in face-to-face situations. (Owens and Strauss, 1975:193)

Studies indicating a relationship strictly between observing parental violence and later violent offenses include Bach-y-Rita and Veno (1974) and Lewis et al. (1979)

These studies and others support the hypothesis that violent values may be transmitted within the family and hence provide members of a subculture of violence with an initial incorporation of the value of violence.

The violent values, once incorporated, may be expressed and further incorporated through the socialization agency of peers.

Same age, same sex peers are likely to be present during violent encounters and also likely to influence conduct.
Male street corner life in the lower classes has been well documented and demonstrates the constant presence and importance of the peer group. (Dietz. 1978:17)

Reiss and Rhodes state.

among lower class boys the probability of committing any kind of delinquent activity is related to the delinquency of one's close friends. (Reiss and Rhodes, 1964:9)

The transmission of violence, through interaction with family and peers, is an extremely important concept for the understanding of homicide. In all of the studies mentioned above, a certain area or origin for the transmission of violence is discussed. In his recent book, The Creation of Dangerous Violent Criminals, Lonnie Athens describes how violent criminals are created. Each area or origin described in the studies above is a stage for Athens in the book. His analysis is the most complete and comprehensive relative to the development of violent individuals and provides this study with an explanation for the question of 'why' people kill. Recall that the purpose of this study is to describe homicide as it exists in Windsor, and due to the nature and number of cases, interviews with violent offenders cannot be accomplished. Athens however provides a satisfactory explanation as to why killers kill.

In The Creation of Dangerous Violent Criminals, Athens describes four stages which an individual must proceed through in order to obtain the values of violence and use them in social confrontations. (Athens, 1989)

The real key to discovering how people become dangerous violent criminals is to find some way to develop a theory from studying them which does not split in two the bio-physiological and social environmental sources of their
violence. (Athens, 1989:14)

For Athens, the notion of social experience provides the key for a proper theoretical framework as to why criminals are violent. Social experiences cannot separate the social environment with the human body. They are both essential and complimentary to having social experiences.

Athens proceeds to discuss his theory which is based on extensive interviews with 'seasoned' and 'unseasoned' violent offenders as well as non-violent criminals. Athens was interested in discovering common past social experiences of these individuals in order to link the use of violence with the incorporation of violent values.

The first stage for the 'Creation of Dangerous Violent Criminals' is Brutalization which is itself divided into Violent Subjugation, Personal Horrification, and Violent Coaching. During the violent subjugation experience, authority figures from the victim's primary group use violence to force him or her to submit to their authority. (Athens, 1989:28) There is an initial resistance to the battery, but eventually the victim feels it is safer and quicker to submit to the beatings.

The humiliation from being brutally beaten down incenses the subject. Her burning rage becomes cooled only later when it is transferred into a desire for revenge. The subject's desire for vengeance expresses itself in passing fantasies in which she batters, maims, tortures, or murders her subjugator. (Athens, 1989:29)

This type of subjugation is termed coercive subjugation. Athens distinguishes this type of subjugation from retaliatory
subjugation where the subject is battered 'well beyond the point where the subject signals submission through such acts as pledging future obedience, begging for mercy or forgiveness or becoming completely hysterical.' (Athens, 1989:32) Therefore, in coercive subjugation, the subject can terminate the beating where as in the retaliatory type, she/he cannot. Athens explains that coercive subjugation is performed for short term goals whereas retaliatory subjugation is performed for long term goals.

Personal horrification occurs when the subject does not himself/herself undergo violent subjugation, but rather witnesses or hears another person of the subjugator's primary group undergoing it. (Athens, 1989:38) Again, the subject and victim are members of the same primary group thereby personalizing the experience for the subject. When a member of one's primary group is being assaulted, the subject first feels apprehension for the victim but feels a strong sense of anger towards the subjugator. The subject then represses his/her anger in passing thoughts and fantasies about battering, torturing, maiming, or killing the subjugator.' (Athens, 1989:40) The subject may, if he/she feels he/she can win, attack the subjugator. If he/she does not, he/she then experiences feelings of impotence and feels angry at himself/herself.

In violent coaching, the subject or novice is encouraged to use violence by an older person or coach. Again, the coach is a member of the subject's primary group. The coach may be a father, mother, uncle, or older close friend and usually possesses some
kind of credibility in the subject's eyes. (Athens, 1989:46) The subject must feel that the coach is not hypocritical but would himself/herself act violently in the same situation the subject faces. Subjects are coached to use enough violence in conflictual situations to prevail in that situation. Subjects are taught to be dominant, forceful, and to be winners. Coaches often tell the subject stories of how they themselves, their fathers or another relative of theirs won a physical altercation and beat the 'villain'. The coach thus appears as a hero to the subject. Coaches may also ridicule the subject into 'standing up for themselves' through psychological punishment. Coaches may also use violent subjugation to coach the subject into being violent.

Brutalization leaves the subject in a confused, turbulent condition. Only after a person experiences brutalization can they move to the second stage, Belligerency.

Much reflection now takes place for the subject. He or she asks 'Why me?'. He or she questions human relationships and 'concludes that there is a huge gap between the ideal and real way in which people interact.' (Athens, 1989:57) The subject tries to find meaning in the brutalization he or she has experienced. With respect to violent subjugation, the subject feels anger towards the subjugator as well as other people as they may someday subjugate the subject as well. With respect to personal horrification, the subjects' rage is directed towards himself/herself. He/she feels this way because he/she could not help a loved one from being subjugated. (Athens, 1989) With
respect to violent coaching, the subject becomes angered at himself/herself; after all, coaches taught him/her to take charge and be forceful, yet the subject cannot stop the subjugation being inflicted upon himself/herself and perhaps other loved ones.

In the belligerency stage, the subject comes to an important conclusion - to stop the brutalization he/she experiences.

The real solution that finally dawns upon the subject is to begin taking violent action himself against other people who unduly provoke him. (Athens, 1989:59)

He/she now realizes that the coach was right; violence is sometimes necessary. If proper circumstances allow, the subject will now badly injure or even kill.

In the third stage, violent performances, the subject puts to use the resolution he/she made in the belligerency stage. Now once provoked, the subject engages in violent battles.

... the expansion of this resolution requires much more than mere contemplation. It requires successful praxis or the successful performance of the activity ultimately contemplated - violent action ... the more successful the performance or the bigger the violent feat performed, then the more quickly the violent resolution of the person can be expected to deepen and widen. (Athens, 1989:71)

Once the subject wins a few battles, he/she feels the decision made to become violent in the previous stage was the correct one. If that person loses, he/she may become 'unviolent' or may become even more determined to win.

In the fourth stage, virulence, the subject reflects upon his/her latest confrontation which he/she won. The subject hears the primary group talking of him or her as 'violent lunatic',
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'violent maniac', or 'madman'. (Athens, 1989:73) The subject feels discomfort and puzzled as it was these people who coached him/her to being violent.

The primary groups response depends upon the severity of violence the subject inflicted. Most times it involved a very severe act of violence and they therefore see the subject as 'mentally unbalanced'. (Athens, 1989:73) The primary group hence treat the subject as if he/she were very dangerous. The subject senses this social trepidation and hence violent notoriety. The subject is thus confronted with a paradox:

On the one hand, notoriety denotes being well known for something bad. On the other hand, it is sometimes better to be known for something most people think is bad and few think is good than not being known for anything at all. (Athens, 1989:74)

The subject now gets respect and has great control over his/her environment. Where the subject used to feel powerless and inadequate, he/she now feels powerful and in control. The subject therefore accepts his/her new violent notoriety.

The individual feels invincible and engages with even less provocation in violent interactions. He/She becomes isolated as primary group members avoid contact with him/her.

According to Athens, an individual cannot become a 'dangerous violent criminal' unless all stages of this process are completed.

The work done by Athens provides the most rational and complete analysis of 'normal' homicide in terms of understanding the perpetrator.
Most of the works used to understand homicide in this research are grounded in Symbolic Interactionism theory, especially the work of Mead, Blumer, Charon and Hewitt.

Symbolic Interactionism, proposed principally by George Herbert Mead and his student Herbert Blumer, attempts to explain the way in which individuals subjectively define and interpret their interactions within certain situations. In contrast to structural analysis, interactionists see individuals as possessing free will and able to make choices. Blumer outlines three basic premises upon which symbolic interactionism is based.

The first premise is that human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them. The second premise is that the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one's fellows. The third premise is that these meanings are handled in and modified through an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters. (Blumer, 1969:2)

Where other sociological approaches see the individual as a determined organism, interactionists see individuals acting in the present, with others and within themselves allowing them to make change.

Charon points out the importance of 'perspective' and not 'attitude' within symbolic interactionism.

A perspective, on the other hand, is not a response to a stimulus, but a guide to definition. It is not an internal trait, but something belonging to and shared in interaction. The individual uses it; it does not cause behavior. Since the individual interacts with many others and plays many roles, he or she will have many perspectives; therefore, any given object can be defined in a number of ways and is not simply a stimulus leading to a specific response. (Charon, 1989:23)
A person may thus be defined as a teacher, husband, father and coach, all in the same day depending upon the situation at the time of interpretation. Unlike attitudes, perspectives are not fixed or stable; they change making behavior unpredictable. (Charon, 1989:24)

Several central concepts are used within symbolic interaction which will help to clarify and explain this perspective.

An important, central concept to symbolic interactionism is the symbol. The importance of language is often taken for granted within our society. Imagine trying to communicate with another without using language. One quickly realizes the centrality and importance of language which makes the human population unique and different from other animals.

Words—symbols—provide a method whereby humans can bring external reality within the sphere of their imaginations. where they can manipulate 'house', 'dog', and 'table' rather than either the physical things for which these names stand or visual images of them. (Hewitt, 1991:41)

Symbols are social and thus meaningful. They are used by a group in a consistent manner. The following example provided by Hewitt clarifies this discussion.

A person who shouts 'Fire!' in a public building, for example, is attaching a symbolic designation to the situation. As he or she shouts, others become aware of the situation in a way they previously were not aware of it. The mental states of the other people have become similar to that of the person who shouts 'Fire!'. Moreover, the individual who warns the others reacts to this warning in much the same way they do—that is, hearing his or her own voice, the person doing the warning takes an attitude toward the situation that resembles the attitude of the others, such as a desire to get out of the burning building.
(Hewitt, 1991:43)

This is symbolic interactionism. Through this situation, one gets a sense for the importance of symbols. Through symbols, 'humans name, remember, categorize, perceive, think, deliberate, problem solve, transcend space and time, transcend themselves, create abstractions, create new ideas, and direct themselves - all through the symbol.' (Charon, 1989:61)

To the symbolic interactionist, objects are much more than physical tangible things which can be physically touched or smelled. Objects can be social as well: 'objects can be anything that we can designate symbolically'. (Charon, 1989:103) Love, reassurance, and sadness are objects. Some of the most important objects to symbolic interactionists are social such as 'conversation': these objects are often the result of interaction between people. Objects can be inviting, where we assimilate them into our experience, or they may be annoying where we try to avoid them. (Hewitt, 1991:103)

People interact in relation to objects in the environment. This organization of conduct or interaction is referred to as the act. 'The act is an elementary unit of conduct that represents the smallest meaningful unit we can abstract from the stream of human behavior.' (Hewitt, 1991:75) The writing of this research at this time is an act. It was initiated from the time the researcher turned on the computer and it will be terminated when the computer is turned off. Mead describes four stages of the 'act'. The act begins with some form of disequilibrium within the
'Impulse' stage. The individual then defines the situation confronting him/her in the 'Perception' stage. In the third stage, 'Manipulation', the individual manipulates his/her environment. In the final stage, 'Consummation', equilibrium is restored. (Charon, 1989:121-123)

Another important concept within symbolic interactionism is the self. 'The self is an object that the actor acts toward.' (Charon, 1989:65)

How can an individual get outside of himself experientially in such a way as to become an object to himself? . . . (It is through) the process of social conduct or activity in which the given person or individual is implicated . . . The individual experiences himself as such, not directly, but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same social group . . . (he) becomes an object to himself just as other individuals are objects to him or in his experience . . . it is impossible to conceive of a self arising outside of social experience. (Mead, 1934:136-140)

According to Blumer and Mead, the self has two basic aspects - the self as object and the self as process. (Blumer, 1969)

The self as object refers to the fact that a human being has a conception or picture of himself/herself which is his/her self image. (Blumer, 1969) The individual takes the roles of others to see or judge himself/herself from a point outside of that individual. The actor thus looks at an image of himself/herself and then judges what he/she sees.

Hewitt gives an example to illustrate an instance of seeing oneself as object.

'Talking to oneself' is an everyday experience. It is also a necessary activity, for 'thought' - which is the name we give to such internalized conversation - cannot take place unless individuals treat themselves as social objects with
whom they can conduct a conversation. (Hewitt, 1991:84)
Whenever we imagine or picture ourselves achieving or doing something, we are treating ourselves as objects. It is important to remember that object does not refer to only physical material such as the human body: the self therefore, does not have to be something tangible. One can see himself/herself as a caring person or a mean person, for example. The self as object is a critical concept for symbolic interactionists.

The self as process is best understood by using Mead's 'I' and 'Me'. (Mead, 1934:173–226) The 'I' involves the first stage of the process which is a reaction or response to a stimulus. The 'Me' involves the second stage of the process where the individual sees himself/herself as object and acts accordingly.

The 'I' and the 'Me' continually alternate in ongoing conduct. At one moment, the individual acts as an 'I', responding to a particular situation and to the objects it contains; at the next moment that response becomes a part of the past and so is part of the 'Me'. (Hewitt, 1991:86)

The following example by Hewitt clarifies the self as process.

A parent sometimes shows anger toward children, beginning to speak harshly to them: in so doing the parent is acting as an 'I'. A moment later, becoming aware of this harshness by imagining how he or she looks from the perspective of the children, the parent becomes a 'Me', and then may respond to this 'Me' by apologizing or by speaking less harshly. In so doing the parent again becomes an 'I', this time responding to an image of self rather than to something outside of the self. (Hewitt, 1991:86)

This process is often a means of controlling conduct. When one loses his/her temper however, the initial impulse goes unchecked by the 'Me' and hence people often speak or act in ways they later realize they wish they would not have. This is
important to the understanding of an act such as homicide.

Evolving from a discussion of the self comes the concept of role. Symbolic Interactionists define role 'as a perspective from which conduct is constructed'. (Hewitt, 1991:95) Hewitt emphasizes that role is not a concrete list of attributes, but rather is an abstract perspective from which the individual participates. (Hewitt, 1991:95) It is through role-taking that we are able to become 'Me's'. We attempt to take the perspective of the others involved in the situation in order to ascertain an appearance of ourselves. We must also know something about the role of the other in order to act upon our interpretations.

A generalized other is a perspective the individual imaginatively adopts within role-taking. 'It is made up of standards, expectations, principles, norms, and ideas that are held in common by the members of a particular social group.' (Hewitt, 1991:102)

This discussion of the key concepts of symbolic interactionism has been used to provide a perspective for understanding homicide in this research.

Athens very successfully incorporates symbolic interactionism into the study of the phenomenon of violent crime. Within his book Violent Criminal Acts and Actors: A Symbolic Interactionist Study, he focuses upon the concept of 'self as process' to describe the interpretations of the situation violent offenders form during violent interactions. Interpretations of the situation occur during the 'Me' stage of the process. Athens
states that there are two important phases of interpretation of the situation. (Athens, 1977)

The first phase of interpreting the situation involves 'definition' where the individual defines the nature of the situation facing him/her. (Athens, 1977) The second phase, 'judgement', occurs when the individual decides upon the proper course of action to take in the situation given his/her definition of it. (Athens, 1977) It is the generalized other (an abstract other or group that the individual makes up over time) which acts to solve the situation.

By taking the role of the generalized other (the perspective of an abstract other or group which the actor himself carves out over time from his interaction with other persons) the actor forms a 'plan of action' to carry out in the situation; that is, he covertly organizes or prepares himself to follow a particular course of overt action. (Athens, 1977:16)

Before carrying out the plan of action, the individual may change the plan or redefine the situation confronting him/her. He/she will then rejudge it by taking the role of the generalized other and indicating how he/she now should act.

To help clarify this discussion of the interpretive process, Athens discusses four types of interpretations of situations which occur when they are applied to violent acts. (Athens, 1980)

A physically defensive interpretation occurs when the individual feels he/she is physically in danger.

By taking the role of the victim, the actor implicitly or explicitly indicates to himself that the meaning of the victim's gesture is either (1) that the victim will very shortly physically attack him or an intimate such as a spouse or child or (2) that the victim is already attacking
him or the intimate. (Athens, 1980:20)

The generalized other addresses the individual to act against the victim and to kill him/her first.

A frustrating interpretation occurs when the offender sees the victim blocking the specific line of action the offender wishes to carry out, or where the victim intrudes into a specific line of action that the offender does not want carried out. (Athens, 1980:22) By taking the role of the generalized other, the offender carries out a plan of action to minimize the victim's intrusion.

A malefic interpretation occurs when the offender interprets the victim's gestures as deriding or belittling and sees that person as 'evil' or 'malicious'. After making self indications to him/her by the generalized other, the offender kills the victim. (Athens, 1980:24)

A frustrating-malefic interpretation occurs when the victims' gestures resists the offender's specific line of action; the offender sees the victim as 'irksome' and hence 'evil'. (Athens, 1980:26)

It should be noted that these interpretations of situations only apply to situations where the victim was killed. The four examples of interpretations of situations show the self as process and further clarify the interactionist viewpoint.

I have thus discussed a Subculture of Violence which provides the environment in which certain groups of people learn to use and expect violence. I then discussed and emphasized the
Symbolic Interactionist approach and how it may be related to understanding all interactions including violent crime. It is my opinion that in order to explain violent crime, both perspectives are useful. After all, not all people involved in potentially violent interactions kill, and not all people within a violent subculture kill. One needs the other to fully explain homicide.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature will be divided into two sections. The first will involve a review of some general studies on homicide. The second section will incorporate several studies focusing on interaction with a Symbolic Interactionist grounding.

The most recent and perhaps the most complete study of homicide in Canada was done by Neil Boyd in *The Last Dance: Murder in Canada*. As stated earlier, Canada experienced a large increase in the homicide rate in the 1960's. (Boyd, 1988)

After the key period of growth in homicide rates between 1966 and 1975, the proportional figures have remained relatively constant. In the late 1980's, our country experiences the same number and rate of killings as it did during the mid-seventies - about 650 homicides annually. (Boyd, 1988:1)

Boyd contends that social phenomenon such as the baby-boom, the dissolution of the institution of marriage, and the increased consumption of alcohol all played a role in the increased rates. He also notes that changes in the law have had very little effect on the rate at which people kill. (Boyd, 1988:2)

Within his study, Boyd found 60% of convictions for homicide were for the offence of manslaughter, a little over 30% for second degree murder, and about 5% for first degree murder. (Boyd, 1988:19)

According to Boyd, the majority of homicides seem to occur amongst family and acquaintances. Eighty percent of homicides
involve family and acquaintances. 10% of homicides are for money, 5% for sex, and 5% involve emotionally disturbed offenders. (Boyd, 1988:18) Killing family members accounts for approximately 40% of the homicides in Canada. Intoxicants, sexual betrayal, and financial difficulties are the most likely 'motives' involved in killing family. (Boyd, 1988:95) The killing of acquaintances accounts for approximately 40% of Canadian homicides as well. The 'motives' involved are similar to those in killing family except the offender is often involved in other illegal activities such as drugs, prostitution, or carrying guns. (Boyd, 1988:128)

Offenders involved in 'killing for sex' are almost always male. Killing for sex includes men killing men as well as women, incest offenders, and child killers such as Clifford Olson.

Perhaps the most frightening form of homicide involves killing for money. Usually performed by strangers, killing for money most frequently occurs during the commission of other felonies such as robbery. (Boyd, 1988:166)

Killing by the mentally disordered account for only 5% of the homicides in Canada. These individuals cannot be held criminally responsible for their actions. If they are found to be mentally disordered at the time of the trial, then they are not required to stand trial. They may, however, be determined fit enough to stand trial at a later date. They therefore are often incarcerated within mental hospitals in which treatment is to take place.

Boyd found the two most common means of killing another
human being, shooting and stabbing, were responsible for about 80% of all homicides; beating and strangulation followed in relative frequency. (Boyd, 1988:19) Between 1961 and 1974, Statistics Canada found shooting accounted for 44% of the killings: beating, 22%; stabbing, 18%; strangulation, 7%; suffocation, 2%; drowning, 1%; arson, 1%; and other means, 5%. (Statistics Canada, 1976:32-33)

Silverman and Kennedy note that the method of assault varies with the gender relationships amongst the participants of homicide. 'For men killing men, the closer the relationship, the more likely guns will be utilized'. (Silverman and Kennedy, 1987:15) For women perpetrators, stabbing or 'other' means such as suffocation or drowning, are the most popular means of killing. (Silverman and Kennedy, 1987) Suffocation and drowning are more likely to be the methods of choice when the victim is a child or infant.

Jayewardene gives a description of a typical homicide in Canadian society.

... homicide is, by and large, a highly personalized act, where persons who have had a close relationship to each other over a long period of time play the dominant roles. Involving the male rather than the female, the less educated and intelligent rather than the more, the young adult rather than the aged, the lower rather than the upper social classes, it has been found to be essentially an intra-group phenomena with both the victim and offender making a contribution to the fatal outcome. (Jayewardene, 1960:9)

Several other studies support the findings of Jayewardene. (Boyd, 1988; Statistics Canada, 1976; Silverman and Kennedy, 1987; Wolfgang, 1958) As well, one may stress that since the majority
of homicides occur amongst family members and acquaintances, the victim will possess many of the characteristics as that of the offender such as age, class, race, and education. (Katz, 1988:21)

In The Female Perpetrator of Homicide in Canada, Silverman and Kennedy used national homicide data for Canada for the years 1961 to 1983, to examine homicides committed by females. They found females contribute to the overall homicide rate 10% to 12%; two thirds of which involve killing their husbands and children, the rest being a friend or acquaintance. More specifically, 22% killed their husbands, 18% murdered their common-law husbands, 24% killed their children, 29% involve relatives, friends, or acquaintances, and 7% of all homicides perpetrated by females involve either no known relationship or a stranger. (Silverman and Kennedy, 1987:6) Surprisingly, they found that mothers who kill their children commit suicide following homicide at a rate of 19%. (Silverman and Kennedy, 1987:12) Women, with the exception of the category 'mothers' (who kill their infants or children), for the most part, do not seem to feel the kind of remorse that leads to suicide. Often after killing an abusive spouse, they experience relief. (Silverman and Kennedy, 1987:12)

Women generally kill their spouse in defence of self, a situation in which the victim precipitated his own death. Long periods of abuse often take the woman to the point where she kills her spouse to save her own life. Rather than kill her husband, many people ponder why the wife doesn't get out of the violent relationship instead.
The question most often asked about battered women is, 'Why don't they leave?' The underlying assumption is that then the battering would stop. Years of research have proved that assumption untrue: the abuse often escalates at the point of separation and battered women are in greater danger of dying then. (Walker, 1989: 47)

Mothers who commit infanticide, 'probably see no options except to kill the child - to avoid discovery, to avoid shame and stigma for themselves and their family: they seem in no way equipped to mother a child'. (Silverman and Kennedy, 1987:14) Silverman and Kennedy further state that the most common occupation of women who commit infanticide is 'student'. (Silverman and Kennedy, 1987)

Peter Chimbos' study of interspouse homicide revealed that 405 Canadian homicides between the years 1969 and 1973 were committed amongst spouses. Approximately 81% of these homicides were committed by husbands and common-law husbands, while the remainder were committed by wives and common-law wives.

Amongst the 34 respondents he used within his study, the most common reason for quarrelling amongst spouses (leading to the homicide) was 'love and sexual matters' (extramarital affairs and sexual refusals), accounting for 47%. Twelve percent blamed the fatal act on 'drinking', 26% could not remember the nature of the quarrel due to 'blackout', and 14% stated there was 'no quarrel'. (Chimbos, 1978:54) Alcohol and/or drugs were involved in the homicidal act 70% of the time. Thirty-eight percent of the killings involved a stabbing, 32% involved beatings, and 30% involved the use of a firearm. (Chimbos, 1978:61)
Qualitatively, the study found that an interspouse homicide is constructed on a foundation of both historical and situational elements. (Chimbos, 1978) The offenders had been accustomed to violent episodes as children: they witnessed abuse within their parents' relationship and were often abused themselves. They therefore came to learn violence as a normal response. Chimbos' 'value-added' model of interspouse homicide provides a very helpful theoretical framework upon which much of the present study is based.

Drugs and alcohol play a key role in the act of homicide. Boyd found that in 30% of all homicide cases, either the victim, offender, or both made use of alcohol. (Boyd, 1988:8) According to Statistics Canada, 41.4% of all murders in Canada between 1961 and 1974 involved drinking prior to the murder incident. (Statistics Canada, 1976-34) Several studies have found alcohol and drugs to be of significance as well. (Chimbos, 1978; Garrett et al., 1986; Goodman et al., 1986; Hollis, 1974; Lindquist, 1986; Mayfield, 1976; Virkkunen, 1974; Voss and Hepburn, 1968; Wolfgang, 1958)

Several of the above studies imply that alcohol has a causal relationship with violence. There is much more than meets the eye however. Theoretical explanations for the alcohol-violence relationship vary greatly. Perhaps most common is the disinhibition paradigm where 'behavioral constraints were thought to be loosened by the psychopharmacologic action of alcohol'. (Collins, 1989:50) Collins proceeds to argue however that the
disinhibition explanation does not take into account known variations in physiological effects by other physiological, psychological and social characteristics. Placebo studies for example, reveal people are more aggressive when they think they are taking alcohol. (Lang et al., 1975)

If variations in alcohol's violence-producing capacity were limited to cognitive, psychological, and situational factors, there would be some hope that a traditional theoretical model could be developed to specify systematically the features of individuals and situations or contexts that are at high risk of alcohol induced violence. (Collins, 1989:62)

Rather than focusing simply on the physiological implications alcohol has on the brain, it is important to understand alcohol's cultural phenomenology and its role in violence. Collins adds that the act of drinking has a cultural life distinct from the physiological effects so often analyzed; the act has separate social rules - it allows people to behave in ways they normally may not. (Collins, 1989:62) 'The anticipation that negative consequences for acting violently might be offset by drinking may tempt some to shroud their violent acts in drink'. (Collins, 1989:62)

Another important aspect of alcohol's cultural phenomenology is the fact that the alcohol-violence relationship may not be 'involuntary' as so often thought. Often in the case of felony violence, the offender may drink before the crime to calm his/her nerves or to raise his/her level of daring. (Collins, 1989:63)

The relationship between alcohol and violence is much more complicated than often indicated. The cultural phenomenology of
alcohol consumption must be considered along with the physiological and cognitive effects alcohol has in homicidal incidents.

Paul Goldstein reviewed the relationship between drugs and violent crime and concluded the following.

Clearly, drugs and violent crime are related. Further, they are related in different ways. The tripartite conceptual framework suggests three models of that relationship: psychopharmacological, economically compulsive, and systemic. Different drugs differentially promote violence depending upon which model is operant. Barbiturates, amphetamines, and alcohol are most often associated with psychopharmacological violence. Heroin and cocaine are most often associated with economically compulsive violence. Any illicit drug may be associated with systemic violence. (Goldstein, 1989:40)

The type of drug, therefore, impacts upon the manner in which the drug affects violence.

Literature on homicide followed by suicide within Canadian studies is scarce. The American literature reveals that only a small number of offenders kill themselves after killing another human being. Wolfgang found only 4%; Dublin and Bunzel found 9%; Green and Wakefield report homicide followed by suicide accounts for 2% to 9% of the cases and it usually involves members of the same family. (Dublin and Bunzel, 1935; Green and Wakefield, 1979; Wolfgang, 1958) Homicide followed by suicide is much more prevalent in the United Kingdom than it is in Canada or the United States.

There is little Canadian literature on the prior records of the offenders. To some extent, the existence of a prior record may provide an extended measure for subcultural values. It may be
hypothesized that individuals who have incorporated pro-violent values would have indicated these values by prior violent offenses such as assault, attempted murder, or rape. Wolfgang reported

Of 400 offenders with a previous arrest record, 66% have a record of one or more offenses against the person, 44% against property, and 48% aggravated assault. Of the 264 with a record of one or more offenses against the person, 73% have a record of aggravated assault. (Wolfgang, 1958:184)

Many researchers in the past have used a variety of classifications for homicidal motivation. Perhaps the most common is that used by the police. Police report that revenge, jealousy, anger, hatred, and argument or quarrel are the motives for the vast majority of homicides. Wolfgang's Philadelphia study revealed

Criminal homicide due to altercations are the most frequent and involve 35% of all victims. Family of domestic quarrels (14%), and deaths due to jealousy (12%). constitute the second and third largest categories. (Wolfgang, 1958:198-199)

These classifications include categories such as homicides committed for sex and homicides committed because of a 'drug-rip-off'. As seen earlier, studies such as Boyd's classify motivations as either killing family and acquaintances, killing for sex, killing for money or killing due to emotional disturbance. (Boyd, 1988) Many classifications fail to discriminate clearly between murders committed for jealousy and murders committed in generalized anger such as the case with 'killing for sex'.

34
This concludes the first section of the review of the literature. While there is a great deal of literature on homicide, the above studies focus primarily on Canadian literature and bring about some important findings relevant to the current study. I now turn to a literature review focusing on studies dealing specifically with homicidal interactions and patterns.

David Luckenbill's study on homicidal interaction provides an instance where a pattern is established between the offender and victim.

The offender and victim develop lines of action shaped in part by the actions of the other and focused toward saving or maintaining face and reputation and demonstrating character. (Luckenbill, 1977:185-186)

Luckenbill found six stages involved in the interaction between the victim and the offender.

Within the first stage, Luckenbill states, 'The opening move in the transaction was an event performed by the victim and subsequently defined by the offender as an offense to 'face'. That image of self a person claims during a particular occasion or social contact'. (Luckenbill, 1977: 179) Within the second stage, 'the offender interpreted the victim's previous move as personally offensive'. (Luckenbill, 1977: 180) Within stage three, 'The apparent affront could have evoked different responses'. (Luckenbill, 1977: 181) For the fourth stage, Luckenbill states 'except for cases in which the victim has been eliminated, the offenders preceding move placed the victim in a
problematic and consequential position: either stand up to the challenge and demonstrate character, or flee the situation and place one's own face in jeopardy'. (Luckenbill, 1977: 182) Within the fifth stage, 'On forging a working agreement, the offender, and in many cases, the victim appear committed for battle'. (Luckenbill, 1977: 184) Luckenbill states that within the sixth stage, 'Once the victim had fallen, the offender either fled the scene, voluntarily remained on the scene, or was involuntarily held at the scene'. (Luckenbill, 1977: 185)

Other studies confirming a progressive development of interaction include Hepburn (1973) and Felson and Steadman (1983).

A study similar to Luckenbill's is that of Felson and Steadman's, where three stages of interaction between the victim and offender are found. Using reconstructed cases based on the accounts of police, eyewitnesses, offenders, and where applicable victims: 159 cases were used in the analysis. The stages are as follows:

The first stage involves verbal conflict in which identities are attacked and attempts to influence the antagonist fail. The second stage involves threats and evasive action. Mediation, when it occurs, tends to occur at this point. Instigation of the conflict tends to occur during either the first or second stage. The third and final stage involves physical attack. (Felson and Steadman, 1983:70)

Felson and Steadman emphasize the principle of retaliation within interaction. Retaliation, by the victim or offender, suggest that 'face-saving' is an important aspect to either player. 'Each participant's actions were a function of the other
person's behavior and the implication of that behavior for defending one's well-being as well as one's honor. (Felson and Steadman, 1983:71)

In a final note, the two authors suggest that third parties to the interaction. (other players besides the victim and offender) were more likely to play the role of antagonists rather than mediator. (Felson and Steadman, 1983)

Within his study on the processual development of interaction, John Hepburn states the first stage is a 'perception of a threat to situated identities such that identities must be negotiated and the interaction becomes identity directed'. (Hepburn, 1973:425)

The factors which facilitate a violent response are: a pervasive norm of violence, referred to as the subculture of violence; the presence of intoxicants; the overt and/or covert support of the audience to the interaction; and the perceived cost of failure. (Hepburn, 1973:427)

Dietz discusses progressive stages for both social and felony homicides. These stages will be discussed further within the victim-offender interaction chapter. She states that within felony homicides, homicides committed during another crime, the act begins before the players are all present; unlike social homicide, there is a prior planning stage involved before the players even confront each other within felony homicide. (Dietz, 1983:33)

The criminal violence sequence involves stages both before and after the violent encounter when the target is not present. Although the action of 'the target influences the course of the interaction in both types of encounters, it is likely to be much more influential in the interpersonal-conflict-type encounters than in the criminal violence
encounters. In the former, a commitment to carry out the crime has been made prior to the confrontation with the target. (Dietz, 1983:31)

In all of the studies of 'processual development of interaction' described above, there is/are certain stage(s) where the perpetrator interpreted the situation he/she was confronted with and acted accordingly. This stage is the key to understanding violent interactions such as homicide. A person may have been abused and witnessed abuse as a child; may have been intoxicated; or may have been under the strong influence of his/her peers; but the act is carried out only after the offender has interpreted his/her situation as placing him/her in a position to act.

Within felony homicide as well, even though the perpetrator has a set plan before the act, the outcome often results from the situation in which the interaction occurs. If the victim, for example, resists the offender's demands, the offender may feel obligated to kill in order to carry out the deed.

This concludes the final section of the review of the literature. The intent of the above review is to provide other instances of violent crime being studied from a Symbolic Interactionism perspective.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Sociological theory and sociological methodology must go hand in hand in order to successfully understand such social phenomenon as human interaction and violence. Recalling that the theoretical framework of this research rests upon the Subculture of Violence and Symbolic Interactionist theories, the accompanying method of research must be flexible yet complimentary to such theoretical positions. The qualitative perspective of interpretive interactionism, as proposed by Norman Denzin, was selected for this research. Denzin defines interpretive interactionism as 'the attempt to make the world of problematic lived experience of ordinary people directly available to the reader'. (Denzin, 1989:7)

Interpretive interactionism is a perspective applicable to various methodologies. 'The research methods of this approach include open-ended, creative interviewing; document analysis; semiotics: life-history; life-story; personal experience and self-story construction; participant observation; and thick description.' (Denzin, 1989:7) It is important to note that interpretive interactionism integrates symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, and phenomenology. This study, however, is principally concerned with interpretive interactionism and its application to symbolic interactionism.

I elected to make use of document analysis, more
specifically, those documents found within police files. Three conditions leading to this decision included: obtaining the best possible source for accurate descriptions of violent interactions between victims and offenders; an investigation into the possible existence of a violent subculture; and the desire to investigate the previous two conditions over a lengthy period of time using several cases, allowing for a good, clear picture of homicide in Windsor. It is only through document analysis of police files that all conditions are met.

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

One generally associates intensive interviewing or participant observation with a theoretical framework such as symbolic interactionism. Interpretive interactionism however, allows for 'an understanding and interpretation of the world as it is lived, experienced, and given meaning to'. (Denzin, 1989:34) This can be achieved not only through interviews and observations, but through document analysis and other methods as well. Like other methods, document analysis has its advantages and disadvantages.

The first advantage is that document analysis is unobtrusive. A non-reactive observation is made while the behavior occurs in its natural situation. Interviews and participant observation place the researcher in the physical presence of the respondent or 'natural situation'. The respondent
may thus alter his/her social construction in such a way as to become 'self-serving'. (Dietz, 1983:40)

The use of police files and document analysis allow for another important advantage, reliability. Within the files, there are several documents, each providing an account of the homicidal interaction. (The actual documents will be discussed later in this chapter) Luckenbill states

This methodological strategy should provide a fairly strong measure of reliability in case reconstruction. By using several independent resources bearing on the same focal point, particular biases could be reasonably controlled. In other words, possible biases in singular archival documents could be corrected by relying on a multitude of independently produced reports bearing on the transaction. For example, the offender's account could be compared with witnesses' accounts and with reports on physical evidence. (Luckenbill, 1977:177)

Intensive interviews with offenders on the other hand, give only one perspective of the interaction. This recollection, as mentioned earlier, may be given in a self-serving fashion. Again, it is important to understand that perhaps the most important account of the interaction, that of the victim, cannot be administered into the understanding.

Document analysis is a very inexpensive and practical methodology. This study for example, sets out to investigate over one hundred different cases of homicide in Windsor. While it may be time consuming investigating all pertinent documents, it is inexpensive and attainable. Interviewing over one hundred offenders on the other hand, if attainable, can become expensive and unmanageable. Getting interviews from all of the offenders
who have committed homicide in Windsor over the last twenty years would probably be an impossible task.

I quickly became aware of the disadvantages of using document analysis as well. (Denzin, 1978:320) The amount or nature of information can become limited. Relevant questions may arise for the researcher which cannot be answered through the analysis of the documents. The offender's statement, for example, is guided and directed by the interviewing officer or detective and not the researcher. Questions which are relevant to the detective or officer may not be relevant for the researcher and vice versa. The researcher, for example, may be interested in the subjective meanings the offender creates within the interaction, while the police are more concerned with the objective, physical actions of the interaction. The researcher is left to interpret the offenders' actions and feelings.

Another disadvantage of using the documents must be noted as well. Individual documents, especially the case of the offender's statement, may contain statements which are given in a self-serving fashion. The offender may describe his/her version of the culmination of events in such a way as to make himself/herself appear 'less guilty'.

The offender's character may also be subjected to the detective or officer's interpretation. The discourse appearing within various documents, and hence the case reconstructions, may seem 'loaded' or biased. Within the statement 'the vicious nature of the offender', for example, the perpetrator's character is
already damaged through police interpretation.

While nothing can be done concerning the discourse appearing in the reconstruction, I wish to acknowledge this disadvantage of document analysis.

It is my opinion that the advantages of document analysis far out weigh the disadvantages, and for the purposes of this research, it is the most appropriate method.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The study incorporates all cases of homicide between the years 1969 and 1988 in the city of Windsor.

My primary goal within the data collection phase of the research was to reconstruct, as accurately as possible, the interaction between the offender and the victim leading up to the victim's death. Reconstruction was based primarily on the documents found within the police files. Such documents as police reports, witness statements, court transcripts, crown attorney briefs, accused charge statements, forensic center reports and others were used.

Upon reading all documents within a file, I reconstructed the violent interaction as accurately as possible, writing out the reconstruction by hand. A data sheet was kept for each case as well, outlining several structural and situational variables. (see the actual data sheet in Appendix, A) This data will be used for a subcultural investigation as well as a statistical
appendix.¹

A field journal was also kept outlining the various stages and encounters of the data collection process which are summed up in the next discussion.

**The Experience and Problems of Researching Homicide**

Upon receiving a letter from Dr. Fleming. (see Appendix C) the Windsor Chief of Police. James Adkin granted us access to the police files on homicide. Both Dr. Fleming and myself were then sworn to an oath of secrecy by His Honor Judge Perkins pertaining to the confidentiality of the subject matter. Subsequently, I commenced data collection from the police files.

Gaining access to the files, after swearing an oath of secrecy to a judge, proved to be the pivotal stage of the study. I was under the impression that gaining access to a municipal police force's homicide files was a rare occurrence. It is conceivable to understand that police are hesitant to give such confidential information to anyone. Other researchers in the past have experienced difficulties in gaining access to various research sites. (Hunt, 1991)

Upon investigating the files, several documents were found to exist in each file. The following is a list of the main

¹ Appendix B contains Statistical Trends for Homicide in Windsor revealing statistical frequencies for several variables.
documents found in the files: this list is by no means exclusive. Police reports, witness statements, detectives' reports, coroners' reports, sudden occurrence or homicide reports, report on verdict or sentence. breathalyzer reports, accused charge statements, court records, crown attorney briefs, psychological assessments, previous records, photographs, drawings of the scene of the crime, ambulance records, and reports from the Center of Forensic Sciences were all common documents found.

All needed data for a case can be found in a complete police case file. Crown attorney briefs for example reconstruct the interaction of the crime based on police and witness statements as well as any other evidence which may have been forthcoming.

Files were found in three different locations within the police station. A basement vault contained the majority of files, especially for the years 1969 to 1982. The files were shelved starting from the earlier years and proceeded to the latter years.

Cases within the 1983 to 1988 period were the easiest to reconstruct as they contained most of the documents mentioned earlier. They were the most organized and consistent cases of all the cases studied.

Cases for the years 1983 to the present were found in the Central Investigations Department. I was informed that the detectives wanted these files near their work area because several of these files were still in the court process and had not been completed as of yet.
While studying files in the basement vault there often was a referral of that particular case to a number on microfilm where the majority of documents could be found for that case. The third location of files therefore was in Central Records. Within this Division, I was allowed to use a microfilm machine to sort through thirteen different tapes. On the films were all major crimes such as robbery, arson, rape, sexual assault, attempted murder and homicide. Subsequently, I had to review all other crimes to retrieve information on homicide. There were no new files found on the films, but missing information from other cases was recovered.

Aside from these three locations of files, I was also informed that certain files may be in the company of the detectives who were assigned to those cases. Over the twenty years covered by the research however, several detectives had retired making contact with them virtually impossible.

This led to the largest problem experienced while collecting the data. Several of the police files for homicide cases were missing all together. The only concrete source of information giving the exact number of cases for the specified time period was that from The Center for Justice Statistics, Ottawa (see Appendix C). Confirming that there were 123 victims of homicide for the years 1965-1988, I quickly realized there were approximately twenty cases which were absent from the police files. Upon inquiring, no concrete explanation was offered as to the location of these missing cases. It is inconceivable to think
that the police department would destroy any of these files: problems would surely arise if there were to be an appeal for a particular case and there were no original documents for that case.

Efforts were made to find the missing cases by contacting the Provincial and National Archives, as well as the Crown Attorney's Office. These missing cases could not be found through any source.

There also were no two case files containing the same documents. Often it was found that files were missing the prior record of the offender for example. This document assisted in acquiring the statistical data for each case. Due to the confidentiality of the offender's prior record card, I was not permitted access to them in the Central Records Department. The staff at Central Records however, were willing to search for missing information which was required in order to complete a case.

Since approximately twenty cases were missing, I attempted to secure relevant documents outside of the police files.

One such document included newspaper articles. The Windsor Star, the local newspaper used for this study, contains a separate research division and library within the downtown building. One advantage of this data source is that homicide articles are uniquely filed under a heading entitled 'CRIME/MURDER'. This prevents any researcher from spending long hours sifting through all newspapers looking for articles on
particular homicide cases. Homicide articles for the years 1987 and 1988 were found on a microcomputer. The cost to obtain a hard copy of a particular article is $1.00 per minute and 25 cents per article. Often hard copies were sought due to the short hours held by the library. (Tuesday to Thursday, 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.)

For the years 1984 to 1986 inclusive, the library has a section of newspaper clippings entitled 'MURDER ARTICLES'. For the years 1960 to 1983, all homicide articles are to be found on microfilm.

An advantage of media data is that homicide is a highly visible crime and when it occurs, one can expect there to be an article in the news pertaining to the incident. All cases known to police therefore, will be broadcasted in print to the public except in rare circumstances.

There are several drawbacks to using newspaper articles for a study of homicide. The first problem is a lack of detail. An article often lacks vital pieces of information in order to fully understand the interaction between the offender and victim leading up to the killing. Reporters are often subjected to limited information given by police press releases. Variables, such as prior record, occupation and involvement of drugs or alcohol, are often not given in a newspaper article. More importantly, events of the victim-offender interaction were often unknown within the newspaper articles. Sensationalism is also a fact that must be taken into consideration as well. Often through
this process, the important facts and details of a case are neglected.

As mentioned earlier, the library staff created a filing system for homicide articles which was intended to save an individual much time. Upon sending articles out to be microfilmed, several years of articles were lost and never returned. For the years 1973, 1974, 1975, 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983, I had to search through every newspaper around the time of the homicide in order to locate pertinent articles. Often, the sentencing article would be years after the actual homicide, creating the long hours one spent searching for that article.

Newspaper articles provide basic information surrounding a homicide. Even though a great deal of time was spent searching for articles for certain years, the newspaper provided information pertaining to the twenty known cases which were absent from the police files.

Other sources of documents include the Provincial and National Archives. These sources proved to be of little consequence for this study. A letter was written to both institutions informing them of my request. (See Appendix C)

A letter from the Provincial Archives stated, 'Sources in the Archives of Ontario are limited'. (See Appendix C) A reply from the National Archives indicated the following, 'I regret to inform you that we have very little information on homicides for this recent time period.' (See Appendix C) The letters were helpful in providing other possible sources. Contact was
subsequently made with the Canadian Center for Justice Statistics and the Windsor Court Administrator.

A reply from the Canadian Center for Justice Statistics proved to be quite helpful. For the first time, I knew the exact number of homicides for each year of the study. (See Appendix C)

The Center for Justice receives their data from individual police department returns: therefore for every homicide in Windsor, a police return is sent to the Center giving statistics and a very brief summary of the offence. Upon contacting the center again, I was informed that access to these returns could not be permitted.

A letter was then sent to the Windsor Court Administrator. (See Appendix C) A reply from the administrator revealed case transcripts could be purchased for 25 cents per page if the offender's and victim's names were known. Dispositions could be traced as well if the names of the victim and offender, as well as the date of the sentencing were known. In order to review an entire case containing three hundred pages of transcripts, a researcher would have to pay $75.00. Transcripts are not kept in any particular order; I was subsequently informed that finding a particular homicide case could take some time.

I proceeded to pay a visit to the Crown Attorney's Office to investigate the possibility of uncovering data there.

Having done volunteer work for the Crown Attorney's Office, gaining access to the files was not a problem. The files dated back to 1984. I was informed that after five years, the files
were sent to the National Archives. I found this to be quite amusing upon reviewing the reply that I received from the National Archives. Files are often taken out by a crown attorney and consequently, some are never returned.

This concludes my experiences in data collection. Having been permitted access to the police files, I expected the data collection process would be void of problems and difficulties. I am now aware of the difficulties in researching homicide, especially when using police files.

Once all reconstructions and data sheets had been completed, the data was prepared for analysis. The statistical data were first tabulated using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science). The frequencies were then placed into table form. (see Appendix B)

Reconstructions were then separated and coded according to the significant concepts studied such as the 'offenders' interpretation of the situation.

INTERPRETIVE INTERACTIONISM

Interpretive research has the following characteristics: (1) It is existential, interactional, and biographical; (2) it is naturalistic; (3) it is based on sophisticated rigor; (4) it can be both pure and applied; (5) it is postpositivist and builds on feminist critiques of positivism; (6) it is concerned with the social construction of gender, power, knowledge, history, and emotion. (Denzin, 1989:19)

As stated earlier, interpretive interactionism provides the
basic methodological framework for this study. Homicidal interactions, are 'epiphanies' as Denzin describes. Rather than emphasizing mundane, every-day interactions, interpretive interactionism focuses on epiphanies which are described as 'those interactional moments that leave marks on people's lives (which) have the potential for creating transformational experiences for the person'. (Denzin, 1989:15) Denzin goes on to explain that 'Having had this experience, the person is never again quite the same.' (Denzin. 1989:15)

There are six phases involved within the interpretive process. (Denzin. 1989: 48-65) The first involves a 'framing of the research question'. Within this study I ask 'How are homicide interactions constructed and given meaning to by its participants within Windsor?'. Second, 'deconstruction and critical analysis of prior conceptions of the phenomenon' are reviewed. This was accomplished within the Review of Literature and Theoretical Framework chapters of this study. Third, 'multiple instances of the phenomenon which are located within the natural world are located'. Police files, including document analysis, provide this study with multiple instances of homicidal interactions. Fourth, the phenomenon is 'bracketed'. By bracketing the phenomenon, the researcher is 'reducing it to its essential elements, and cutting it loose from the natural world so that its essential structures and features may be uncovered'. (Denzin. 1989:48) Within the current study, key concepts including various forms of interpretations were evolved without 'the influence of previous
literature. The concepts will be discussed in future chapters.

Fifth, construction takes place. While bracketing dissects the
phenomenon, construction, after investigating key concepts,
places the phenomenon back into a coherent whole. Lived
experience is thus re-created in terms of its key concepts and
elements. Finally, contextualization attempts to interpret
essential themes and structures and give them meaning by placing
them back in the natural social world. (Denzin, 1989:60)

Contextualization is evident within the remaining chapters of
this research.
CHAPTER V

AN INVESTIGATION INTO A VIOLENT SUBCULTURE

To fully explain and understand homicide, one must integrate a subcultural analysis with interactional analysis. While it is critical to understand that humans make decisions which alter interaction, it is just as critical to understand that they carry certain 'baggage' with them such as past epiphanies or historical experiences such as abuse.

Within the current discussion I will investigate the possibility of a subculture of violence as evident by certain important demographic variables.

In The Subculture of Violence, Wolfgang and Ferracuti stress the importance of integration within their explanation of criminal violence. (Wolfgang, 1967) Upon explaining the subculture of violence, they integrate biological, psychiatric, psychometric and sociological explanations.

The assembly of a large number of facts, consistent in content and collected in sophisticated detail from a variety of places, increases the probability of developing a theory that will bind the facts together into parsimonious abstraction. After a theory is formulated, the data are often re-examined in a style that is somewhat analogous to the procedure of the clinician who tries to capture in the life-history of his patient the meaningful and significant events that express the etiology of a current crisis. (Wolfgang, 1967: xxi)

Unfortunately, the methodology chosen within the current
study does not allow for an investigation into the psychological makes of the offenders. I can however investigate the social structural variables which seem to be recurrent within subcultural studies and other homicide studies as well. (Boyd, 1968; Felson and Steadman, 1983; Hepburn, 1973; Pokorny, 1965; Wolfgang, 1958)

In several instances (1958), (1964), (1967), Wolfgang reveals that offenders within the subculture of violence are generally young, black males, living within a lower social class.

I now turn to the demographical findings of this study to examine the possible existence of a subculture of violence.

Age

'Almost universally it can be asserted that the highest incidence of assaultive crimes such as homicide are found among young offenders, most of whom are in their late teens to early thirties.' (Wolfgang, 1967: 258) Within Windsor, young adults, ages 21 to 30, are most active (43.1%) as offenders within homicide. (Refer to Appendix B, Table 3) The average age of offenders was 31.01. With respect to age, offenders of homicide within Windsor fit well into the findings of Wolfgang and others. Wolfgang and Ferracuti explain

Because the young male is better equipped physically than the very young, the middle-aged, or the very old to manifest this form of masculinity; because the youthful male, once having learned this normative value, needs no special education to employ the agents of physical aggression (fists, feet, lithe agility); and because he seeks reinforcement from others for his ego, as do we all, and for his commitment to these values of violence, he comes to play games of conflict within his own subcultural value groups.
(Wolfgang. 1967: 259-260)

Wolfgang continues by explaining that homicides committed by the very young or very old are generally committed by the mentally ill.

**Gender**

As evident from the preceding quotation, males are far more likely to be members of a violent subculture than females. The Windsor findings reveal that almost nine in ten (89.7%) offenders are male. (Refer to Appendix B, Table 5)

Often lower class boys are socialized to use violence where necessary, whereas middle and upper class boys learn that violence is self defeating. In the lower class for example, boys are taught to protect their siblings and personal belongings, and if necessary to fight to do so. (Dietz. 1978) Males, especially within the lower class are also expected to 'save face', not get pushed around by anyone. Females are not socialized to learn these types of values as much as males.

The media, as well, often depicts the use of violence by males. How many times do we witness television programs where two males are fighting over a female? How often do we see females fighting within professional sports as compared to males? Too often, even in today's society, males are encouraged to use violence. Family, peer groups and media are all contributing factors for the male acceptance of violent values.
A basic premise within the Subculture of Violence theory as proposed by Wolfgang and Ferracutti is that violent values are learned within the lower classes much more so than any other class. (Wolfgang, 1958: 1964: 1967) Wolfgang and Ferracutti state when homicide is committed by members of the middle and upper social classes, there appears to be a high likelihood of major psychopathology or of planned, more 'rational' (or rationalized) behavior. Thus for them to commit an act of willful murder, which is in diametrical opposition to the set of values embraced by the dominant social-class establishment of which they are a part, often means that these persons are suffering severely from an emotional crisis of profound proportions. (Wolfgang, 1967: 262)

Within the current study, the files were rather limited in providing data which could be used to demarcate the different economic groups within Windsor. Income and level of education, two variables often associated within socioeconomic status (SES) or class analysis, were absent from the files. The only means of attaining this information was within the court transcripts: a document which was generally absent from the files. The only source of (SES) could be derived through occupational analysis. There is a section on the criminal record cards designated for occupation of the offender.

I used the classification scheme outlined by Pineo, Porter, and McRoberts for occupational analysis to ascertain SES. (Pineo, 1977) The classifications were kept the same while the names of the classifications were altered somewhat.

Of the 116 offenders, 108 were used for occupational analysis as no occupation could be found for 8 of the offenders. (Refer to Appendix B, Table 9) An astonishing 37% of the
offenders were unemployed when they committed the fatal act. Blue Collar workers accounted for 29.6% of all homicides. These two categories are both characterized as having low socioeconomic status and therefore representing the lower class of society. When combined, the two occupational categories account for 66.6% of all homicides. This figure (66.6%) is probably low or deflated. One could assume that the category of housewife and student/child may include lower SES offenders.

The west and east sections of the city, those with the highest incidence of low-income, contained the highest numbers of homicides. (Refer to Appendix B, Tables 13, 14, and 15) The reader is reminded however, that not all homicides occurred within the residence of acquainted offenders and victims making this finding somewhat questionable.

Clearly, offenders of homicide are over-represented within the lower class of our society, the highest percentage of whom are unemployed.

**Race**

Whenever a culture is heterogeneous, with a minority that is subservient, suppressed, or in some other manner superordinated by a ruling majority, the minority group is likely to be viewed as socially inferior and to have a high proportion of its members in the lower social and economic class. (Wolfgang, 1967:263)

Windsor however, cannot be classified as a racially heterogeneous culture. Race, therefore plays a minor role within the subcultural analysis.
Prior Record

The existence of prior violent offenses provides a further indicator for violent values.

The prior record of the offender provides the necessary information to determine if in fact the offender has had violent interactions before.

Almost half (46.1%) of the offenders in Windsor had prior violent offenses. (Refer to Appendix B, Table 23) Fourteen prior records could not be found. Criminal records are often expunged upon the death of the offender; therefore if the offender committed suicide, or died since committing the homicide, the record would be unavailable.

The categories were condensed to include 'no prior record', 'prior non-violent offenses', and 'prior violent offenses'. 'Prior violent offenses' includes crimes committed against the person such as assault, rape, attempted murder, robbery, and murder. 'Prior non-violent offenses' includes any offence other than crimes committed against the person.

It is important to remember that only if there was a charge laid would a prior offence be found on a record card. Several charges would have been dropped due to a lack of evidence.

The trends of age, gender, class and prior record all lead to the possibility of a subculture of violence. This discussion has not set out to 'prove' that a subculture exists but rather to investigate the possibility of such a phenomenon. Perhaps a future study will be conducted where Windsor's homicide offenders will individually be tested for violent values to further
compliment my hypothesis that a violent subculture does actually exist.

PAST LIFE EXPERIENCES CONducive to THE SOCIALIZATION OF VIOLENT VALUES

Within the files there were several instances where an offender, within an official statement, entered his/her past life experiences indicating either being the victim of abuse or the witness of abuse. These are the 'epiphanies' or dramatic life experiences which promote violent values and socialize individuals into a violent subculture.

Case # 170675

The trial revealed that Offender A was abused as a child quite frequently. His mother told the jury of an occasion when her son was only fourteen years of age, and her husband knocked him up against the wall and kept beating him while he was lying on the floor. It was also revealed that Offender A has had a bad drug problem for quite a few years, since he was first caught sniffing glue at the age of eleven.

This case will be discussed in greater detail within the next chapter. Offender A, who severely assaulted Victim A had experienced abuse as a child. His father often abused and beat him thus providing him with the necessary 'baggage' to act violently within certain situations. A child may learn and accept this violence as ordinary, everyday punishment; the value of violence thus becomes a learned response.
Case # 290180

Victim A was known by family members as a very violent man, especially when intoxicated. They stated that he often beat and abused all of the children at one time or another.

This prelude for case # 290180, which will be discussed within self-preservation interpretations of the situation, provides another instance were the offender experienced abuse at the hands of his father. All of the children within the family had either experienced or witnessed abuse at one time or another. Violence can become a learned response especially when it is exhibited frequently within the family setting where an individual grows up.

Case # 250272

Victim A had been known to police and his family as a very violent man. During the trial, all of his children admitted a story of some sort where they were abused or beaten by their father. Offender A was no exception. When she was 13, her father indecently assaulted her and was subsequently sent to jail. On another occasion, he put his daughter in the hospital for over a week.

Most of his reckless assaults occurred when he was intoxicated.

This provides yet another instance where the offender experienced violence as a child and thus was socialized to accommodate and accept the value of violence.

Often, individuals within a subculture of violence are those who, through experiences similar to the ones just described, learn and incorporate violent values at early stages of their lives. A individual may also be socialized to incorporate violent values later on in life as well.
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Case # 161175

Ex common-law husband and wife. Victim A and Offender A have had violent interactions in the past. He apparently has beaten her with a baseball bat, and she has apparently shot him in the arm before. Since their separation, Victim A has persistently threatened and bothered Offender A over the custody of their son.

Within this case, Offender A felt the only way to protect herself was through the use of violence. Resorting to violence would be made easier having experienced it frequently in the past.

These examples further provide evidence for a subculture of violence. Not all people who enter into violent situations commit homicide. If, however, someone has been socialized to accept and promote violence, they may interact in such a way as to kill!
CHAPTER VI

HOMICIDAL INTERACTIONS

Having established that individuals may enter into interactions carrying certain 'baggage', we now turn to an analysis of that interaction.

Recall that the self is composed of both self as process and self as object. Within the self as process, an individual alternates between the 'I' and the 'Me'. During the 'Me' stage, a definition of a situation is created by taking the role or roles of the other person(s) in the situation. The individual then judges the situation by taking the role of a generalized other and thus acts accordingly. The behaviors and expectations exhibited through these actions are influenced by socialization within violent subcultures. The generalized other contains expectations of violence.

By interacting with himself/herself in this fashion, the individual constructs interpretations of the situations which confront him/her. These interpretations, formed by offenders, are crucial for the understanding of homicidal interactions. While Athens discusses four major interpretations, the Windsor data will be better understood by generating new interpretations more suitable to the data. Athens work is recognized as the basis for this work, however, Canadian data should not be forced into the conceptual framework developed elsewhere. So while his categories
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are recognized and served as a guide, they were extended and modified to fit these data.

INTERPRETATION OF THE SITUATION

Resistant

The first interpretation to be discussed is resistant. A 'resistant' interpretation of the situation refers to a situation where the offender interprets the victim's actions as blocking or interfering with a specific course of action. Resistance may also come in the form of a 'lack of cooperation' on the part of the victim. The resistance is perceived by the offender as preventing or possibly preventing him/her from attaining his/her goal.

Case # 071277

Offender A entered the jewellery store wearing a blue ski jacket and a dark brown nylon mask over his face. Once in the store, he instructed the Victims to move to the rear of the store. Victim A was further instructed to get the cash box. While returning with the cash box, she apparently exclaimed 'It's a robbery'. The accused then panicked and fired six shots from the revolver he was carrying. One of the shots struck Victim A in the head, killing her instantly. Three of the shots struck Victim B leaving him lying on the ground. The other two bullets were found lodged in the wall.

By taking the role of the victim, the offender indicates to himself that the meaning of the victim's gesture. 'It's a robbery', resists his 'specific line of action' he seeks to carry out. (Athens, 1977) The yelling out of Victim A could inhibit the
The violent plan of action formed by the offender is the most appropriate means, in his mind, of dealing with the resistance offered by the victim.

Within a 'resistant' interpretation, the offender first defines the situation as resistant. Then, by the taking the role of the generalized other, he/she assesses the situation and forms a plan of action to counteract the resistance.

Case # 090585 (quotes taken from Windsor Star, March 19, 1986)

At approximately 9:30 p.m., the doorbell rang. When Mrs. A opened it, two men burst into the home throwing her against the stair railing. One man possessed a knife, the other, a .22 calibre rifle. After closing the door, the two men forced Mrs. A and her husband, Victim A into the den. They then asked them were the money was.

The Victim A told the two that they keep no money in the house. 'Offender A showed no anger, made no remarks in response. Swinging the rifle towards Victim A, six feet away, he pulled the trigger'. The gun misfired.

Offender A then pointed the gun at Mrs. A's head momentarily. Swinging the rifle back towards Victim A, he pulled the trigger again. This time, the crack of a shot filled the air. Mrs. A then tried to hit Offender A with a fireplace instrument. They struggled into the living room where Offender A overtook her and forced her onto the couch. Victim A followed the commotion to the living room. Offender A then turned 'oward him and fired two more shots into him.

'But even now Victim A did not fall, and Offender A's vicious nature flared. Walking over to the wounded man, he struck him once in the chest with the butt end of the rifle, then again in the face. Victim A collapsed on the floor.'

Mrs. A then made an attempt to use the phone to call for help, but Offender A tore it from the wall and then ordered her upstairs. Once in her bedroom, Offender A began looking for money. He came across a watch and stated 'What's this?' Mrs. A replied 'It's a watch not money'. Offender A then pointed the gun at her face and pulled the trigger.

'The bullet entered the inner corner of the right eye, struck the cone inside the eye socket and shattered, fragments going inward, others outward through the right temple.'

She fell to the floor still conscious.
The two accused then went downstairs to hunt for other valuables. Mrs. A., not hearing them anymore, raised herself and crawled to the bedroom doorway when she heard them coming again. She crawled back to her original position, all the while wiping up the trail of blood she left behind on the carpet.

Both men entered the room and stood above her. Offender A bent over and placed his hand over her nose and mouth to see if she was breathing. She, however, held her breath and fooled the two.

They left again. Mrs. A. crawled to the bedroom phone and dialed 911. The police came immediately.

Upon taking the role of the victim(s), the offender indicated to himself that the meaning of the victim(s) gesture 'We keep no money in the house', was un-cooperative with his specific line of action. The offender then took the role of the generalized other and indicated to himself that he ought to respond violently. He therefore shot Victim A. The offender's specific line of action was to obtain the victim's money without any interference or resistance and to subsequently escape. The victim's resistance to the attainment of the money meant that the direction of the act (robbery) was not proceeding along the lines the offender intended. A violent plan of action was thus followed.

The term audience, within this study, refers to any other person or persons present during the violent interaction other than the victim and the offender. The presence of an audience can have a significant impact upon homicidal interactions. (Hepburn, 1973)

In deciding how to react to the perceived threat to one's identity, the individual must find a compromise between his desires and the commitments to lines of action he is forced to make in accommodating the claims of alter and the audience. That is, he may be held accountable to, and claims may be placed upon him by, the audience. (Hepburn, 1973:425)
Hepburn further states, 'the role of the audience is illustrated by the fact that reported acts of violence are more likely to occur in the privacy of the home, where intervention is not as likely as on the streets or in the commercial establishments (bars, restaurants, retail stores, etc.)' (Hepburn, 1973: 426) In contrast to intervention, the audience may provide support for the offender and escalate the tensions already experienced by the offender.

Of all the various interpretations of the situations which will be discussed, none had a higher incidence of audiences than resistant interpretations. Multiple offenders were quite commonly found within resistant interpretations, as evidenced by the preceding case.

Upon committing robberies and other felony homicides, offenders seem to find comfort working with a companion. Dietz discusses how robberies are accomplished better by more than one person. (Dietz, 1983) In the first case discussed, the offender formulated a plan with a companion but carried it out alone. In the second case discussed, the offender formulated and carried out his plan with his companion.

Vengeant

Vengeance refers to the 'damage or harm done to another in retaliation for damage or harm to oneself or an associate'.
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(Webster's, 1988:1091) A 'vengeant' interpretation refers to a situation where the offender interprets the victims' gestures as either being physically harmful, or having been physically harmful to an associate. Gestures which are harmful to oneself will be discussed within 'self-preservation' interpretations of the situation. The key to a 'vengeance' interpretation is retaliation. The following case provides a clear example of a 'vengeant' interpretation of the situation.

Case #310384

. . . Once at his car, Mr. X drove through the parking lot towards Oullette when the two men blocked his path by standing in front of the car. He left his car, and proceeded back into the tavern to get his brother, Mr. Z. The brothers came out of the tavern and were confronted by the two men, one of whom was Victim A. Pushing and shoving started and then punches were thrown. Sometime during the confrontation, Mr. Z was stabbed by Victim A. Mr. X, who observed the stabbing, knocked his opponent to the ground. Victim A then ran into the tavern, with the two brothers giving chase. The brothers were met at the door by their cousin Offender A, who was on his way out at the time.

Mr. X told Offender A what had happened and that the guy was somewhere in the bar. Victim A was eventually caught and being held by some bar patrons. Offender A approached him, pulled out a pocket knife and stabbed him in the chest.

Upon learning of the harm inflicted upon his associate by the victim, the offender, by taking the role of the generalized other, formed a plan of action for killing.

Often the relationship between an offender and his/her associate is valued very highly by the offender. There can be a silent agreement between them stating that whenever one is harmed or attacked, the other always defends or retaliates for him/her. A premise of the subculture of violence is that the expectation of an associate is to retaliate and to assault co-operatively.
This is the case within the above interpretation of the situation. The retaliation factor may be magnified if the associate is a blood relative.

The presence of an audience is not a necessary characteristic, but is very common within vengeant interpretations of the situation. It is generally an attack upon an intimate that the offender is avenging. Within the preceding case, Offender A was retaliating due to the stabbing of his cousin by Victim A.

**Vexation**

According to Webster's Dictionary, to vex is 'to annoy (someone)'. (Webster's, 1988: 1095) A 'vexed' interpretation refers to a situation where the offender, upon taking the role of the victim, indicates to himself/herself that the meaning of the victim's gestures is to annoy and vex. The offender then makes further self-indications and interprets the victim as being evil. Finally, by taking the role of the generalized other, a violent plan of action is formed. An expectation indicated to the offender by the generalized other is that violence would best solve the annoying stimulus. Many offenders, within vexation interpretations of the situation, were abused themselves and hence see violence as the normal response when they are vexed. The following case provides an instance of a 'vexed' interpretation of the situation.
Case #201179

On the evening of the homicide, at approximately 10:00 p.m., Ms. T left to go out to purchase a painting for the living room. When she left, the children were fussing but were quite alright. She left Offender A in charge to make sure that the children were put to bed. When she returned, at approximately 10:30 p.m., the children were asleep. When she attempted to go and change Victim A's diapers, Offender A told her not to bother that she would only wake the child and he would start to fuss again. She therefore left the child alone.

The next morning when Ms. T awoke, Offender A had gone next door to help a friend fix a car, so she proceeded to the bedroom to wake Victim A. At this time, she found him dead. The child was lying on the floor against the radiator with part of his head crushed. The child was cold and stiff. He was fully clothed and there was a small amount of blood coming from the child's mouth and nose. There were also certain areas of the skin that had started to turn purple, indicating that the child had been dead for some time.

Ms. T called an ambulance immediately. Offender A was later taken to headquarters where he confessed to killing the child. He stated, 'I loved the kid. I didn't mean to do it. I am sorry...' '...he would not stop fussing.' He also stated 'I didn't mean to do it. I just hit the kid and his head hit the radiator and then I panicked.'

This is a typical case where the victim's persistent fussing and crying annoyed the offender to the point where violent action was taken to try to reduce the annoyance. The persistent crying of a baby, the constant soiling of diapers, or the refusal to eat provides a stimulus to start an act. Upon taking the role of the victim, the offender defines the situation as a personally offensive gesture by the victim. The offender interprets the situation as a personal attack upon himself/herself. After taking the role of the generalized other, the offender indicates to himself/herself that he/she ought to respond violently. In the above case, the offender hit the child who then hit his head on the radiator. The annoyance, or vex, once taken personally.
creates rage in the offender who begins an assault with the intent of stopping the annoying behavior.

There was no audience present within any of the vexed interpretations of the situation. If an audience, in this case, would have been present, the offender may not take the annoying gestures as a personal attack.

Humiliating

Humiliation, as a general term refers to making a person suffer by 'lessening his dignity or self esteem'. (Webster, 1988:472) Humiliating situations are among the most common in which offenders feel the need to injure or kill. It is within a humiliation interpretation of the situation in which 'saving-face' occurs.

Humiliating interpretations of the situation are very similar to Athens' 'malefic' interpretations.

Malefic interpretations are formed in a three-step process. First, by taking the role of the victim, the actor implicitly or explicitly indicates to himself that the meaning of the victim's gestures is that he is deriding or badly belittling the actor. Secondly, by taking the role of a generalized other, the actor implicitly or explicitly indicates to himself that the victim is an extremely evil or malicious person. Finally, by making further self indications from the role of the generalized other, the actor implicitly or explicitly indicates to himself a violent plan of action. (Athens, 1977: 61)

The humiliation interpretation, however, may be associated with another interpretation as well.
Resistant-Humiliation

A resistant-humiliation interpretation is very similar to Athens' 'frustrative-malefic'. Within a resistant-humiliation interpretation of the situation, the offenders' self-esteem is lessened due to the resistance he/she experiences during a specific line of action.

Case #310580

Offender A became extremely upset on the evening before the homicide. He was mad that his gold had been hocked and the drugs were late resulting in the loss of his gold. He felt that Victim A and Mr. L were cutting him out of the deal with a made up story about the delaying of the marijuana.

Victim A, after proposing to his girlfriend Miss D, went to his friends'. Mr. L at 11:00 p.m., the evening before the homicide, to celebrate. Mr. L's wife and their boarder were also present in the house at this time.

Sometime between 12:30 and 1:00 a.m., Offender A came over, very upset. He was extremely high on delude and alcohol. He entered and yelled, 'You think I'm a goof, you're not going to beat me.' He then turned to Mr. L and stated that he wanted his money. After calming down somewhat, he left.

He then apparently went to a friend's house where he got a gun. He then went back to Mr. L's house about fifteen minutes later.

At the time Offender A entered, Mr. L was facing Victim A with his back to Offender A. Victim A stood up and was shot immediately by Offender A. While Victim A was falling, he was shot again. Mr. L then turned around and saw Offender A holding the .38 calibre revolver. Offender A then stated 'You think I'm an asshole'. He proceeded to shoot Mr. L in the stomach. After falling to the floor, he shot him in the stomach again. Offender A then left the premises.

Police and ambulance were called. Victim A subsequently died at 4:15 that morning. Mr. L, however, survived.

In the preceding case, the offender interpreted a 'resistant-humiliation' interpretation of the situation. The offender was humiliated because he did not receive his gold 'collateral' for the drugs. He felt that the victim and his friend were trying to cut him out of his gold. Therefore, since
the victim and his associate blocked or resisted the offenders return of gold. he felt humiliated and used and thus, after taking the role of the generalized other, formed a plan to kill. It is important to note that resistance always recedes the humiliation within this form of interpretation.

Audiences were frequently present within resistant-humiliation interpretations. The presence of the audience would intensify the humiliation suffered by the offender. Within the above case, the presence of the audience meant that not only the victim would know of the resistant gestures, but several others would witness them as well. The offender interpreted that several people saw the victim make the offender appear as an 'asshole' and a 'goof'.

Sexual-Humiliation

Several cases contained a 'sexual-humiliation' interpretation of the situation. Within this situation, the offender's self-esteem is lessened by the sexual gestures of the victim.

Case #170675

On the day before the homicide, Offender A and Offender B hitched to Windsor. Upon arrival, they located Victim A and stayed and partied the night with him. The next day, Victim A took the two on a tour of Windsor; they also bought some angel dust, got high and drank a large quantity of booze. All three became very high and intoxicated.

At one point, Victim A who was hot, went into the bedroom to change. While there he called for Offender A to come into the room. Once there, Victim A apparently grabbed Offender A 'by the crotch'. Offender A suddenly smashed the wine bottle he had in his hand over Victim A's head. He then began a vicious assault on him, punching and kicking as hard as he possibly could.

Offender B tried to pull Offender A off of the victim but
was unsuccessful. Offender B then joined in on the assault.

The offender interpreted the victim's action as a homosexual advance which he perceived as an insult to his heterosexual masculinity.

By taking the role of the victim, the offender indicates to himself that the meaning of the victim's sexual gesture is to belittle. The offender thus judges the victim to be extremely evil. Through further self indications from the role of the generalized other, the offender forms a violent plan of action.

This case also reveals that 'face-saving' can occur outside of the public domain. With just the offender and the victim in the bedroom at the time of the victim's advancement, the offender's identity was damaged with no one else present.

Jealous-Humiliation

Jealousy may be defined as 'a state of fear, suspicion or envy caused by a real or imagined threat or challenge to one's possessive instincts'. (Webster's. 1988: 522) A jealous-humiliation interpretation of the situation occurs when the offender's self-esteem is lessened by gestures from the victim which evoke jealousy. Case 060482 provides an example of a jealous-humiliation interpretation of the situation.

Case #060482

Between the hours of 3:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., the three men consumed approximately 40 beer. Mrs. W had four or five bottles. Shortly after 10:00 p.m., Mrs. W complained that she wasn't feeling well and proceeded to the second floor bedroom to lie down. About fifteen minutes after she left the basement, Victim A got up to go to the washroom and informed the other two that he would be right back.

After waiting a considerable amount of time, Offender A
became suspicious and got up to see where Victim A had gone. Offender B followed closely behind.

Upon opening the bedroom door, Offender A found Victim A in bed with his wife, partially undressed and fondling her. Mrs. W and Victim A allegedly created a plan to meet in the bedroom to have sex.

Offender A immediately rushed the bed and knocked Victim A to the floor. While on the floor, Offender A repeatedly kicked and punched the victim. Offender B initially tried to stop Offender A, but after failing to do so, he joined in on the vicious assault. They both kept punching and kicking Victim A; a large amount of blood became apparent on his face.

Following this initial assault, Victim A managed to crawl out of the bedroom and onto the stairway landing where he fell down the stairs to the main floor.

The offenders followed him and began to assault him again. After seeing he was motionless, the two accused then dragged the victim outside into the snow and told him to leave at once. Victim A was still partially clothed.

Approximately a half hour later, the offenders looked out and noticed that the victim was still lying in the same location that they had left him. Upon realizing that he was dead, the two brought the body back into the house. They proceeded to drag him out to the back yard and left the body lying in the garbage bin.

Upon discovering his friend in bed with his wife, Offender A became the victim of intense jealousy and thus, humiliation; the woman he married was having sex with his friend behind his back in his own bedroom. This was a real threat to the offenders' role as husband.

Upon taking the role of the victim, the offender indicates to himself that the meaning of the victims' gestures (having sex with the offenders' wife) is that he is deriding or belittling the offender. Since the belittling comes in the form of a challenge to the offenders' possessiveness, we term this interpretation 'jealous-humiliation'.

The presence of an audience is critical within the jealous-humiliation interpretation of the situation. The finding of his
wife in bed with his friend created the entire situation calling for a violent plan of action in the above case.

Disparage-Humiliation

The preceding three forms of 'humiliation' interpretations occur in situations in which the circumstances are quite unique. The gestures made by the victim which are offensive to the offender all contained 'physical' characteristics, where no verbal assault was needed to trigger a violent plan of action. The with-holding of an object, a physically sexual advancement, or the discovering of one's wife in bed with a friend are examples of 'physical' gestures. 'Disparage-humiliation' occurs as a result of a verbal assault upon the offender by the victim. Disparage refers to 'talking to the detriment of (a person)'. (Webster's. 1988: 272) The researcher used this label because it can include a variety of situations were the offender was belittled in some way by the victim verbally. The following case provides an example of a 'disparage-humiliation' interpretation of the situation.

Case #220688

Offender A and his girlfriend had split; consequently, he had been on a week long drinking binge. On the evening before the homicide, he was at the Detroit Tavern drinking with his friend Victim A. During conversation at the tavern, Victim A apparently called Offender A's old girlfriend a 'lesbian'. This upset Offender A immensely. At approximately 11:00 p.m., the two left the tavern and went to the victim's home which is approximately one half block north of the tavern.

Around midnight, the accused attacked the victim just outside of the back door on the sidewalk leading up to the back door.

The offender struck the victim numerous times on the head and abdomen with a heavy stick-like rod. He then proceeded to
stab the victim as well. Offender A proceeded to get into the car and back out of the driveway. . . .

. . . . Police placed an undercover officer in the jail cell with the accused. Eventually the officer was able to get the accused to talk of his offence. He revealed the incident where the victim called his ex-girlfriend a lesbian making him extremely upset. He then admitted to the beating and stabbing of Victim A.

Within this situation, the victim derided the offender's ex-girlfriend and in the process humiliated and belittled the offender himself. Upon taking the role of the victim, the offender interpreted the verbal gestures about the offenders' ex-girlfriend as belittling or disparaging. Even though they were 'friends', the offender made further indications to himself that the victim was an evil person. Finally, by taking the role of the generalized other, the offender indicated to himself that a violent plan of action was necessary. He thus beat and stabbed the victim.

In a similar case involving friends, the offender admitted in court to killing his victim because the victim made crude remarks about the offender's girlfriend after seeing a picture of her. Again, the offender interprets the victim's deriding remarks about his girlfriend as a personal attack upon himself. The humiliation transferred to rage upon the interpretation, and the offender subsequently shot the victim in the head.

While there was no audience within the above case, the presence of an audience within disparage-humiliation often intensifies the meaning of the gestures interpreted by the offender.
Altruistic

An 'altruistic' interpretation occurs within a situation where the offender attempts to alleviate any form of discomfort affecting the victim. The discomfort may include financial difficulties, physical disabilities, or any other phenomenon the offender sees as harmful or discomforting to the victim.

Case #130579

Victim A had a stroke approximately fourteen weeks before the homicidal incident. She had subsequently been in and out of hospital ever since.

On the day of the homicide, the offender and victim's son decided to stop by his parent's residence later on that day on his way to work. After unlocking the back door, he entered the premises and saw his mother lying on the couch. She was cold to the touch and had no pulse. He proceeded to the bedroom where he found his father lying on the bed. He immediately called police and ambulance.

On the coffee table, a note was found which read the following. 'Goodbye. sorry this had to be but I could not stand Victim A suffering any longer. Everything is in order in Victim A's bedroom. Please forgive me. Offender A'.

Several chemicals and pills were found in the house lying out in the open as well. A post mortem revealed that both the offender and victim died of chemical poisoning. Offender A had apparently poisoned his suffering wife and then poisoned himself.

By taking the role of victim, the offender indicates to himself that the meaning of the victims' gestures (physical suffering) is that the victim is unhappy and discontent with the suffering she is experiencing. Then, upon taking the role of the generalized other, the offender indicates to himself that the victim would be better off if she were no longer living. He therefore responds with a violent plan of action.
The offender could no longer stand to see his wife suffering. Rather than see her living in such a state, he felt she would be better off dead.

Since altruistic interpretations generally involve a plan by the offender, there rarely is an audience present. The offender would not want to risk having his/her plan foiled by the intrusion of others. He/She would therefore would commit the violent act in private.

**Self-Preservation**

A self-preservation interpretation is based upon Athens' 'physically defensive' interpretation of the situation.

There are two essential steps in the formation of physically defensive interpretations of the situation. First, by taking the role of the victim, the actor implicitly or explicitly indicates to himself that the meaning of the victim's gestures is either (1) that the victim will very shortly physically attack him or an intimate such as a spouse or a child, or (2) that the victim is already physically attacking him or an intimate. Secondly, by taking the role of the generalized other, the actor then implicitly or explicitly indicates to himself that he ought to respond violently toward the victim and calls out within himself a violent plan of action. (Athens, 1977: 59)

The following case gives an instance where the offender felt his life was in danger.

**Case #290180**

On the afternoon of the homicide, Victim A had started drinking at about 4:00 p.m. Offender A, along with two sisters were next door painting a duplex when Victim A yelled over for Offender A to come to the house at 9:00 p.m. Victim A then asked his son for a phone number he had apparently given him concerning a girlfriend of Victim A's. Offender A said that he did not have the number when his father ordered him to give it. The father
then told his older son J to go upstairs and get a belt so that Offender A could be taught a lesson. Victim A proceeded to beat his son with the belt about the arms and back.

Victim A then ordered Offender A to go upstairs and get the phone number or he would receive another beating. The son proceeded upstairs to his father's room, grabbed a rifle and loaded it with one live round. He then proceeded to the attic where he tried to secure the entrance by wedging the rifle against the attic entrance cover.

Meanwhile, downstairs, J was ordered by his father to bring his brother downstairs so he could receive another beating. J could not get the attic cover open and hence, Victim A proceeded to the attic entrance where he tried to force the cover open. He finally succeeded in opening the cover and proceeded to enter the attic. While half of his body was in the attic, Offender A fired the rifle and shot his father in the chest killing him instantly.

Offender A indicated to himself that the meaning of Victim A's gestures was that very shortly he would receive another beating. Offender A thus proceeded upstairs, obtained a gun and hid in the attic. The initial beating, the threat of another beating, and the attempt to get into the attic were the gestures made by the victim that the offender designated to himself as foreshadowing a physical attack. Upon taking the role of the generalized other, the victim indicated to himself that he ought to respond violently. Once his father entered the attic, Offender A responded by shooting his father in the chest.

Case # 161175

At approximately 1:45 p.m. on the day of the killing, Offender A received a phone call from Victim A. He threatened her with bodily harm at one point in the conversation. He arrived at her residence shortly afterwards. At that time, Mrs. Y and Mrs. S were visiting Offender A. Victim A forced his way into the house after Offender A refused to open the door. As Offender A scrambled to get her son, a struggle ensued between Victim A and Mrs. Y after Victim A exclaimed, 'You fuckin cunt, mind your own business'. Meanwhile, Offender A and her son ran upstairs to her bedroom, she grabbed a gun, loaded it, and waited in the doorway of her bedroom facing the hall towards the stairs.

Victim A began running up the stairs. Offender A warned him to stop, but he kept marching towards her. Once in sight, she
shot him in the midsection. After he fell, she closed the bedroom door and called the police.

Within this case, the threatening phone call, and the physical presence of Victim A in the hallway were gestures which the offender designated to herself as foreshadowing a physical attack.

In both of the preceding cases, the offenders felt that the only way to avoid a physical attack, was to attack first. An offender's act of violence is victim precipitated when he/she forms a self-preservation interpretation of the situation. (Athens, 1977)

Self-preservation interpretations are generally the result of on-going abuse where there is no audience. Most self-preservation interpretations within the Windsor data lacked an audience.

The preceding interpretations of situations are not mutually exclusive nor exhaustive. I believe that other interpretations exist within homicidal interactions. The interpretations discussed above, however, form the interpretations found within the Windsor data. This research deviates from Athens' four basic interpretations because they could not adequately describe interpretations such as 'vengeant', 'vexation' and 'altruistic'. I also wished to create new terminology which could be adapted to the Windsor data.

Interpretation of the situation provides the necessary conceptualization and framework upon which the remainder of this
chapter is based.

THE INTERPLAY OF ROLES AND THE
INTERPRETATION OF THE SITUATION

Recall that role is 'a perspective from which conduct is constructed'. (Hewitt, 1991: 95) While no one role can contain a concrete list of attributes, expectations evolve within a role over a certain period of time.

If one were to carefully review the previous discussion of interpretation of the situation, a pattern emerges with respect to the roles the victim and the offender were playing at the time of the fatal interaction.

Various roles such as lover, friend or stranger contain different levels of intimacy and different expectations. These various roles can influence the interpretation formed by the offender and hence influence the interaction.

The relationship between the victim and the offender is an important variable in studies of personal violence because it places the event within the context of social structures. Roles such as husband, wife, friend, lover, and stranger are complex social relationships which may delineate homicides that share a distinctive etiology. Furthermore, the moral and legal responses to violence are, to a large extent, determined by the social roles of the victim and offender. (Loftin et al., 1987:259)

I turn now to a discussion including the various interpretations and the patterns found with respect to the roles of the victim and the offender, at the time of the interpretations.
An obvious pattern within resistant interpretations included the incidence of the victim and offender being strangers. While other roles may be played at the same time, the role of stranger had important implications for several of the homicides committed during a 'resistant' interpretation.

Recall from the previous discussion the case of the offender who attempted to rob the jewellery store. While the victims were working at the time, their role of stranger carries a great deal of importance for the offender.

First, the offender's specific line of action was to successfully rob the jewellery store; this would include not being apprehended following the act. The offender, therefore, robbed strangers who would not recognize or know him. It makes better sense to rob strangers rather than someone who might know and recognize you; the chances of being apprehended are reduced. Had the offender known the owners of the jewellery store, he may have decided his chances of apprehension would be increased and therefore chosen another route.

Another implication for cases such as this is that an offender may find it easier to rob and perhaps kill a stranger rather than someone known to him/her. An offender will have an easier time planning the death of a stranger rather than the death of one he/she may rely on or care about as in the case of a spouse or friend.

Finally, the stranger role also means that there is no past experience for either person on which to predict the others
actions or responses.

The very fact of being unknown as a stranger can carry important implications for violent interactions often found within a 'resistant' interpretation of the situation. I wish to emphasize that other factors are taken into consideration as well when an offender forms a specific line of action. However, the fact of implementing a plan surrounding a stranger obviously makes more sense to an offender as evident by the number of 'resistant' interpretations involving strangers.

Within a vengeant interpretation, the importance of role does not lie between the offender and the victim as with the other interpretations, but rather between the offender and the intimate he/she is retaliating for. There has to be a strong relationship between the offender and the intimate he/she is defending. Often blood relatives, lovers or close friends have a strong enough bond where the offender would kill to avenge harm done to that intimate.

Homicides committed within a vexed interpretation were almost entirely committed by parents or guardians upon young children or infants. Recall that stimuli such as crying, the soiling of diapers and the refusal to eat were interpreted by the offender as annoying gestures which required a violent plan of action.

Infants or young children have yet to be socialized into various roles. The role of father, mother or guardian however, contains several expectations. Basic expectations include
providing, nurturing and caring for their children.

In the process of answering to these expectations, fathers and mothers are often subjected to continual gestures such as those listed above. The gestures may be taken as a personal attack by the infant. The infant or young child is thus seen as evil or malicious by the parent or guardian due to the continual annoyance. The father or mother make further indications to himself/herself and decides that a violent plan of action is necessary to alleviate the vexation.

Homicides committed within a humiliating interpretation of the situation frequently occurred amongst intimates including such roles as friends, family and lovers.

When reflecting upon the intimacy of the relationship, this pattern makes much sense. Friends are often quite dependent upon one another, they count on each other for companionship and support. When a friend belittles, derides, or humiliates another friend, the impact is much greater than if the humiliation came from a stranger. We don't expect to be humiliated by those who are closest to us; therefore, when it does occur, it carries much more meaning and emotion for the offender.

Case# 130377

Offender A was released from penitentiary recently and was on parole. He was doing time for attempted murder and robbery. His relationship with his wife had been quite shaky since his release. She had apparently left him twice since his release. When she returned, on both occasions she was threatened by him that if she did it again, he would kill her.

At one point, Offender A discovered his wife nude in a closet in Mr. L's bedroom one morning, several days before she was killed.

On the morning of the homicide, Victim A and Offender A
began arguing, apparently over the promiscuity by Victim A and her affair with Mr. L. The intensity of the argument increased and while in the bathroom, Offender A grabbed a gun which was in the house and shot his wife in the head.

Within this case of jealous-humiliation, the painful reminder of his wife having sex with another man proved to be a fatal gesture by the victim. Upon taking the role of the victim, the offender indicated to himself that the meaning of the painful reminder is that she was belittling and hence lessening his self-esteem. He further indicated to himself that she was evil and that he ought to respond with a violent plan of action.

Expectations often associated with the role of a spouse include loyalty and faithfulness; marriages are often built upon expectations such as these. When a member of a marriage becomes promiscuous however, the loyal and faithful partner can become devastated: this partner feels betrayed as well as humiliated. 'How could he/she do this to me?'. they often ask. The belittling gesture of being promiscuous humiliates the offender who feels a violent plan of action is necessary to stop the belittling of the evil victim.

Homicides committed within an altruistic interpretation of the situation were committed solely amongst spouses. An expectation of a spouse may include the providing for and care of the other. The traditional breadwinner for example, was to keep his/her family as comfortable as possible.

If however, one spouse became uncomfortable or was suffering for some reason, the other spouse may feel that it is his/her
responsibility to correct the situation. Upon seeing the discontent through the victim's gestures, an offender may indicate to himself/herself that a violent plan of action is necessary in order to alleviate the discomfort.

Self-preservation interpretations were commonly found amongst roles such as lovers and those associated with the family including father, son, daughter. It is within these situations that abuse is most conducive.

Case # 251272

On the particular day of the offence, Offender A and her father had been arguing for some time; both had been drinking as well. At approximately 2:00 a.m., Offender A informed her father that she was leaving. He, however, had different intentions, and forced her to stay by blocking the doorway. He then forced her into the bedroom where a violent struggle began.

Victim A, eventually overpowering his daughter, began an indecent assault upon her. A short time later, he allowed her to get away and she proceeded to the kitchen. Again, he blocked the doorway to the only exit out of the house and forced her to stay with him. The two started arguing once more, and Victim A started towards Offender A who was standing against the kitchen sink. As he approached, he kept telling her he was going to kill her. In self defence, Offender A grabbed a knife which was in the sink and pushed it into the victim's heart as he lunged at her.

Offender A immediately ran to the neighbors house where she phoned the police and ambulance.

Within this case, the victim was known to be abusive not only to his daughter but to other members of the family as well. The offender had been abused both physically and sexually in the past. The verbal pronouncement and the physical lunging were the gestures interpreted by the offender as requiring a violent plan of action.

Physical abuse generally occurs within a home environment. Co-workers, acquaintances or strangers generally do not routinely
abuse one another. A physically disciplining father or a physically abusive husband generally do their disciplining or battering within the home. It is therefore within the home we generally associate roles such as husband, wife, father, son and daughter.

The focus of this discussion was not roles per se, but rather patterns which were uncovered between roles and the various interpretations of the situation. While roles are abstract perspectives which vary according to interaction, the roles discussed here, including husband, wife, friend, father, etc., are unique and do interplay with the various interpretations of the situations formed by the offender.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SITUATION AND
THE DYNAMICS OF INTERACTION

As stated in the review of the literature, several researchers in the past have attempted to explain homicidal interactions through processual stages. (Dietz, 1983; Felson and Steadman, 1983; Hepburn, 1973; Luckenbill, 1977) It is my opinion that the most appropriate and fitting set of stages for the Windsor data are those proposed by Dietz. Her discussion of both social conflict homicide and felony homicide allow for the most appropriate incorporation of the various interpretations of the situation.

Dietz' stages of social and felony homicide appear as
follows.

SOCIAL HOMICIDE
Initiating Confrontation
Decision Negotiation
Action
Control

FELONY HOMICIDE
Planning Decision
Confrontation
Victim Response
Action
Escape
PostCrime Activities

Dietz states that the major difference between the two types of homicide is as follows. 'The violent criminal act usually begins before the targets are present, while the interpersonal violence encounter begins with both parties or groups present at the initiation and decision-making stages'. (Dietz, 1983:33)

A resistant interpretation of the situation will almost always be found within felony homicides. A plan or specific line of action is always present. The offender may plan to eliminate the victim immediately, or let the interaction decide the fate of the victim.

Within a robbery for instance, the offender's main goal is not to kill but to gain; if a killing is required to fulfill the main goal, then he/she might do so, often depending upon the actions of the victim.

In some robbery cases the intent is to rob, and killing is the result of a defensive reaction to the specific situation. In other cases, the intent exists both to rob and to kill. (Dietz, 1983:46)

The following case reveals an instance where the offender
meant to injure or eliminate the victim immediately. It also clearly outlines all of the stages suggested by Dietz within felony homicide.

**Case #191171**

Victim A was the owner of a hotel in Windsor. He was in the habit of bringing the money made at the hotel to his home every evening.

Offender A and Mr. T had been friends for some time and enjoyed drinking and partying together. Being unemployed, Offender A had been 'hungry' to make some money any way he could. He had been talking to his friend Mr. Z prior to the homicidal incident, when Mr. Z gave Offender A an idea to make some quick money.

Mr. Z is known to be a 'clever criminal' and used to work for Victim A at the hotel. At one time, Mr. Z was arrested while waiting for Victim A to return home from the hotel one evening. He wanted to steal the money that the victim so often brought home from work at nights. This was the same plan that was suggested to Offender A.

Offender A liked this idea; he therefore conspired with Mr. T to try the plan themselves. One evening, Offender A and Mr. T were drinking and decided that it was a good time for their plan to steal Victim A's money. Mr. T however backed out when it was time to move on it.

Offender A therefore proceeded to the victim's home alone. He waited for Victim A to get out of the car with the money bag. Offender A then ran up behind Victim A and hit him in the back of the head with a hammer. He then hit him again in the forehead, dropping the victim to the ground. The offender then grabbed the bag and fled the scene by foot.

The initial stage, planning decision is clearly evident when Offender A learns of the possible monetary gain by robbing Victim A. Confrontation occurs once Victim A exits his car and Offender A attacks him. There is no victim response stage within this case. The offender had included the immediate elimination of the victim within his plan.

Recalling the case of Offender A, who attempted to rob the jewellery store in the earlier discussion of resistance
interpretations provides an instance of the victim response. The victim responded with 'It's a robbery'. This lead to the offender indicating to himself that a violent plan of action was necessary. He therefore killed her.

Within the above case, the action stage involved the offender striking the victim in the head with a hammer and taking the bag of money. The offender fled by foot, an indication of the fifth stage of felony homicide, escape. There was no evidence of post-crime activities within this case, however, the researcher feels the offender probably proceeded to some safe unknown location.

When an offender does not intend to eliminate the victim immediately, it is within the victim response stage that he/she interprets the situation which decides the fate of the victim.

Social homicides generally occur within vengeant, vexed, humiliating, altruistic or self-preservation interpretations of the situation. The following case contains the four stages of social homicide as outlined by Dietz.

Case # 021172

At approximately 3:30 a.m. on the night of the homicide, Victim A from Detroit, and Offender A, who had been arguing for sometime, raised their voices once again. Offender A, who was known to carry a gun around was a very possessive, 'take no shit' kind of a guy. He persisted in putting Victim A down.

Victim A jumped up from the dining room table and threw his chair aside. He stated he was going to the washroom. Once near Offender A however, he made a lunge towards him. Offender A in turn pulled out his gun and shot Victim A twice. After he fell to the floor, Offender A shot again to make sure he was dead.

The house in which this incident occurred was well known as a house where drug deals were made. This appeared to be the only purpose of the house.

Mr. Y was also in the house at the time of the shooting. He
went to get a blanket to wrap Victim A's body up in while Offender A went through the victim's wallet. The two proceeded to roll the body up in the blanket. Offender A then drove Victim A's car to the back of the house were they loaded the body into the back seat.

Offender A said they would burn the car with the victim in it. Mr. Y however, came back into the house to tell Offender A that it was raining very hard outside.

They therefore drove the car out to Maidstone and parked it in a field. The two then brought the victim's body out of the car and started to beat the face in with the jack from the car. They proceeded to search the car for any valuables or drugs and then threw the body back into the back seat.

Offender A fled to Montreal to Miami to Jamaica and back to Miami.

The owner of the field were the car was abandoned notified the police of the car and body found on his property.

In court, it was revealed that there were seven people in the house that night. Offender A apparently called Victim A a 'damn Yankee' and Victim A called Offender A a 'nigger punk', just prior to the shooting.

The initiating confrontation occurred when the victim and the offender exchanges insults; Offender A called Victim A a 'damn Yankee', and Victim A called Offender A a 'nigger punk'. While the two had been in one another's company previous to the violent interaction, the insults proved to be the point at which a confrontation started. Decision negotiation occurs for both the victim and the offender. The victim decided that the offender's insults required action and therefore he lunged at the offender. The offender then decided that his physical well being was in jeopardy. He thus reacted in a violent manner.

Within the action stage, the victim lunges towards the offender who reacts by drawing a gun and firing at the victim. It is just prior to the action stage where the offender interprets the situation and calls for a violent plan of action. In the above case, a self-preservation interpretation of the situation
was formed.

Within the control stage, the offender generally opts for one of three ultimatums. The offender will either flee the scene, remain at the scene and take responsibility for the homicide, or be involuntarily held for the police by members of the audience. (Luckenbill, 1977) Within the above case, the offender attempted to conceal the victim and then subsequently fled the scene.

The interpretation of the situation is a critical element in understanding the interaction between the offender and the victim. Upon taking the role of the victim, the offender interprets the gestures of the victim. By further taking the role of the generalized other, a violent plan of action is often called upon. One must account for the roles being played by the participants at the time of the fatal interaction as well. A distinctive interpretation is also found within the dynamics and processual developments of the interactions.

All of the homicides within this study fall into one of the interpretations of the situation discussed within this chapter. As stated earlier, the offender's interpretation of the situation provides the pivotal point within homicidal interactions. Upon interpreting the gestures of the victim in a form discussed previously, the offender indicates to himself/herself that violence is required.

All homicidal interactions found within this study contained certain processual developments or stages. The majority of these interactions contained those developments outlined by Dietz.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The task now at hand is to reflect upon what has been discussed so far and to further discuss the value of the explanatory schemes used within this research.

From the introduction to this point of the research, I have attempted to explain, in the manner most appropriate, the phenomenon of homicide within the city of Windsor. No other individual, to my knowledge, has researched or attempted to explain homicide within the city.

In doing the research, I felt the most relevant methodological perspective was interpretive interactionism including the use of document analysis. Interpretive interactionism allowed for interpretations to be made of the offenders actions during the violent interactions. Using multiple documents for each case reduced the possibility of attaining a biased account for case reconstruction. I have hopefully made 'the world of problematic lived experience of ordinary people directly available to the reader'.

The review of the literature was divided into studies containing the analysis of hard data such as Boyd and the analysis of homicidal interactions such as Luckenbill. This strategy for a review of literature was established in order to
compliment the theoretical framework. The studies containing hard data assisted in the explanation of the Subculture of Violence theory. The majority of these studies revealed that the offender was a young male who came from the lower class. (Boyd, 1980; Silverman and Kennedy, 1987; Statistics Canada, 1976:) Studies containing an analysis of the victim-offender interaction revealed stages of interaction as well as concepts such as retaliation and the role of the audience. (Dietz, 1983; Hepbu n. 1973; Luckenbill, 1977)

Theoretically, I am convinced that in order to explain violent crimes such as homicide within Windsor, an integration of Symbolic Interactionism and the Subculture of Violence theories are needed.

Understanding the interaction between the victim and the offender is extremely important. Understanding the offender's definition and judgement of the situation is an essential key to understanding homicide.

Just as important, however, is realizing that the offender comes to the homicidal scene carrying certain 'baggage' or life history experiences including having been abused as a child or having witnessed previous violent acts. Violent values are often learned and encouraged by young males who find themselves within the lower class of our society.

An individual who has incorporated violent values will act differently than someone who disapproves of violence upon taking the role of the generalized other within the interpretation of
the situation.

I am familiar with the criticisms which have been targeted at the Subculture of Violence theory. The main being that the theory is often seen as a tautology. Researchers attempt to explain violent values and expectations through the analysis of hard data such as age, sex, race, and social class. While I included instances of offenders who experienced violent life histories, the lack of instances will surely raise the tautological criticism.

I can only defend this action by acknowledging the criticism and by stating that without the inclusion of a subculture of violence, the behaviors and expectations of the offenders within violent interactions cannot be adequately explained.

I am also convinced that the past American research on the Subculture of Violence does apply to violence within a city such as Windsor. While the geographical setting may be different, being socialized to expect and accept the value of violence has the same repercussions universally.

With respect to Symbolic Interactionism, the interpretation of the situation within violent encounters provides the key to understanding the actual interactions between the victim and offender. I also felt that the expectations associated with various roles such as friend, lover, and stranger, interplay with the interpretation of the situation.

There are definite processual stages within homicidal
interactions. I chose to use the stages of Dietz' as they deal with both social and felony homicide. Other studies focus primarily upon social homicides. (Felson and Steadman, 1983; Luckenbill, 1977) Dietz' stages were also flexible enough to allow for the inclusion of the Windsor data without the researcher having to 'force' the data into the stages.

This concludes my explanation for the explanatory schemes used throughout this research. I now turn to a discussion of the Future Implications of the research.

FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

This study has attempted to investigate homicide within our community, and in the process, the realization of just how intricate a problem it is, has been uncovered. There are many dimensions and elements involved in homicidal interactions. The study has hopefully uncovered some of these and left the door open for future research on this extremely serious and sensitive topic.

As stated earlier, due to time, money and practicality, no offender interviews were conducted for the study. This has not depreciated the value of this research, however, future researchers may interview Windsor's homicide offenders and perhaps test for such phenomenon as violent values.

I would also hope that more homicide studies will be conducted within our Canadian cities in the future. The more this
serious problem is studied, the greater our understanding of it will be.

Our policing agencies should attempt to become more standardized in retaining vital documents pertinent for studies such as this one. Through a joint effort, these agencies and academics can better understand crime and hence prepare better preventative measures.

A PERSONAL REFLECTION

In Windsor, there is a slightly higher rate of killing than the national average. Canada experiences about 650 homicides per year or 2.5 killings for every 100,000 Canadians. (Boyd, 1988:1) Within Windsor, during the twenty year period covered by the study, there was an average of 5.5 killings per year. With a population (1981) of 192,083, Windsor's rate of homicide is 2.86 per 100,000.

While this homicide rate is a bit higher than the national average, it is far lower than most areas in the United States, particularly Detroit. Windsor's research neighbor. Most people thus reply that they feel safe living within our Canadian society.

The problem with this feeling of 'safeness' is that homicide within the Windsor community does not involve lunatics or sociopaths who engage in a killing rampage. While stranger homicide does appear to be increasing, the majority of homicides in
Windsor occur amongst people we know and people who are our neighbors.

There appears to be a growing concern over the increase in violence within the community even as this chapter is being written. There are daily accounts of new violence being reported within the local newspaper. I conclude that we do have a problem of violence within our society. As long as our society is witnessing phenomenon such as wife abuse, child abuse, and increasing rates of violent crimes, all of which can lead to death, we need to study the problem, understand it and then implement preventative measures.

Can we prevent homicide? We will probably never witness a violent-free society. We may attempt to reduce violence within our society, however. Perhaps a start to prevention of violence begins within our classrooms. If somehow the intergenerational transmission of violence can be broken, a step towards a violence-reduced society would have been taken.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VICTIM</th>
<th>OFFENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIME OF ASSAULT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>METHOD OF ASSAULT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLACE OF ASSAULT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VICTIM-OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INVOLVEMENT OF DRUGS OR ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUICIDE FOLLOWING HOMICIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISPOSITION (CHARGE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PREVIOUS RECORD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPARENT MOTIVE 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

STATISTICAL TRENDS FOR HOMICIDE IN WINDSOR

DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

Table 1  HOMICIDES IN WINDSOR FOR THE YEARS 1969–1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Homicides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Victim Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Offender Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
GENDER OF VICTIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
GENDER OF OFFENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6
RACE OF VICTIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

RACE OF OFFENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115   100.0

Table 8

OCCUPATION OF VICTIM *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper White Collar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower White Collar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Child</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The researcher used the classification scheme outlined by Pineo et al. for occupational analysis. (Pineo, 1977)
Table 9  OCCUPATION OF OFFENDER *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper White Collar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower White Collar</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Child</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The researcher used the classification scheme outlined by Pineo et al. for occupational analysis. (Pineo, 1977)

SITUATIONAL TRENDS

Table 10  HOMICIDES AND THE DAY OF THE WEEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11  HOMICIDES AND THE TIME OF DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>midnight-6:00 a.m.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 a.m.-noon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noon-6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m.-midnight</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12
**METHOD OF ASSAULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beating</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabbing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangulation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffocation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13
**FREQUENCY OF HOMICIDE AND CITY SECTION** *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Section</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refer to the diagrams following this page. The census tract map was found in Census of Canada, 1981. The street map was provided by the University of Windsor's Map Dept. Boundaries on the map were created by the researcher.
Table 14  POPULATION OF CITY SECTIONS *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Section</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>15185</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>77172</td>
<td>40.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>73533</td>
<td>38.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>26193</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>192083</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This table was created to give the reader a comparison of the population to actual homicide figures within each section.

Table 15  LOW INCOME INCIDENCE RATES AND CITY SECTION *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Section</th>
<th>Low Income Incidence Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Low Income cut-off rates were attained from Census of Canada, 1981.
### Table 16
PLACE OF ASSAULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Assault</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingroom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road/Alley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar/Parking Lot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 17
VICTIM/OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated Spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common-Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/Girlfriend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Bfriend/Gfriend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Child</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories used are those designated by police.
Table 18
IN Volvement of Drugs *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Drugs?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Involvement may include victim, offender, or both. 'No Evidence' refers to cases were the researcher was unable to detect if there was any use of drugs.

Table 19
IN Volvement of Alcohol *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of alcohol?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Involvement may include victim, offender, or both. 'No Evidence' refers to cases were the researcher was unable to detect if there was any use of alcohol.

Table 20
Homicide Followed by Suicide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suicide</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21  
**HOMICIDE CHARGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justifiable Homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Murder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Capital Murder</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Degree Murder</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Degree Murder</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infanticide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22  
**DISPOSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discharge/Acquittal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Guilty/Insanity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformatory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 Years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23  
**PRIOR RECORD OF THE OFFENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Record</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Prior Record</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Violent Offenses</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Offenses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 24

**TYPE OF HOMICIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Homicide</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 25

**MOTIVATION FOR SOCIAL HOMICIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Defence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 26

**MOTIVATION FOR FELONY HOMICIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery/B+E/Theft</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Archival Sources re Homicide, Windsor, 1968-1985

RE 20 Ministry of Correctional Services
Series G-17 Sampled Probation and Parole Case files, 1960-1985

Series F-46 Jail Registers, Windsor Jail. Vols 18 (1966-1968) to Vol 18d (1973-1974) (NB: Jail registers were discontinued after this date.)

RG 23 Ontario Provincial Police
Series I-6 Major Occurrence Reports, 1969-1983. (on microfilm)
Series I-1 Card index to microfilm of case files. (on microfilm)
October 16, 1989

Kurt Davidson
438 Indian Road
Windsor, Ontario
N9C 2L4

Dear Sir/Madam:

Re: Homicide data for Windsor, Ontario

This is with regard to your request concerning the above-noted.

Enclosed is the information you requested.

The information you requested is not available from this Program. Your request has been forwarded to the
Program of the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

The information you requested is not available from this office. We recommend you contact:

[redacted]

We are not aware of this (these) report(s).

The report(s) you requested is/are being reprinted and will be forwarded to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Homicide data for Windsor, Ontario

La réponse à votre demande concernant le sujet en rubrique est indiquée ci-après.

Veuillez trouver ci-joint les renseignements que vous avez demandés.

Les renseignements que vous avez demandés doivent être obtenus d'une autre source. Nous avons fait parvenir votre demande au Programme du Centre canadien de la statistique judiciaire.

Les renseignements que vous avez demandés ne sont pas disponibles à ce bureau. Nous vous recommandons de communiquer avec:

[redacted]

Nous ne confectionnons pas la (les) document(s) que vous cherchez.

Les (les) document(s) que vous cherchez est (sont) en réimpressions. Vous nous ferons parvenir quantité que possible.
We have forwarded your request for the publication(s) to:
Publication Sales
Statistics Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0T6
(613) 951-7276

Nous avons fait parvenir votre demande de publication(s) à:
Ventes des publications
Statistique Canada
Ottawa, (Ontario)
K1A 0T6
(613) 951-7276

Please find enclosed a list of the products available from the Law Enforcement Program.

Veuillez trouver ci-joint une liste des produits offerts par le Programme de l'application de la loi. 

If you require further information or have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Joanne Lacroix (613) 951-6643 or myself.

Si vous désirez de plus amples renseignements ou si vous avez des questions, n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi ou avec Joanne Lacroix (613) 951-6643.

Sincerely,

Sharon Longchamps
Information Officer
Law Enforcement Program
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics
(613) 951-0152


Sharon Longchamps
Agent d'information
Programme de l'application de la loi
centre canadien de la statistique juridique
(613) 951-0152

p.j.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HINDSOR, ONTARIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** CANADIAN CENTRE FOR JUSTICE

**STATISTICS:** LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

**HOMICIDE PROJECT**

**NOTE:** COUNT ONE OFFENCE FOR EACH VICTIM.
REFERENCES
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