

96010118

114196

**INTRA-FAMILY HOMICIDE IN THE UNITED STATES  
INCIDENCE, TRENDS, AND DIFFERENCES BY REGION, RACE, AND GENDER\***

Peggy S. Fless and Murray A. Straus  
Department of Sociology and Family Research Laboratory  
University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824 603 862-2594

**Abstract**

The research reported in this paper is based on rates computed from the "supplemental homicide report" data files for the period 1976-1984. Analyses of these rates found that: (1) Homicides of one family member by another decreased during the period 1976-79 to 1980-84. (2) The most frequently occurring type of intra-family homicide was murder of a spouse. (3) 97 percent of the women killed by another family member were killed by their husband. (4) The South predominates in intra-family as well as in acquaintance and stranger homicide. (5) Homicide rates for black and white victims and offenders tend to follow a similar patterns, but the black rates are much higher. (6) In black families spouse homicides are a larger proportion of intra-family homicides. Possible explanations for these findings and their policy implications are discussed.

\*\*\*\*\*

The high incidence of violence between family members has become increasingly well documented in the past decade (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980; Straus and Gelles, 1986). We now know that a large number of individuals in the United States experience some sort of violence at the hands of family members at some time in their lives. Surprisingly, much less has been written on lethal violence between family members. To date, most research on family homicide has been relatively small scale, often focusing on a series of in-depth case studies of people who have killed members of their families (Brown, 1987), statistical analyses of characteristics of a small group of family homicide perpetrators (Chimbos, 1978), or studies of a single city (Wolfgang, 1958; Bourdouris, 1971). Little information has been available regarding

Contents

OBJECTIVES . . . . . 2  
METHODS . . . . . 3  
    Data  
    Family Homicide Rates  
FAMILY, ACQUAINTANCE, AND STRANGER HOMICIDE . . . . . 4  
    Trends  
GENDER DIFFERENCES . . . . . 6  
    Victimization Rates  
    Offense rates  
RACE DIFFERENCES . . . . . 8  
REGION . . . . . 9  
SPOUSE, PARENT AND CHILD HOMICIDE . . . . . 10  
    Overall Patterns  
    Gender Differences  
    Race  
    Race and Gender  
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . . 14

NCJRS

OCT 27 1988

ACQUISITIONS

\* Paper presented at the Third National Family Violence Research Conference, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, July 6, 1987. This study was carried out under two of the programs of the Family Research Laboratory: the State and Regional Indicators Archive and research program and the Family Violence Research Program. Bibliographies listing books and papers of these programs are available from the Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire, 128 Horton Social Science Center, Durham, NH 03824.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the important contributions of a number of people and organizations. The Federal Bureau of Investigation provided the Supplemental Homicide Report (SHR) tape, and answered many questions concerning this data. Robert Flewelling performed the data processing miracle of converting the SHR files into rates for numerous specific categories of homicide. Kirk R. Williams and the members of the 1986-87 Family Violence Research Seminar made many valuable suggestions which greatly aided the revision of the paper.

We are grateful to the National Institute of Justice for grant 851JCX0030 (Justifiable and Criminal Homicide of Family Members, Acquaintances and Strangers, principal investigators, Kirk R. Williams and Murray A. Straus) for support of this project, and to the Graduate School of the University of New Hampshire and the National Institute of Mental Health (grant T32 MH15161) for more general support of the research program.

national trends and patterns. This study is intended to help fill that gap.

#### OBJECTIVES

Homicide data for the United States for the years 1976-1984 will be examined, with a focus on homicides which involves family members. Four major questions will be addressed. How frequent is family homicide as compared to the rates for acquaintance and stranger homicide?

What differences are there by gender, race and region in the incidence of these three types of homicide?

How frequently do three specific types of family homicide occur: those involving murders of spouses, parents, and children?

How different are men and women and blacks and whites in the frequency with which spouses, parents, and children are murdered?

#### METHODS

##### Data

The scarcity of research on family homicide is partly a function of difficulties with obtaining appropriate data. The homicide mortality data published in the Vital Statistics Of the United States provides no information at all on perpetrators and therefore cannot distinguish homicides in which the victim and offender are members of the same family. The annual publication of the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting system is the most widely used source of American homicide statistics. However, the data published by the FBI on intra-family homicide is restricted to the percentage of homicides which are between family members, and even this is not reported separately for cities, states, or regions. However, since 1976 the FBI has collected (but not published) what are called Supplemental Homicide Reports (SHR). The SHR contains a wealth of

information about individual homicide events including extensive information concerning victim/offender relationships.

We obtained the SHR computer files for each year from 1976 to 1984 and used that data to compute the homicide rates in this paper. Most of the rates to be reported are the average annual rate for the nine year period 1976-84. However, in some places we also compare rates for the period 1976-79 with those for 1980-84.

The rates to be reported are based on all single victim/single assailant murders and non-negligent homicides recorded in the SHR data files for 1976 through 1984. The data have been weighted to correct for cases in which the identity of the assailant is not given. These weighting procedures allow for more accurate estimates of rates for specific victim/offender relationships (see Williams and Flewelling, 1986, for complete explanation of this process).

##### Family Homicide Rates

A family homicide is defined herein as one involving blood or married kin (including such categories as in-laws, step-parents and children, and common-law spouses). An acquaintance homicide is one in which victim and offender knew one another, but were not related (e.g., friends, neighbors, dating partners, ex-spouses, etc.). A stranger homicide is one in which victim and offender were not known to each other prior to the homicide event. Parent and child homicide victims discussed here include step as well as biological relationships. "Child" refers to a relationship, not an age category. Thus some of the "children" represented by the statistics in this paper are adults. Spouses are defined as individuals currently legally married, as well as common-law spouses. All rates are per 100,000 of the relevant population (either total, male, female, black or white as appropriate). All rates are "national" in the sense that the

population covered consists of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, unless otherwise stated.

#### FAMILY, ACQUAINTANCE, AND STRANGER HOMICIDE

(Table 1 about Here)

The first column of Table 1 shows that the most commonly occurring type of homicide during the period 1976-84 was the murder of an acquaintance. The second most frequent type were murders in which the victim and offender were strangers. However, stranger murders occurred at less than half the rate of acquaintance murders. Murders within the family occurred at a slightly lower rate than murders of strangers. Thus, Americans in the period 1976-1984 were most "at risk" to be involved in homicide events with acquaintances and much less likely to be murdered by family members or by strangers.

#### Trends

Comparison of the rates in the columns for 1976-79 and 1980-84 shows that acquaintance homicides continued to be the most frequent type, but the rate of family homicides decreased and the rate of stranger homicides increased.\*1 As a result, homicide of strangers moved to second place in 1980-84, and family homicides became the type with the lowest rate.

The decrease in family homicide rates from the 70's to the 80's parallels Straus and Gelles's (1986) findings of a decline in physical child abuse and spouse abuse as measured by national surveys conducted in 1975 and 1985. Together, these findings suggest a downward trend in both lethal and non-lethal violence in families. Straus and Gelles (1986) suggest five types of changes in American society which might explain the decrease.

First, there have been major changes in the structure of American families (such as later age at marriage, fewer children, and more equality between husband and wife) which are known to be associated with physical abuse.

Second, there was an amelioration of economic problems known to be associated with child abuse and spouse abuse, especially lower unemployment.

Third, there are more alternatives for battered women, such as shelters and hot lines, greater acceptability of divorce, and the vastly greater number of married women with full time jobs that make it economically possible to leave a violent husband.

Fourth, there are treatment programs, including programs for violent husbands (some of them court-mandated), an increase between 1975 and 1985 of 360% in the number of certified family therapists (plus many more who are not formally certified), and the establishment of "child protective services" in all 50 states.

Fifth, there have been a number of changes which can be categorized as deterrents to family violence. "The decade in question has been characterized by activities that were intended to change both internalized norms and objective sanctions about family violence. Extensive efforts have been made to alert the public to the problem of child abuse and wife beating." (Straus and Gelles, 1986:474). Many states have enacted statutes which make explicit the criminality of an assault on a spouse. A growing number of police departments have changed from the previous standard policy of non-interference in "domestic disputes" to a policy of arresting assailants.

If these and other factors described by Straus and Gelles have decreased the incidence of child abuse and spouse abuse, they have probably also affected the family homicide rate because few family

homicides occur as the only episode of violence in an otherwise peaceful family. Rather, they are likely to be "just one episode in a long standing syndrome of violence" (Straus, 1986: 457). As more resources become available to families to break out of the pattern of non-lethal violence, it is logical that family homicide would decrease as well. Future tracking of the family homicide rate will be important in order to ascertain if this downward trend continues.

#### GENDER DIFFERENCES

##### Victimization Rates

(Table 2 about here)

Table 2 shows gender differences for the three types of homicide for 1976-1984. The column headed M/F gives the ratio of male homicide victimizations to female victimizations. It shows that men are murdered at a rate which is 1.3 to 4.7 times higher than females. This corresponds to long established patterns in all types of violence; that is, that men are more violent in interpersonal relationships than women. However, the ratio between male/female victimization rates is relatively low for family homicide. Homicide which occurs between family members is much less distinctive as regards gender patterns than are other types of homicide. The well established trend of much greater male victimization does not seem to hold with regard to family homicide where victimization rates for women are very similar to those for men.

Reading down the columns of Table 2 shows within-gender differences for the three types of homicide. Men are most likely to be murdered by acquaintances, and least likely to be killed in a family context. Women are slightly more likely to be victims of acquaintance than family homicide and have much lower victimization rates for stranger homicides.

##### Offense rates

The right hand panel of Table 2 shows that the difference between offense rates for males and females is even greater than the difference in victimization rates. This applies to all three categories of homicide. As found for victimizations rates, the ratio between male/female offender rates is lowest for family homicide (2.3 times greater rate for males), and greatest for stranger homicides, where the offence rate is 29.4 times greater than the rate for women.

Reading down the columns in Table 1 headed "Offenders" shows that the highest offense rates for men are in acquaintance homicide, the lowest for family homicide. This is the same pattern as found for victimization rates. Females, however, have highest offense rates in the family homicide category. Thus, when women kill, they are most likely to do so in a family context. Men perpetrate more homicides in a larger variety of settings.

The picture that emerges as regards gender patterns in the three different categories of homicide indicates that family homicide has distinct differences from acquaintance or stranger murders. As victims, women are about equally likely to be killed in the family as they are by acquaintances, whereas men are much more likely to be killed by an acquaintance. For these reasons the ratio between male and female victimization and offense rates is lowest for family homicide.

The relatively high rate of intra-family murders committed by women may well be explained by the fact that it is in families that women are most likely to be assaulted (Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz, 1980). So it is not surprising that it is in this same setting that they are most likely to be murdered or to respond with lethal violence themselves. Browne (1987), for example, found that many wives who kill their husbands do so

after enduring years of physical (and often life threatening) abuse themselves.

#### RACE DIFFERENCES

The fact that the overall murder rate for blacks is higher than those for whites has long been established (Curtis, 1974; Wolfgang, 1958; Silberman, 1978; Loya and Mercy, 1985). Other research shows that there is a higher incidence of non-lethal assault in black families than in white families (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980). This suggests that the black rate for intra-family homicide will also be greater than the rate for whites. The rates shown in Table 3 confirm this. They show that blacks have a four to eight times higher victimization rate than whites for the three categories of homicide, and a three to eight times greater offense rate.

(Table 3 about here)

Although some other differences between blacks and whites are shown in Table 3 -- for example, the lowest victimization rate for whites is in the family homicide category, whereas for blacks the lowest victimization rate is for murder by strangers -- the most important conclusion from Table 3 is that the black rates roughly parallel the white rates but at a much higher level.

It is evident that blacks are more likely to kill or be killed in the family than whites are. Explanations for this phenomenon can probably be found in the quality of life experienced by blacks in America. They are inordinately victimized by poverty, joblessness, (O'Hare, 1985; Pearce, 1983) and the stress of living in a racist society, all negative life experiences which contribute to higher rates of violence in any setting.

#### REGION

Table 4 shows that acquaintance homicide rates are highest in all four regions. Stranger homicide is more common than family homicide for the Northeast and the Midwest, while in the South and the West, family homicide rates are higher than those for strangers. The South has highest homicide rates for all three types of homicide.

(Table 4 about here)

The South has long been noted for its high homicide rate (Hoffman, 1925; Brearly, 1932; Porterfield, 1948; Shanon, 1954; Hackney, 1969; Gastil, 1971; Smith and Parker, 1980). This region has not, however, been found to have higher rates of family violence (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980). Thus, the finding of higher family homicide rates in the South, while consistent with overall patterns of homicide, does not coincide with research findings regarding levels of non-lethal violence in families. A possible explanation lies in the fact that "family homicide" includes more types of family relationships than were included in the Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz survey. For example, the homicide statistics include murder of and by adult children, whereas the family violence surveys cover only couples and their minor children. Simple measurement error may also be involved. Homicide statistics are likely to be much more complete and reliable than are survey data in a sensitive area like violent interactions in families. In any case, it is clear that lethal violence in families is more common in the South than in other regions, even though non-lethal family violence may not be higher there.

#### SPOUSE, PARENT AND CHILD HOMICIDE

"Family homicide" is a very broad category. Grouping all family relationships may obscure important differences. Consequently, three specific relationship categories of family homicide were investigated:

spouse, parent, and child. These categories were chosen because they constitute the core of family relationships for most Americans.

#### Overall Patterns

The Total column of Table 5 shows that spousal homicide is by far the most common, with rates four times higher than those for child homicide. Parents are the least likely victims of family homicide, with rates of victimization slightly lower than those for children.

(Table 5 about here)

The fact that more homicides occur between spouses than between parents and children is not unexpected. Survey research on family violence has revealed higher rates of life threatening behaviors such as threatening with or using guns or knives between spouses than by parents towards their children, although children experience more violence of all types (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980; Straus and Gelles, 1986). Spouse homicides may also be common because they are the only category examined here which involve two adults who are peers. It may be that violence is more likely to escalate to a lethal context in such a situation than when norms of protection and respect are present, as in parent-child and child-parent relationships.

When homicide does occur between parents and their children, children are the more likely victims. This could be a reflection of greater size and strength and access to guns, or it could be the power differential inherent in these relationships, with parents most likely to take the dominant role even when children are grown. In addition, the period of time in which parents and children have the greatest amount of contact with one another (including co-residing) is when children are young and likely to be physically weaker than their adult parents.

#### Gender Differences

Comparison of the male and female rates in the bottom two rows of Table 5 shows that fathers and male children are murdered at nearly double the rate shown for mothers and female children. This is consistent with the general pattern of greater male involvement in violence. However, in spouse relationships, the victimization rates for women is 34 percent greater than the rate for men. Or putting this another way, Table 5 shows that, compared to males, females have about half the risk of being murdered in the role of parent or of child, but females have a one third higher risk of being murdered by their spouse than men. The high rate at which wives are homicide victims is further emphasized by another comparison. This contrasts the intra-family victimization rate for females in Table 2 (1.18) with the spouse victimization rate of 1.15 in Table 5. The latter figure is <sup>72%</sup> ~~72%~~ of the former, indicating that when women are victims of murder at the hands of another family member, the perpetrator is almost always her husband. The situation is quite different for husbands. Less than half (42%) of husband victims were murdered by their wife. The panel headed "Gender Of Offenders" in Table 5 shows the complement of the findings on spouse murders just discussed. The homicide offense rate for men is 57 percent greater than the rate for women killing a husband.\*2

#### Race

Part A of Table 6 shows that blacks have much higher victimization rates than whites for all three types of family relationship. The lowest ratio between black and white victimization rates is found for murder of parents by a child, where blacks are about 3.3 times more likely than white to be killed by their children. Black spouses and children each

have victimization rates more than five times those of their white counterparts.

(Table 6 about here)

One characteristic shared by both racial groups is that spouses are by far the most likely victims of intra-family homicide. White children, however, have rates of victimization nearly equal to that of white parents, while black children are more than 1.7 times as likely to be victims as are black parents.

Part B of Table 6 shows a pattern of race differences in offense rates that is very similar to the pattern for victimization rates shown in part A. The only important difference occurs in the rates for black parents and children, but this is not really a difference. It is the complement of the findings for black parents and children listed in the Victims panel of Table 6.

#### Race and Gender

(Table 7 about here)

Gender Differences Within Racial Groups. Table 7 permits many different comparisons. In this section we will compare differences between male and female homicide within racial groups to determine if the gender differences follow the same pattern in white and black families. Part A of Table 7 shows that, with one important exception, the differences between men and women in homicide victimization follow roughly the same pattern within each racial group as was found without specifying the race of the victim. The exception concerns murder at the hands of a spouse. Among whites, wives have roughly double the risk of being murdered by their spouse than husbands, whereas among blacks the situation reverses. Black women have a 23 percent lower risk of being murdered by their husband than black men have of being murdered by their wives. Or

putting it another way, when whites are killed by their spouses, wives are the most likely victims, while when blacks are killed by a spouse, the most likely victim is the husband.

It is important to note that even though black women are less vulnerable to being killed by their husband than are black husbands to being killed by their wives, the homicide rate for black spouses -- both husbands and wives -- is extremely high. Nevertheless, it is also important to try to identify the reasons why the rate is lower for black wives than for black husbands. One possibility has to do with the greater power of black women in the family. White women, because of greater economic and social-emotional dependency on their husbands may be more vulnerable to being victims of wife-beating--and homicide--than are black women.

The other side of the coin is shown in part B of Table 7, which indicates that black women murder their husbands at a rate which is almost as high as the rate at which black husbands murder their wives; whereas white women murder husbands at less than half the rate at which white husbands murder their wives. Carol Stack (1974) and others who have studied black families note the "strength" of black women and their unwillingness to be "made a fool of" by their men. One of the women studied by Stack said:

"(My mother)...didn't care what I did so long as I didn't let Eliot make an ass out of me. The point is a woman has to have her own pride. She can't let a man rule her. You can't let a man kick you in the tail and tell you what to do. Anytime I can make an ass out of a man I'm going to do it. If he's doing the same to me, then I'll quit him and leave him alone" (p. 110-111).



Stack asserts that this attitude is typical among the young black women of her study (p. 111-112). To the extent that Stack is correct, the unwillingness of black women to tolerate with assaults by their husbands may explain why black wives are not more frequent murder victims than their husbands (as is the case with white women); and the willingness of black women to "make an ass out of a man" may be part of the explanation for the near equality with men in the rate at which a spouse is murdered.

Prevalence Of Spouse Homicides. Another important comparison made possible by Table 7 is the ratio of spouse homicides to other intra-family homicides. As noted earlier in this paper, murder of spouses is the predominant type of intra-family homicide, occurring at 2.3 times the combined rate for murders of parents and children. However, when these ratios are calculated separately for whites and blacks, the predominance of spouse homicides is even greater in black families than in white families.

The explanation for the fact that black spouses are murdered at an even higher rate than other members of black families is an important research issue which, if pursued, might also provide additional insight on the broader question of why intra-family homicides occur so frequently. At this point we can only speculate that it might reflect the interaction of the economic position of blacks in American society, certain characteristics of the black family, and the gender role orientations of black men. This explanation starts with the fact that poverty, unemployment, welfare regulations and other factors have created a situation in which black men lack the economic resources needed for the traditional husband/father role. As a result, black women tend to have more power in their families than white women (Stack, 1974; Valentine, 1978). This is a potent source of conflict in a society in which the idea of the husband as the "head of the family" remains the de facto norm. In

the case of black families, we suggest that it is even more of a problem because black males have a stronger commitment to the traditional role model of the husband as the head of the family than do white men (Beckett, 1974). Thus, by a cruel irony of American society, black men, who tend to particularly value male dominance, are blocked in this aspiration, as in so many others. This creates conflict and tension which, in the context of a sector of society where violent conflict frequently becomes homicidal, might help explain the high homicide rate of black couples. Specifically, if these speculations are correct, they suggest that the tension occurs when black men attempt to exercise power consistent with their traditional values and ideology. However, if the husband does not contribute the economic resources that the traditional view assumes as the basis for the "head of the household" status, the wife will tend to regard his assertion of authority as illegitimate. In those circumstances, i.e. lack of economic resources to serve as the basis for exercising power, men tend to use their greater size and strength as the basis for exercising power (Allen and Straus, 1980), and the resulting violence can escalate into homicide.

If subsequent research supports the explanations presented in the previous paragraphs, considerable caution is needed concerning the policy implications. For example, conservatives might argue for policies which help more black men play a traditional male-dominant "head of household" role, and others might argue that white women can reduce the risk of being victimized at twice the rate of white men by following the lead of their black sisters and "kick his ass if he tries anything." Both of these approaches could be disastrous. Male-dominance in black families and a violent response to violence by white women could change who is victim and who is offender, but the toll of violence is likely to be as high or higher. A more promising direction for social policy intended to reduce

intra-family homicide is based on the research which shows that inequality is associated with violence (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; 1980; Straus, 1973, 1976; Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz, 1980) and other research which indicates that violence for morally correct purposes tends to produce even more violence (Baron and Straus, 1987; Straus, 1983, 1987). In short, attempting to restructure black families in the traditional male-dominant pattern, and encouraging women to resist assault by assault, does not deal with the fundamental causes and could exacerbate the situation. Instead, social policy intended to reduce intra-family homicide needs to focus on the poverty, inequality, and deep seated belief in the efficacy of physical force to deal with wrong-doers that is at the root of so much American violence, including intra-family homicide. This suggests the overriding importance of providing blacks of both genders and white women with the occupational and economic resources and the respect which are due all Americans so that each can participate as equals in the family and in the larger society.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this paper was to make available gender-specific, race-specific, and regional rates for homicides which occur between family members, between acquaintances, and between strangers. These rates were computed from the Supplemental Homicide Report data files for the period 1976 through 1984. Analyses of these rates found that:

1. Homicides of one family member by another decreased during the period 1976-79 to 1980-84.
2. Within the broad category of intra-family homicide, we distinguished murders of spouses, of parents by a child (who could be an adult-child) and murders of children (who could also be adults) by a parent. The most frequently occurring type of intra-family homicide was

murder of a spouse. Forty two percent of men murdered by another family member were killed by their wife, and <sup>72</sup>~~94~~ percent of the women killed by another family member were killed by their husband.

4. Although males are murdered by other family members at 1.3 times the rate at which females are murdered, the male predominance in both victimization and perpetration is much less than among homicides between acquaintances or strangers.

5. The South predominates in intra-family homicide as it does in acquaintance and stranger homicide.

6. Homicide rates for black and white victims and offenders tend to follow a similar pattern of differences between the rate of family, acquaintance, and stranger homicides; and within the family for spouse, parent, and child homicides, but with the black rates are much higher in all categories.

7. Gender differences for murder of a parent or a child are similar for black and white families. However, for murder of a spouse, white wives are victims at double the rate at which white husbands are killed by their spouse; while for blacks, husbands are more likely to be victims. The offense rates show that black husbands and wives have nearly equal, whereas for whites, the rate is double that of wives.

8. Comparison of black and white intra-family homicide rates shows that in black families spouse homicides are a larger proportion of intra-family homicides.

These gender differences and race differences are extremely large and have important theoretical and practical implications. They are interpreted on the basis of other research as reflecting the effects of poverty and inequality. The policy implication is the need for steps to reduce inequality between, both within the family and in the society in general, between men and women and between blacks and whites.

1. The decrease shown in Table 1 understates the actual level of change because it compares the average for 1976-79 with the average for 1980-84. This obscures the fact that 1975-79 was a period of rapidly rising rates, and the period 1980-84 of rapidly decreasing rates. See Straus 1986b and 1987a for year by year trends.

2. The two sets of rates are not mirror images of each other because they are computed using two different populations for the rate denominator. Thus husband offense rates are not the same as wife victimization rates, as the former refers to rates per 100,000 men while the latter rate is based on the female population.

#### References

- Bourdouris, James. 1971. "Homicide in the Family." Journal of Marriage and the Family 33: 667-676.
- Brearly, H.C. 1932. Homicide in the United States. North Carolina: Chapel Hill Press.
- Browne, Angela. 1987. When Battered Women Kill. New York: Free Press.
- Chimbos, Peter. 1978. Marital Violence: A Study of Interpersonal Homicide. San Francisco: R & E Associates, Inc.
- Curtis, Lynn A. 1974. Criminal Violence: National Patterns and Behavior. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Gastil, Raymons. 1971. "Homicide and a Regional Culture of Violence." American Sociological Review 36 (June): 412-427.
- Hackney, Sheldon. 1969. "Southern Violence." Pp. 387-404 in Violence In America, edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. A Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.
- Hoffman, Frederick. 1925. The Homicide Problem. Newark: Prudential Press.
- Loya, Fred and James A. Mercy. 1985. University of California at Los Angeles, Centers for Disease Control: The Epidemiology of Homicide in the City of Los Angeles 1970-79. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control.
- O'Hare, William P. 1985. "Poverty In America: Trends and New Patterns." Population Bulletin 40 (June): entire issue.
- Pearce, Diana. 1983. "The Feminization of Ghetto Poverty." Society 21 (Nov-Dec): 70-74.
- Porterfield, Austin. 1949. "Indices of Suicide and Homicide by States and Cities." American Sociological Review 14 (Aug): 481-490.

Shannon, Lyle. 1954. "The Spatial Distribution of Criminal Offenses by States." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 45 (Sept-Oct): 429-443.

Silberman, Charles. 1978. Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice. New York: Random House.

Smith, Dwayne, and Robert N. Parker. 1980. "Types of Homicide and Variation in Regional Rates." Social Forces 59 (Sept): 136:147.

Stack, Carol. 1974. All My Kin. New York: Harper and Row.

Straus, Murray A. 1973. "A General Systems Theory Approach to a Theory of Violence Between Family Members." Social Science Information 12:105-125.

Straus, Murray A. 1976. "Sexual Inequality, Cultural Norms, and Wife-Beating." Victims and Society, edited by Emilio C. Viano. Washington, D.C.: Visage Press. Also in Victimology 1976 1(Spring):54-76, and in Women Into Wives: The Legal and Economic Impact of Marriage, edited by Jane Roberts Chapman and Margaret Gates. Sage Yearbooks in Women Policy, Vol 2. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1977.

Straus, Murray. 1986. "Domestic Violence and Homicide Antecedents." Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine (June): 446-465.

Straus, Murray and Richard Gelles. 1986. "Societal Change and Change in Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys." Journal of Marriage and the Family 48 (Aug): 465-479.

Straus, Murray, Richard Gelles, and Suzanne Steinmetz. 1980. Behind Closed Doors. Gerder City, NJ: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Valentine, Bettylou. 1978. Hustling and Other Work. New York: Free Press.

Williams, Kirk, and Robert Flewelling. 1986. "Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger Homicide: Alternative Procedures for Rate Calculations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, NY: New York.

Wolfgang, Marvin. 1958. Patterns in Criminal Homicide. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Table 1. U.S. Mean U.S. Homicide Rates, 1976-1984, by Relationship of Victim To Offender.

Victim/Offender Relationship Type	1976-1984	1976-1979	1980-1984
Family	1.82	1.89	1.77
Acquaintance	3.99	3.90	4.06
Stranger	1.87	1.65	2.05

Table 2. Victimization & Offense Rates for Three Types of Homicide by Gender, 1976-1984.

Homicide Type	Victims			Offenders		
	Male	Female	M/F	Male	Female	M/F
Family	2.06	1.60	1.3	2.69	1.18	2.3
Acquaintance	6.46	1.66	3.9	7.47	.99	7.5
Stranger	3.14	.67	4.7	3.24	.11	29.4

Table 3. Victimization & Offense Rates for Three Types of Homicide by Race, 1976-1984

Homicide Type	Victims			Offenders		
	White	Black	B/W	White	Black	B/W
Family	1.24	6.56	5.3	1.30	6.87	5.3
Acquaintance	2.28	17.40	7.6	2.28	18.77	8.2
Stranger	1.42	5.55	3.9	.94	6.97	7.4

Table 4. Homicide Rates for 3 Categories of Homicide by Geographic Region, 1976-1984.

Homicide Type	Region			
	N. East	Mid W.	South	West
Family	0.81	1.04	2.58	1.62
Acquaintance	2.01	2.28	5.57	3.21
Stranger	1.00	1.06	2.06	1.39

Table 5. Homicide Victimization Rates for Three Types of Victim/Offender Relationships by Gender, 1976-1984.

Victim	Total	Gender of Victim		Gender of Offender	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Spouse	1.01	.86	1.15	1.30	.83
Parent	.18	.25	.13	.30	.21
Child	.25	.32	.17	.36	.05

Table 6. Homicide Victimization Rates for Three Types of Victim/Offender Relationships by Race, 1976-1984

Victim	A. Race of Victim			B. Race of Offender		
	White	Black	B/W	White	Black	B/W
Spouse	.68	3.64	5.4	.71	3.82	5.4
Parent	.15	.50	3.3	.17	.92	5.4
Child	.16	.88	5.5	.16	.53	3.3

Table 7. Homicide Victimization Rates for Three Types of Victim/Offender Relationships by Race and Gender, 1976-1984

Victim	Whites		Blacks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
A. Victims				
Spouse	.46	.90	4.14	3.19
Parent	.18	.12	.78	.24
Child	.20	.12	1.28	.52
B. Offenders				
Spouse	1.0	.45	3.91	3.74
Parent	.20	.14	1.11	.75
Child	.29	.03	.96	.15