

1-1-2015

## Thirty Year Follow-Up of Juvenile Homicide Offenders

Norair Khachatryan

*University of South Florida*, [norairk@mail.usf.edu](mailto:norairk@mail.usf.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#)

---

### Scholar Commons Citation

Khachatryan, Norair, "Thirty Year Follow-Up of Juvenile Homicide Offenders" (2015). *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.

<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/5822>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usf.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usf.edu).

Thirty Year Follow-Up of Juvenile Homicide Offenders

by

Norair Khachatryan

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
Department of Criminology  
College of Behavioral and Community Sciences  
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Kathleen M. Heide, Ph.D.  
Wesley G. Jennings, Ph.D.  
Wilson Palacios, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:  
March 11, 2015

Keywords: adolescent murderers, post-incarceration recidivism, typology test, sexual murder  
subsample

Copyright © 2015, Norair Khachatryan

## Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
Abstract	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature	3
Juvenile Parricide Offenders	3
Conflict v. Crime-Related JHOs	6
Juvenile Sexual Homicide Offenders	6
Treated v. Untreated JHOs	8
Follow-Up Studies of Incarcerated JHOs	9
Chapter 3: Methodology	13
Sample	13
Follow-Up Data	14
Measures of Recidivism	15
Descriptive Data	16
Statistical Analysis of Overall Sample	17
Crime v. Conflict Analyses	17
Sexually-Oriented Murders	19
Chapter 4: Results	21
Sample Description	21
Incarceration-Related Data	21
Post-Release Arrests and Violent Offenses	23
Non-Violent Crime	27
Correlates of Post-release Violence	28
Recommitments	29
Non-Recidivists	30
Reexamination of Previous Successes	30
Chapter 5: Results for Crime v. Conflict Analyses	32
Classification of Sample Subjects into Groups	32
Follow-Up Findings	35
Chapter 6: Results for Sexual Homicide Subsample	40
Sample Subject Classification	40

Follow-Up Findings	43
Chapter 7: Discussion	48
Implications	51
Limitations and Directions for Future Research	53
References	56
Appendix 1: Coding Instrument	62

**List of Tables**

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics and Prior Record Information	22
Table 2: Homicide Incident Characteristics	22
Table 3: Number of Post-release arrests	24
Table 4: Number of Violent Offenses	25
Table 5: Types of Violent Offenses	26
Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Arrests and Violent Offenses	27
Table 7: Types of Non-Violent Offenses	28
Table 8: Post-Release Violence by Offender Race	29
Table 9: Number of Recommitments among Recidivists	30
Table 10: Demographic Characteristics and Prior Record Information by Cornell Homicide Type	34
Table 11: Homicide Incident Characteristics by Cornell Homicide Type	35
Table 12: Release from Prison by Cornell Homicide Type	36
Table 13: Total Number of Arrests by Cornell Homicide Type	37
Table 14: Total Number of Violent Offenses by Cornell Homicide Type	38
Table 15: T-test Analyses of Cornell Homicide Type	39
Table 16: Prior Offenses and Index Homicide	46
Table 17: Incarceration and Recidivism	47

### **Abstract**

Killings by juvenile offenders have been a matter of concern in the United States since the 1980s. Although the rate of juvenile-perpetrated murders has been declining since the 1990s, it remains problematic, in that juvenile offenders account for approximately 10% of all homicide arrests. Research on recidivism of juvenile homicide offenders (JHOs) is important, due to relatively short follow-up periods in prior studies and a recent Supreme Court ruling that struck down mandatory life sentences without the possibility of parole for juveniles convicted of murder. The present study was designed to explore long-term patterns of recidivism, and particularly violent recidivism, in a sample of 59 male JHOs from a Southeastern state who were prosecuted as adults for murder or attempted murder in the early 1980s, convicted, and sentenced to adult prison. Furthermore, the predictive utility of a juvenile homicide typology was analyzed, and the offenders who committed sexually-oriented murders were examined in-depth. The results indicated that close to 90% of released offenders have been rearrested during the 30-year follow-up period, and more than 60% have been rearrested for violent offenses. Five offenders completed (4 offenders) or attempted (1 offender) a new homicide. Out of 7 variables tested, race emerged as the only significant correlate of post-release violence. Release from prison, post-release arrests, and post-release violent offenses were not significantly related to the circumstances of the index homicide (crime-oriented v. conflict-oriented). The subsample of juvenile sexual homicide offenders (JSHOs) consisted of 8 offenders; 6 of them were released from prison, 4 were rearrested, and 3 were rearrested for violent offenses. None of the released JSHOs were arrested for a homicide or any sexually-related crimes. The implications of the

findings for management of JHOs, the comparability of this study to prior studies, and directions for future research are discussed.

## Chapter 1: Introduction

Killings by juveniles have been a subject of great interest in academia and the mainstream media in the past several decades. Almost every day in the United States, there are new stories about juveniles who commit gang-related homicides, domestic homicides, and thrill killings, among other types. The topic of juvenile homicide became particularly sensational in the mid-1990s, when arrests of youths under the age of 18 for homicide in the U.S. were the highest on record (3,284 arrests in 1993), and at the end of the 20th century, after a spate of deadly school shootings that culminated in the massacre at Columbine high school (Heide, 1999; Blumstein, 2002). In the late 1990s, the rate of killings by juveniles was observed to be approximately 15 times higher in the United States than in most other industrialized nations (Bailey, 2000).

Although the rate of juvenile homicide has been somewhat declining in the new millennium, contrary to the predictions of experts in the 1990s (Zimring, 2012), it remains a serious problem. Individuals under the age of 18 accounted for almost 10% of 9,775 homicide arrests in 2009 (Heide, Sepowitz, Solomon, & Chan, 2012), and more than 7% of the 9895 people arrested for homicide in 2011 (FBI, 2012). The post-incarceration experiences of juvenile homicide offenders (hereinafter, JHOs) are particularly important in this day and age, given the relatively recent *Miller v. Alabama* (2012) Supreme Court ruling, which banned mandatory life sentences without the possibility of parole for juveniles convicted of murder (Greene & Evelo, 2013). This ruling will most likely lead to an increase in the proportion of JHOs who are released back into society in the coming years, which makes studying the recidivism patterns of these individuals a matter of crucial importance. It is essential for researchers and the public to know

the experiences of this population of offenders over a long period of time, and what factors increase the likelihood that juvenile killers will engage in criminal activity after release from confinement.

This thesis was designed to explore more in depth whether people who were incarcerated for murder or attempted murder as juveniles succeeded or failed post-release. This study provided a long-term analysis of JHOs' recidivism patterns. Additionally, given the high societal interest in sex offenders, the juveniles in the current sample who committed sexually-oriented murders were examined in-depth. The present study builds on previous follow-up studies that have examined the post-homicide experiences of JHOs.

## **Chapter 2: Review of the Literature**

Over the years, much effort has been devoted to understanding the causes of juvenile homicide. Heide (2003, 2015) and Dent and Jowitt (2003) provided valuable descriptions of different factors that have been found to contribute to juvenile homicide, which include neurological impairments, psychological disorders, learning difficulties, abusive and violent family environments, substance abuse, and early onset of aggressive and anti-social behavior. Dozens of studies have been conducted on the correlates of juvenile homicide, but there is a dearth of research on what happens to this population of offenders after they commit the homicide and are released back into society from incarceration in juvenile or adult correctional institutions or time in treatment facilities.

Five different categories of studies will be reviewed: juvenile parricide offenders, comparisons between conflict-motivated JHOs and crime-motivated JHOs, juvenile sexual homicide offenders, comparisons between treated and untreated JHOs, and follow-up studies on groups of JHOs who served time in correctional facilities. Due to the fact that adult homicide offenders are developmentally different and face different legal circumstances than their juvenile counterparts (Grisso, 1996; Greene & Evelo, 2013), follow-up studies about them will not be included in this literature review.

### *Juvenile Parricide Offenders*

Early studies of post-detention adjustment of JHOs focused primarily on juveniles who killed or attempted to kill their parents (juvenile parricide offenders), and typically consisted of small clinical samples. Duncan and Duncan (1971) reported that 4 out of 6 juvenile parricide offenders

in their study desisted from criminal activity, in an analysis that was conducted more than 10 years after their release. There was no follow-up information available on the other two offenders. Tanay (1973, 1976) provided follow-up information on three juveniles who killed an abusive parent. The follow-up time frame was between 4 and 10 years, and all three offenders made a successful re-integration to society; none of them were rearrested. Similar results were obtained in Post's (1982) analysis of a sample of four abused juvenile parricide offenders. Follow-up information, for which the length of time was unspecified, was available for two male offenders, and neither of them had been rearrested at the time of that analysis. The juvenile parricide offenders in the studies by Tanay and Post fit the description of Heide's "severely abused parricide offenders" (Heide, 2013). These adolescents kill an abusive parent for the sake of physical or mental survival.

Corder, Ball, Haizlip, Rollins, and Beaumont (1976) compared post-detention outcomes between 10 juveniles who killed a parent, 10 juveniles who killed a relative other than a parent, and 10 juveniles who killed a stranger. The average follow-up period was 4.5 years. The results indicated that the parricide offenders fared much better than the non-parricide offenders; only 1 out of 10 parricide offenders was incarcerated at the time of the follow-up, compared to 19 out of the 20 JHOs who killed a non-parental relative or a stranger.

Russell (1984) and Heide (1992) both reported follow-up information on two juvenile parricide offenders, with mixed results. In Russell's sample, one of the offenders obtained an advanced degree, became a professor, and had not been rearrested; on the other hand, the second offender continued committing violent crimes after being released on parole, including attacks against strangers. Heide also followed-up on two parricide offenders with differential post-release outcomes. One of the juveniles had not gotten into trouble since his supervised release

2.5 years prior to that point, but the second juvenile did not adjust well after he had been found not guilty by reason of insanity and was released from a mental hospital. This youth was arrested for committing a number of armed robberies, and sent to prison. After his release, while he was on probation, he violated his probation by absconding.

In a recent literature review by Heide (2013), she found that while many juvenile parricide offenders readjusted well to society (as occurred in the previously mentioned studies), post-release outcomes for some offenders were not as favorable. A male matricide (murder of the mother) offender developed neurotic and psychotic symptoms after the homicide (Scherl & Mack, 1966); a female matricide offender was reported to have been suffering from paranoid delusions and persistent homicidal and suicidal thoughts (Mack, Scherl, and Macht, 1973); and, two male patricide (murder of the father) offenders committed new homicides following their release from confinement (Anthony, 1973; Reinhardt, 1970).

In addition to reviewing past recidivism studies, Heide (2013) also provided follow-up information on a sample of 11 juvenile parricide offenders she had evaluated. Of these, five had been released from an adult prison (4 offenders) or a mental institution (1 offender). Nine of the offenders were male and two were female. The average follow-up period was 12 years. Only one out of the five released offenders committed no further crimes, three had committed new crimes, and one had violated the terms of his probation and was sent back to prison. One of the recidivists committed a double homicide more than a decade after his release.

Among the offenders who had not been released from prison, 2 out of the 6 offenders adjusted successfully to the prison environment, and four experienced poor adjustment. One offender killed a fellow inmate, and the remaining three had received extensive amounts of disciplinary reports, and had been spending a large portion of their incarceration in disciplinary

confinement.

### *Conflict v. Crime-Related JHOs*

Cornell and colleagues (1987) divided juvenile homicide offenders into three groups: a conflict group (30 offenders), in which murder was committed during an interpersonal dispute; a crime group (37 offenders), in which murder was committed during the commission of a crime, such as robbery or rape; and a psychotic group (5 offenders), which consisted of juveniles who suffered from psychotic symptoms during the commission of the homicide. In that study, juveniles who committed crime-related offenses were more likely to have a prior criminal record, poor school adjustment, substance abuse problems, and a lower level of stress before the homicide, in comparison to juveniles who killed during conflict. The researchers concluded that crime-oriented JHOs were less amenable to treatment due to higher psychological maladjustment, and were thus more likely to engage in future criminal behavior than conflict-oriented JHOs.

In an analysis of Canadian juvenile homicide offenders, Toupin (1993) examined follow-up data on a sample of 43 homicide offenders, which was selected from police and youth court records, as well as records from a psychiatric hospital and several residential treatment centers. The follow-up time frame was approximately seven years. The juveniles who committed conflict-related homicides recidivated on a smaller scale—in terms of any offenses, violent offenses, and serious offenses—compared to both crime-oriented juvenile homicide offenders and a control group of property offenders.

### *Juvenile Sexual Homicide Offenders*

In a case study of a 13-year old juvenile sexual homicide offender who fatally stabbed an adult female neighbor, Myers, Eggleston, and Smoak (2003) found that he was struggling to readjust

to society. In the three years between his release and the end of the follow-up period, this youth was arrested twice: once for being in a possession of a gun and once for stalking an ex-girlfriend, both of which were violations of the terms of his probation.

Two follow-up studies with larger samples have been conducted about recidivism among juvenile sexual homicide offenders. Hill, Habermann, Klusmann, Berner, and Briken (2008) examined a sample of 166 German sexual homicide offenders who had committed a sexual homicide between 1945 and 1991; 11% of sample subjects (19 offenders) were under the age of 18 when they committed the sexual killing. After a search through German federal criminal records, the authors provided follow-up information on 90 offenders who had been released from incarceration for the index homicide conviction. The follow-up period was approximately 10 years.

The results of this study indicated that none of the juvenile sexual homicide offenders had committed another homicide. Offenders who committed their first sexual homicide when they were younger than 21 and offenders who served less than 15 years committed higher rates of post-release sexual violence. The authors also noted that the individuals who committed their first sexual offense as juveniles were more likely than their adult counterparts to commit non-sexual violent offenses after release.

Myers, Chan, Vo, and Lazarou (2010) examined a sample of 22 juvenile sexual killers who were tried in adult court. This study was the first one to investigate how young sexual killers in the United States fared after release from custody. Eleven offenders out of the original 22 had either been released from prison after their initial homicide (9 offenders), or had not been caught for the sexual homicide for which they were included in the study (2 offenders); 6 out of those 11 offenders committed additional crimes. Three of the recidivists committed additional sexually-

oriented homicides. Among the remaining three recidivists, one offender was arrested for selling drugs and resisting arrest with violence, and the other two violated the conditions of their parole.

Psychopathy was found to be significantly higher among the offenders who recidivated than among those who desisted from offending, and all the recidivists who committed additional sexual homicides met the criteria for sexual sadism, compared to only one non-homicide recidivist. The authors concluded that juvenile sexual murderers were at a higher risk of future lethal violence than non-sexual juvenile murderers.

#### *Treated v. Untreated JHOs*

The current knowledge about the differences in recidivism rates between JHOs who receive treatment and JHOs who do not receive treatment was produced mainly by the work of one organization. The Texas Youth Commission evaluated the effectiveness of an intensive group treatment program, the Capital Offender Program (COP), later known as the Capital and Serious Violent Offender Treatment Program (C&SVOTP), in reducing recidivism rates for JHOs and other types of violent juvenile offenders. The program is administered at the Giddings State School in Giddings, Texas. JHOs who were enrolled in COP were compared to a control group of JHOs who were not able to receive treatment because of space limitations. Recidivism was measured by examining re-arrest and re-conviction data at 1- and 3-year intervals (Howell, 1995; Texas Youth Commission, 1996)

The first set of results showed short-term support for the COP, in that JHOs who were treated had lower re-arrest and reincarceration rates than those who were not treated, 1 year after release. However, after 3 years, these differences disappeared, and treated JHOs were no longer significantly less likely to reoffend than their control group counterparts.

Subsequent analyses provided more promising results for this program. JHOs who were exposed to treatment were 16% less likely to be rearrested than untreated JHOs, at both 1- and 3-year time points. In regard to incarceration, treated offenders were 70% and 43% less likely to be reincarcerated after 1 year and 3 years, respectively, compared to untreated offenders (Texas Youth Commission, 1997; as reported in Heide, 1999).

Inspection of more recent data indicates that the C&SVOTP remains a powerful tool in reducing reoffending rates among violent juvenile offenders. Heide (2013) reported that youths who completed the program in 2006 were 55% less likely to be reincarcerated for any offense and 43% less likely to be reincarcerated for a felony, compared to youths who did not participate in the program. In 2010, juveniles who were enrolled in the program, regardless of completion status, were 66% significantly less likely to be rearrested for any offense than their untreated counterparts. Treated juveniles were also 19% less likely to be rearrested for a violent offense, but that difference was not statistically significant (Texas Youth Commission, 2010).

#### *Follow-Up Studies of Incarcerated JHOs*

To date, there have been four studies that have analyzed recidivism in moderate to large samples of JHOs who were released from correctional institutions. In three of these studies, JHOs were placed in juvenile correctional facilities (Hagan, 1997; Trulson, Caudill, Haerle, and DeLisi., 2012; Vries & Liem, 2011). In the remaining study, JHOs were incarcerated in adult prisons (Heide, Spencer, Thompson, and Solomon, 2001). In the three studies that reported overall recidivism data for the JHOs, the results, as discussed below, were strikingly similar. These studies reported that approximately 60% of JHOs in the three samples recidivated in the follow-up periods which ranged from one year to 16 years (Hagan, 1997; Heide et al., 2001, Vries & Liem, 2011).

Hagan (1997) tracked 20 male subjects who were convicted as juveniles of a completed homicide or an attempted homicide, and were released back into society in the late 1970s and 1980s. The follow-up time frame ranged from a minimum of 5 years to more than 15 years after release. Hagan found that none of the offenders had committed another homicide, but that 60% (12 offenders) of them had recidivated, and 58% of recidivists (7 offenders) had committed another violent act. Additionally, half of the sample received new prison sentences. Hagan noted that there was no difference between the homicide offenders and the attempted homicide offenders in relation to likelihood of recidivating. There was also no significant difference between the sample of JHOs and a control sample of non-homicide juvenile offenders, in relation to post-release criminal activity.

In a follow-up study that investigated the same sample that will be examined in the present study, Heide and colleagues (2001) followed up on a sample of 59 male JHOs who were convicted and sentenced in the adult criminal justice system and received by the adult department of corrections (DOC) in a southeastern state between 1982 and 1984. The sample consisted of juveniles who were convicted of murder, attempted murder, or manslaughter. This study relied on DOC data to track the commitment, release, and recommitments of the subjects. The follow-up period ranged from 1 year to 16 years, depending on the offender. The homicide offenders were considered recidivists if they were re-committed to prison after committing a new crime or violating their parole conditions.

The researchers found that 43 of the 59 offenders in the sample were released from prison, and that 60% (25 offenders) of those who were released received new prison sentences or were recommitted for a parole violation. Eighty percent of the recidivists in the sample reoffended within the first 3 years after release. The authors emphasized that due to the

conservative measure of failure employed—return to prison—the percentage of recidivists was likely higher than the 60% reported in the study.

Vries and Liem (2011) conducted the only European follow-up study of JHOs to date. The sample consisted of 137 Dutch JHOs; 85% of them (116 offenders) were male and 15% (21 offenders) were female. The offenders in this study constituted all the juveniles convicted of homicide between 1992 and 2007 in the Netherlands. The follow-up period ranged from 1 year to 16 years. In addition to providing descriptive information about the recidivistic behavior of the sample, the authors also examined whether a group of static and dynamic risk factors was useful in predicting whether individuals would recidivate or not.

During the entire follow-up period, more than half of the sample (59%) committed additional offenses after release from incarceration. Three percent of all recidivistic offenses were either completed (2 offenses) or attempted (16 offenses) homicides. Regarding influential risk factors, three static risk factors were found to significantly predict recidivism: being male, lack of self-control, and criminal history. Lack of self-control was defined as a risk factor that does not change over time because it was described as such in previous literature (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Nagin and Paternoster, 2000). Two dynamic risk factors predicted recidivism: Associating with delinquent peers and substance abuse. The latter influenced recidivism in the unexpected direction, in that a substance abuse problem decreased the likelihood of recidivism.

The last known study in this area was published by Trulson and colleagues (2012), in which the researchers examined whether juveniles who committed gang-related homicides were more likely to recidivate than other types of juvenile offenders who committed murder or other crimes. Their sample consisted of 1,804 serious and violent male juvenile offenders, who were both incarcerated and released from a large Southern juvenile correctional facility between the

years 1987 and 2004. One hundred twenty-six of those delinquents were convicted of a gang-related homicide, and 338 of them were convicted of a non gang-related homicide, and labeled “general homicide offenders”. The dependent variables of interest were any recidivism within 3 years of release, felony recidivism within 3 years of release, and frequency of new arrests.

The results revealed that juvenile gang murderers were 51% more likely to be rearrested after release and approximately 90% more likely to be rearrested for a felony offense, in relation to general homicide offenders and non-homicide offenders. However, conviction for a gang-related murder had no significant effect on the frequency of new arrests. Furthermore, when compared to non-homicide offenders, general homicide offenders were 72% more likely to be arrested for a new felony offense. Descriptive recidivism information (i.e., overall percentage of recidivists in the sample) was not provided by the authors.

Perusal of prior research indicated that prior studies have used relatively short follow-up periods and that a long-term prospective study of JHO recidivism has not been done yet. The present study was designed to address the knowledge gap regarding juvenile killers’ experiences after incarceration and up to middle adulthood, through the use of post-release data spanning approximately 30 years.

### **Chapter 3: Methodology**

#### *Sample*

The sample in this follow-up investigation consisted of 59 male JHOs who were charged with either first degree murder, second degree murder, or attempted murder in the early 1980s. Three of the offenders were ultimately convicted of manslaughter, but they were originally charged with murder (in the first or second degree), so they were included in the study because, based on record data and interviews with these individuals, the murder charge was deemed a better indicator of the manner in which they carried out the killing. Juveniles who were convicted of attempted murder were included in the study because it was determined that their intentions did not differ from those who completed the homicide; the outcome was different due to factors such as poor execution on the part of the offender, the physical health of the victim, and the availability of medical care (Heide et al., 2001).

The research project with the above sample of JHOs was initiated in a Southeastern state, by Dr. Kathleen Heide. Sample subjects for the study were identified through a computer search conducted by the state DOC in 1984. The following inclusion criteria were used to select the subjects:

- 1) Male;
- 2) Under the age of 18 when the killing occurred;
- 3) Processed through the adult criminal justice system;
- 4) Sentenced as an adult, and received by the Department of Corrections between January 1982 and January 1984;

- 5) Incarcerated in the Department of Corrections less than a year at the time they were identified by the computer search; and
- 6) 19 or younger at the time of the initial interview.

The subjects were all males because at that time, similarly to the present situation, juvenile homicide was a male-dominated crime (Heide, Solomon, Sellers, & Chan, 2011). Dr. Heide administered in-depth psychological interviews to the 59 offenders. These interviews covered family, school and work history, drug and alcohol involvement, dating history and sexual involvement, activities, and delinquent involvement. In addition, extensive record data were collected about these 59 individuals, including police reports that provided the circumstances of each homicide, prior delinquent records, family data, education and work history, substance abuse involvement, and sentencing information. The data were collected from various sources, such as probation department reports, indictment and charging documents, sentencing documents, and DOC records. All of the necessary materials were contained in inmate records maintained by the DOC.

#### *Follow-up Data*

Follow-up information was obtained through two methods: first, an internet search was performed in order to find out the incarceration status of the original sample subjects.

Subsequently, the DOC provided extensive follow-up data about the offenders who were not shown to be incarcerated on the internet or were not located at all during that search. The DOC data included arrests during incarceration and after release (including probation and parole violations), case dispositions, and criminal registration notices, which gave an indication about the possible current location of a particular offender. The follow-up data spanned approximately 30 years, and were up to December 2012.

A coding instrument was developed in order to record the follow-up data (see Appendix 1). The instrument included the following categories: violent offenses, property offenses, drug-related offenses, possession of a firearm, loitering and/or prowling, willful obstruction of law enforcement, and other types of offenses, including probation/parole violations. Arrests for loitering and/or prowling and willful obstruction of law enforcement were seen numerous times at the beginning stages of coding, and these two offenses were thus added to the instrument.

Coding of follow-up data was done at an adult correctional facility by five coders. Training on how to rate the items was undertaken by Dr. Heide. Inter-rater reliability was checked at the beginning of the coding and was nearly 100%. The coding of every subject was double-checked by a second coder at the prison site. Any disagreements were discussed and resolved, bringing the inter-rater reliability to 100%.

### *Measures of Recidivism*

The previous follow-up study by Heide and colleagues (2001) used recommitment to prison as a measure of recidivism. In the current study, the more liberal measure of new arrests is used to measure success and failure, but recommitment data are also reported. This addition provides another measure of whether a JHO succeeded or failed at abiding by society's rules, after release from incarceration. Offenders were classified as recidivists if they were arrested for new crimes, violations or probation/parole, or both. Furthermore, since the current DOC follow-up data included arrests that occurred during the time-frame of the last follow-up study, sample subjects who were evaluated as successes because they were not recommitted during the first follow-up study were re-visited, in order to examine whether those people succeeded in staying out of trouble with respect to post-release arrests as well.

### *Descriptive Data*

The sample was described in terms of demographic characteristics (race, age at homicide arrest), pre-homicide delinquency (prior record, prior violent record, total number of prior arrests, age at first arrest), and homicide-related characteristics (presence of accomplices, weapon choice).

Nominal variables were represented by frequencies and continuous variables were represented by mean values. The variables selected to describe the sample have been identified in prior research as correlates of adult criminal offending (See, Farrington, 1989; Moffitt, 1993; Trulson et al., 2012).

The most important aim of this study was to find out what has happened to these individuals in the approximately 30 years that have passed since they were first incarcerated. The following basic information was reported about the sample: (1) number of offenders who are still incarcerated on the original charge, (2) number of offenders who have died, (3) arrests during homicide-related incarceration and after release, (4) types of violent and non-violent offenses committed after release, (5) recommitments to prison, and (6) observations regarding time served and time at risk.

Regarding post-release arrests, violent offenses were described in greater detail than other types of offenses due to the general public's particular anxiety about violent recidivism (Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 1991). In order to portray the amount of post-release violence perpetrated by the offenders more accurately, the number of violence-related charges was reported, rather than the number of violence-related arrests. Time served for the offenders who were released was calculated from their arrest date to their prison release date, thereby recognizing that experiences in jail while awaiting trial can be important in shaping an offender's behavior during prison confinement and after release.

### *Statistical Analysis of Overall Sample*

Cross-tabular analyses were utilized to examine whether violent recidivism was significantly related to the following variables: offender race, prior delinquent record, prior violent record, number of prior arrests, age at first arrest, presence of accomplices, and homicide weapon choice. Three variables were dichotomized, based on their distributions: age at first arrest (**1** = 12 or below, **2** = 13 and above), number of prior arrests (**1** = 2 or below, **2** = 3 and above), and homicide weapon choice (1 = firearm, 2 = non-firearm). The dependent variable, which represented post-release violent offenses, was also measured dichotomously (1 = yes, 2 = no).

The Bonferroni correction method was employed to examine whether the values of the independent variables significantly differed for either of the two values on the dependent variable. Significance level was set at .05 for all the statistical analyses in this study. Given the nominal nature of the tested variables, Phi and Cramer's V were selected to measure the strength of any significant relationships. Values of 0.2 were defined as small effects, values of .05 as moderate effects, and those at .08 as strong effects (Ferguson, 2009).

### *Crime v. Conflict Analyses*

Police reports describing homicide circumstances were perused in order to classify offenders into the three categories identified by Cornell and his colleagues. A homicide incident was classified as *crime-oriented* if there was clear evidence of criminal motivation at the beginning of the incident. Both felonies and misdemeanors fit the criteria for this category. In contrast, a homicide incident was classified as *conflict-oriented* if there was clear evidence of a direct conflict between the offender and the victim. The third subgroup of JHOs in the typology—those who experienced psychotic symptoms during the homicide event—was not represented in this sample.

JHOs were classified into one of the two homicide groups by two raters, who initially agreed on the classification of 93% of the 59 offenders. One of the raters had doubts about four cases and did not rate them. When these cases were examined and discussed, both raters classified the offenders into the same homicide offender groups, bringing the final inter-rater reliability to 100%.

The two groups of JHOs were compared on demographic characteristics, prior delinquent history, and homicide-related characteristics to determine if the groups differed significantly on these variables. Afterwards, cross-tabular analyses were used to test for significant relationships between the homicide circumstances (hereinafter, “Cornell homicide type”) and three dependent variables: release from prison, number of post-release arrests, and number of post-release offenses. Similarly to the analyses of the entire sample, the Bonferroni method was also used, in order to analyze the relationship between Cornell homicide type and each individual value of the dependent variables. Additionally, the relationships between Cornell homicide type and the two recidivism variables were analyzed using a T-test, for the purpose of examining whether there are mean differences between the two groups with respect to post-release arrests and violent offenses.

Depending on the findings from the bivariate cross-tabular analyses of the overall sample and those pertaining to the crime v. conflict typology, a multivariate analysis may be conducted in order to investigate whether violent recidivism can be predicted by certain variables. As previously stated, violent crimes warrant a more in-depth focus because post-incarceration violence is the primary concern with respect to released homicide offenders.

The variables representing arrests and violent offenses were originally continuous, but were re-coded into categories for the purpose of these analyses. The variable representing release

from prison (coded as 1 = JHO never released from prison, 2 = JHO was released from prison) also had to be recoded in order to exclude the offenders who had died while serving their sentence for the homicide conviction.

Based on the results from Toupin's (1993) follow-up study and the generally positive readjustment to society that was demonstrated by conflict-oriented parricide offenders in prior research (Corder et al., 1976; Duncan and Duncan, 1971; Post, 1982; Tanay, 1973, 1976), two hypotheses were tested in this study:

*Hypothesis 1:* Crime-oriented offenders will accumulate more post-release arrests than conflict-oriented offenders.

*Hypothesis 2:* Crime-oriented offenders will commit more violent offenses than conflict-oriented offenders.

### *Sexually-Oriented Murders*

As mentioned in the introduction, the juveniles in the sample who have committed sexually-oriented homicides were addressed in this study as a special interest group. Myers (2002) stated that juvenile sexual killers have a greater chance of being reformed after release from custody than their adult counterparts; in contrast, Hill and colleagues (2008) noted that younger sexual killers were more likely to reoffend than older ones, as mentioned earlier. With these pieces of information in mind, and the very high interest of the public in sex offenses, this group of offenders warranted a closer look.

Using the original police reports, crime scene circumstances were reviewed for each of the 59 offenders in the sample. In order to be classified as a sexual homicide, the crime had to contain one or more of the following elements (Ressler, Burgess, & Douglas, 1988):

- 1) Partial or complete removal of the victim's attire, or lack of attire;

- 2) Exposure of the sexual parts of the victim's body;
- 3) Sexual positioning of the body;
- 4) Insertion of foreign objects into the victim's body cavities;
- 5) Evidence of sexual intercourse (vaginal, anal, oral); and
- 6) Evidence of substitute sexual activity, interest, or sadistic fantasy, such as mutilation of the victim's genitals.

## Chapter 4: Results

### *Sample Description*

Demographic information and prior delinquent behavior of the JHOs in the sample are presented in Table 1. Thirty eight sample subjects (64%) were Black and the remaining 21 subjects (36%) were White. At the time of their arrest, the mean age of the offenders was approximately 16 years old. Of the 58 offenders for whom prior record data were available, more than three quarters (44 offenders) had been arrested prior to the homicide, and approximately 45% (26 offenders) had been arrested for violent offenses. The mean number of prior offenses was close to 4. Age at first arrest was known for 40 of the 44 offenders with prior arrest histories, and the mean age was lower than 13 years.

As shown in Table 2, the majority of offenders (71%) were involved in homicide incidents in which the victim or victims were killed. Nearly three quarters of sample JHOs (73%) committed the homicide offense with accomplices, and nearly half of JHOs (49%) used a firearm during the commission of the offense. Among weapons of choice, the “others” category (20% of the sample) included manual and ligature strangulation, asphyxiation, personal weapons (hands, feet, knees), and multiple weapons, in which more than one weapon was used and it was not clear which one inflicted the fatal wounds.

### *Incarceration-Related Data*

Out of the 59 JHOs in the sample, eight offenders (14%) have never been released from prison

**Table 1.** Demographic Characteristics and Prior Record Information

Variables	N
Race (n = 59)	
White (%)	21 (35.6)
Black (%)	38 (64.4)
Total(%)	59 (100.0)
Age at Homicide Arrest (n = 59)	
Mean (SD)	15.97 (.850)
Range	14-18
Prior Record (n = 58) <sup>a</sup>	
Yes (%)	44 (75.9)
No (%)	14 (24.1)
Total (%)	58 (100.0)
Prior Violent Record (n = 58) <sup>a</sup>	
Yes (%)	26 (44.8)
No (%)	32 (55.2)
Total (%)	58 (100.0)
Age at First Arrest (n = 40) <sup>b</sup>	
Mean (SD)	12.75 (2.351)
Range	7-16
Prior Arrests Total (n = 58) <sup>a</sup>	
Mean (SD)	3.72 (3.910)
Range	0-16

<sup>a</sup> Prior record data was missing for one subject

<sup>b</sup> data on age at first arrest was missing for 5 subjects; 14 subjects had no prior arrests.

**Table 2.** Homicide Incident Characteristics (n = 59)

Variables	N (%)
Victim died	
Yes	42 (71.2)
No	17 (28.8)
Total	59 (100.0)
Accomplices	
Yes	43 (72.9)
No	16 (27.1)
Total	59 (100.0)
Weapon Choice	
Firearm	29 (49.2)
Knife	12 (20.3)
Blunt Object	6 (10.2)
Others	12 (20.3)
Total	59 (100.0)

for the index homicide conviction. Forty eight offenders were released for the homicide conviction, and the remaining three individuals died before they had a chance to be released; two of these offenders died in prison, both from AIDS-related complications, and the third one escaped from prison and was subsequently killed, under unknown circumstances. Follow-up data indicated that two additional offenders have died at some point following their release from prison, bringing the number of deceased JHOs in the sample to five. One of the two offenders died in a car accident, and the circumstances surrounding the other released offender's death are unknown.

Of the 48 JHOs who had been released from prison during the follow-up period, nine (19%) were arrested during their homicide-related incarceration; four offenders were arrested in jail while awaiting trial, and the other five offenders were arrested in prison. The offenses for which these JHOs were arrested included aggravated assault, simple assault/battery, sexual battery, arson, and attempting to escape.

#### *Post-Release Arrests and Violent Offenses*

Post-incarceration data were available for all 48 released offenders. The length of follow-up for these individuals ranged from 354 months (29 years, 5 months) to 381 months (31 years, 8 months), with a mean of 368 months (30 years, 8 months). Time served in prison for them ranged from 9 months to 336 months (28 years), with a mean of 96 months (8 years).

Perusal of Table 3 indicates that 42 of the 48 released offenders (88%) have been rearrested for new crimes or violations of probation/parole. Only one of these 42 recidivists (2%) was rearrested solely for violating their probation or parole. Of released JHOs, 77% were rearrested more than once, and 33% were arrested nine or more times. Time at risk after release

and before the first new arrest ranged from one month to 214 months (17 years, 10 months) for the recidivists, with a mean of 30 months (2 years, 6 months).

Violent recidivists constituted 63% of all released JHOs (30 offenders) and 71% of the total number of recidivists. As shown in Table 4, half the offenders who were released committed more than one violent crime and more than one third of them committed four or more violent crimes.

**Table 3.** Number of Post-release arrests (n = 48)

	N (%)
0	6 (12.5)
1	5 (10.4)
2	6 (12.5)
3	3 (6.3)
4	4 (8.3)
5	5 (10.4)
6	0
7	2 (4.2)
8	1 (2.1)
9+*	16 (33.3)
Total	48 (100.0)

\*9 more arrests.

**Table 4.** Number of Violent Offenses (n = 48)

	N (%)
0	18 (37.5)
1	6 (12.5)
2	6 (12.5)
3	1 (2.1)
4+*	17 (35.4)
Total	48 (100.0)

\*4 or more offenses.

Table 5 displays the prevalence of serious violent crime among the released sample subjects. Ten percent of the 48 released JHOs committed either completed (4 offenders) or attempted (1 offender) homicides. Nearly 70% were rearrested for aggravated assault or battery (40%) or simple assault or battery (29%). Approximately one in four of released JHOs (27%, n = 13) were rearrested for robbery; the most common type of robbery perpetrated by sample subjects was armed robbery (10 offenders). Three offenders were rearrested for committing burglary with a weapon. Only one offender in the sample committed a sexual assault after release from incarceration.

Fifteen offenders (31%) were rearrested for committing other types of violent crimes. This category included offenses that were rare, such as aggravated child abuse, or less severe in nature, such as resisting arrest with violence, unlawful restraint, threatening to use violence, and firing a weapon.

A descriptive summary of post-release arrests and violent offenses is presented in Table

**Table 5.** Types of Violent Offenses (n = 48)

Variables	N (%)
Homicide	
Yes	5 (10.4)
No	43 (89.6)
Total	48 (100.0)
Aggravated Assault/battery	
Yes	19 (39.6)
No	29 (60.4)
Total	48 (100.0)
Simple Assault/Battery*	
Yes	14 (29.2)
No	34 (70.8)
Total	48 (100.0)
Sexual Assault	
Yes	1 (2.1)
No	47 (97.9)
Total	48 (100.0)
Robbery	
Yes	13 (27.1)
No	35 (72.9)
Total	48 (100.0)
Armed Burglary	
Yes	3 (6.3)
No	45 (93.8)
Total	48 (100.1)
Other Types	
Yes	15 (31.3)
No	33 (68.8)
Total	48 (100.1)

*Note.* Armed burglary = burglary in which a weapon is displayed.

\*This category included both assaults and batteries.

6. The offenders who were released from prison have accumulated a total of 359 arrests and have committed a total of 146 violent offenses during the follow-up period. The highest number of new arrests was 30 ( $M = 7.48$ ,  $SD = 7.760$ ) and the highest number of violent offenses was 23 ( $M = 3.04$ ,  $SD = 4.187$ ).

**Table 6.** Descriptive Statistics for Arrests and Violent Offenses (n= 48)

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total number of arrests	0	30	359	7.48	7.760
Total number of violent offenses	0	23	146	3.04	4.187

### *Non-Violent Crime*

Table 7 presents post-release data on the most serious non-violent crimes and their frequencies among the 48 released JHOs. Close to half the 48 released JHOs (22 offenders) were rearrested for property crimes; offenders were arrested for personal thefts, home burglaries, vehicle burglaries, possessing or receiving stolen property, and damaging property. Slightly more than half of released offenders (n = 26) were rearrested for drug-related offenses, including the manufacturing, possession, and sale of drugs. Cocaine-related arrests were the most common in this category (14 offenders). Nearly one in five of released JHOs (10 offenders) were found in possession of a firearm (illegal for felons).

Nearly half (46%, n = 22) violated the terms of their probation or parole; all but one of these offenders had also been rearrested for new crimes. The “others” category in the table consisted of petty offenses, such as trespassing, forgery, disorderly conduct, obstruction of justice (including tampering with evidence), and non-child support; nearly two thirds of the sample (64%, n =31) committed one or more of these offenses.

Many released offenders had also engaged in a variety of relatively minor non-violent crimes (not shown in table 7 but included in the arrest count presented in Table 6). These crimes included resisting arrest without violence (18 offenders), traffic-related offenses (12 offenders),

**Table 7.** Types of Non-Violent Offenses (n= 48)

Variables	N (%)
<b>Property Offenses</b>	
Yes	22 (45.8)
No	26 (54.2)
Total	48 (100.0)
<b>Drug Offenses</b>	
Yes	26 (54.2)
No	22 (45.8)
Total	48 (100.0)
<b>Possession of a Firearm</b>	
Yes	10 (20.8)
No	38 (79.2)
Total	48 (100.0)
<b>Probation/Parole Violation</b>	
Yes	22 (45.8)
No	26 (54.2)
Total	48 (100.0)
<b>Others</b>	
Yes	31 (64.6)
No	17 (35.4)
Total	48 (100.0)

driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol (8 offenders), carrying a concealed weapon (7 offenders), and loitering and/or prowling (6 offenders).

#### *Correlates of Post-release Violence*

A cross-tabular analysis indicated that violent recidivism was significantly related to race. As demonstrated in Table 8 by the Bonferroni method, Black offenders were much more likely to accumulate post-release arrests for violence than White offenders (73% v. 40%) ( $\chi^2 (1) = 4.713$ ,  $p = .030$ ,  $\phi = -.313$ ). There were no significant relationships between post-release violence and the remaining independent variables: prior delinquent record, prior violent record, number of prior arrests, age at first arrest, presence of accomplices, and homicide weapon choice.

**Table 8.** Post-Release Violence by Offender Race

Post-Release Violent Offenses	Offender Race		Total (%)
	White (%)	Black (%)	
Yes	6 <sub>a</sub> (40.0)	24 <sub>b</sub> (72.7)	30 (62.5)
No	9 <sub>a</sub> (60.0)	9 <sub>b</sub> (27.3)	18 (37.5)
Total	15 (100.0)	33 (100.0)	48 (100.0)

*Note.*  $\chi^2 (1) = 4.713$ ,  $p = .030$ ,  $\phi = -.313$ .

### *Recommitments*

Twenty nine offenders (60%) are known to have been recommitted to prison throughout the follow-up period, constituting 69% of the recidivists in the sample. Since the previous follow-up study by Heide and colleagues (2001), at least four additional offenders have been sent back to prison for their crimes.

The above recommitment percentages need to be viewed with caution. Disposition data were unavailable or incomplete for some of the recorded arrests. Accordingly, it is possible that the proportion of recommitted offenders in the sample is much higher than the 60% figure presented here.

As shown in Table 9, 17 of the 29 recommitted offenders (59%) have experienced multiple recommitments. The highest number of known recommitments was six. The offenders were generally sent back to prison for violent, property, and drug-related offenses, as well as possession of a firearm and violations of probation/parole. Some offenders were recommitted for minor offenses, which were related to a failure of complying with law enforcement officers (e.g.,

resisting arrest, obstruction of law enforcement).

**Table 9.** Number of Recommitments among Recidivists (n = 42)

	N (%)
0	13 (31.0)
1	12 (28.6)
2+*	17 (40.5)
Total	42 (100.1)

\*2 or more recommitments.

#### *Non-Recidivists*

As reported earlier, six of the 48 released offenders have not been rearrested since their release from prison for the homicide conviction. Time at risk for these non-recidivists ranged from 40 months (3 years, 4 months) to 315 months (26 years, 3 months), with a mean of 149 months (12 years, 5 months).

All six of the non-recidivists were involved in completed homicides. Three offenders were Black and the other three were White. Four of the six non-recidivists had a prior delinquent record. Four offenders committed the murder alone and two were involved in group incidents. Three of them used firearms, one used a knife, one used a blunt object (a hammer), and the remaining offender was involved in an incident where multiple weapons were used, including tree limbs, a 2 x 4 board, and personal weapons. As of October 2014, all six of these offenders were confirmed to be alive.

#### *Reexamination of Previous Successes*

In Heide et al. (2001), the authors classified 18 offenders as “successes”, which means that they

were not sent back to prison during the follow-up period. As reported earlier, the measure of failure to reintegrate back into society in that study was recommitment to prison for new offenses or revocation of parole for the index homicide conviction, due to the unreliability of arrest data at that time.

Inspection of current follow-up data indicated that 8 of the 18 offenders who were deemed successes by the authors in the late 1990s had been arrested during the initial follow-up period of 16 years; three of those eight recidivists were arrested for violent offenses. The highest number of arrests during those 16 years was eight. Three of the 10 offenders who would be considered successes by both measures—arrests and recommitment—have remained free of criminal activity during the 30-year period. In other words, only 3 of the 18 JHOs who appeared to be successful during the first follow-up period were not rearrested over the 30-year follow-up period.

## Chapter 5: Results for Crime v. Conflict Analyses

### *Classification of Sample Subjects into Groups*

Of the 59 JHOs in the original sample, 43 were classified as crime-oriented offenders, representing 32 separate homicide incidents. Crime-oriented commitment offenses consisted of 25 robberies, four home burglaries, one vehicle burglary, one sexual assault, and one case of male prostitution that escalated to murder. The following brief case excerpts illustrate the brutality and senselessness of many of the killings by crime-oriented JHOs in the present sample:

- Three boys, ranging in age from 15 to 17, fatally beat a man with tree limbs, personal weapons (i.e., punching and kicking), and a 2 X 4 board; the motive for the attack was robbery, and the group's loot consisted of \$2.50 and a bag of groceries.
- A 15-year-old boy shot and killed a milkman during a robbery, after the victim turned over his money and pled for his life.
- A 16-year-old boy attempted to rob a jogger of money and a gold chain, and when the victim attempted to flee, he was shot in the back by the youth; the victim survived.
- Two 16-year-old boys burglarized a man's home and smothered him to death with a pillow after he confronted them.

Sixteen JHOs were classified as conflict-oriented offenders, representing 15 separate homicide incidents. The homicides in this group stemmed from conflicts with acquaintances (five incidents), strangers (four incidents), family members (three incidents), and friends (three incidents). The case excerpts presented below demonstrate the trivial nature of some of the

conflicts that resulted in a loss of life or grave bodily injury:

- A 16-year-old boy shot and killed a man who reportedly cursed at him outside a nightclub.
- A 16-year-old mistakenly accused a female friend of stealing \$40 from him during a card game, and subsequently stabbed her in the head and face repeatedly; the victim survived the attack.
- Three boys, ages 16 and 17, were involved in an argument with another male juvenile outside a skating rink and one of the JHOs chased and fatally shot the victim; the argument was over a hat worn by the juvenile victim.
- A 16-year-old boy fatally shot his father after finding out that he was going to be sent to reform school by the victim; the relationship between the JHO and the victim was reportedly marked by arguments.

The comparisons between the two groups of homicide offenders on demographic characteristics and prior delinquency are displayed in Table 10. There were no significant differences between the two groups on any of the variables pertaining to demographics and prior delinquency. The proportion of White offenders was higher in the conflict group than in the crime group. The mean age at the time of the homicide arrest was approximately 16 years old in both groups. The majority of juveniles in both groups had a prior delinquent record; in contrast, the majority in both groups had no prior arrests for violence. The mean age at first arrest and mean number of prior offenses were approximately the same in both groups.

Table 11 presents the cross-tabular analyses between Cornell homicide type and homicide-related characteristics. Crime oriented JHOs were significantly more likely than conflict-oriented JHOs to participate in group homicide incidents (86% v. 37.5%). In contrast,

conflict-oriented JHOs were more likely to act alone than their crime oriented counterparts (62.5% v. 14%) ( $\chi^2 (1) = 13.905, p < .001, \phi = -.485$ ).

Overall, the relationship between homicide circumstances and weapon choice narrowly missed reaching the level of statistical significance ( $\chi^2 (3) = 7.386, p = .06$ ). However, the Bonferroni correction factor indicated that conflict-oriented offenders were significantly more likely to use firearms than their crime-oriented counterparts (75% v. 39.5%).

**Table 10.** Demographic Characteristics and Prior Record Information by Cornell Homicide Type

Variables	Cornell Homicide Type		Total
	Crime (n = 43)	Conflict (n = 16)	
<b>Race (n = 59)</b>			
White (%)	14 (32.6)	7 (43.8)	21 (35.6)
Black (%)	29 (67.4)	9 (56.3)	38 (64.4)
Total (%)	43 (100.0)	16 (100.0)	59 (100.0)
$\chi^2 (1) = .637$			
<b>Age at Homicide Arrest (n = 59)</b>			
Mean	15.98	15.94	15.97
Range	14-18	15-17	14-18
$t (54.27) = .213$			
<b>Prior Record (n = 58)<sup>a</sup></b>			
Yes (%)	33 (78.6)	11 (68.8)	44 (75.9)
No (%)	9 (21.4)	5 (31.3)	14 (24.1)
Total (%)	42 (100.0)	16 (100.1)	58 (100.0)
$\chi^2 (1) = .610$			
<b>Prior Violent Record (n = 58)<sup>a</sup></b>			
Yes (%)	19 (45.2)	7 (43.8)	26 (44.8)
No (%)	23 (54.8)	9 (56.3)	32 (55.2)
Total (%)	42 (100.0)	16 (100.1)	58 (100.0)
$\chi^2 (1) = .010$			
<b>Age at First Arrest (n = 40)<sup>b</sup></b>			
Mean	12.83	12.50	12.75
Range	7-16	8-16	7-16
$t (38) = .384$			
<b>Prior Arrests Total (n = 58)<sup>a</sup></b>			
Mean	3.81	3.50	3.72
Range	0-16	0-11	0-16
$t (56) = .267$			

<sup>a</sup> Prior record data was missing for one subject

<sup>b</sup> data on age at first arrest was missing for one 5 subjects;  
14 subjects had no prior arrests.

**Table 11.** Homicide Incident Characteristics by Cornell Homicide Type (n = 59)

Variables	Cornell Homicide Type		Total (%)
	Crime (%)	Conflict (%)	
<b>Accomplices</b>			
Yes	37 <sub>a</sub> (86.0)	6 <sub>b</sub> (37.5)	43 (72.9)
No	6 <sub>a</sub> (14.0)	10 <sub>b</sub> (62.5)	16 (27.1)
Total	43 (100.0)	16 (100.0)	59 (100.0)
$\chi^2 (1) = 13.905^{**}$			
<b>Weapon Choice</b>			
Firearm	17 <sub>a</sub> (39.5)	12 <sub>b</sub> (75.0)	29 (49.2)
Knife	11 <sub>a</sub> (25.6)	1 <sub>a</sub> (6.3)	12 (20.3)
Blunt Objects	4 <sub>a</sub> (9.3)	2 <sub>a</sub> (12.5)	6 (10.2)
Others+	11 <sub>a</sub> (25.6)	1 <sub>a</sub> (6.3)	12 (20.3)
Total	43 (100.0)	16 (100.0)	59 (100.0)
$\chi^2 (3) = 7.386$			

\*\*p < .001,  $\phi = -.485$ .

### *Follow-Up Findings*

The cross-tabular analysis between Cornell homicide type and release from prison is presented in Table 12. This analysis included only the 56 offenders who did not die in prison or while escaping from prison. Among the eight JHOs who have never been released, six were in the crime group and two were in the conflict group. The relationship between the two variables was not significant, meaning that homicide type (crime v. conflict) was not significantly related to whether an offender was released from prison.

The subsample of 48 released JHOs consisted of 35 crime-oriented offenders and 13 conflict-oriented offenders. The mean time served in prison was 96 months (8 years) for crime-oriented JHOs and 99 months (8 years, 3 months) for conflict-oriented JHOs. The mean length of follow-up for crime-oriented offenders was 368 months (30 years, 8 months), compared to 369 months (30 years, 9 months) for their conflict-oriented counterparts. There were no significant

**Table 12.** Release from Prison by Cornell Homicide Type (n = 56)

Never Released from Prison	Cornell Homicide Type		Total (%)
	Crime (%)	Conflict (%)	
Yes	6 <sub>a</sub> (14.6)	2 <sub>a</sub> (13.3)	8 (14.3)
No	35 <sub>a</sub> (85.4)	13 <sub>a</sub> (86.7)	48 (85.7)
Total	41 (100.0)	15 (100.0)	56 (100.0)

<sup>a</sup> Not significant Chi Square/Bonferroni factor

Note:  $\chi^2(1) = 0.015$ ,  $p = .902$ .

differences between the two groups on time served ( $t(46) = -.130$ ,  $p = .897$ ) and follow-up length ( $t(46) = -.661$ ,  $p = .512$ ).

Cross-tabular analyses between Cornell homicide type and the remaining two dependent variables are presented in Tables 13 and 14. Inspection of Table 13 reveals that the two groups did not differ significantly in terms of the number of arrests. The Bonferroni correction method indicated that there was no significant difference between Cornell homicide type values for any of the values on this dependent variable. Furthermore, as shown in the footnote, the two groups did not significantly differ when the variable for post-release arrests was tested dichotomously. It is interesting to note that the highest percentage of crime group offenders (37%) were rearrested nine or more time, and equal percentages of conflict-oriented offenders (23%) had either zero new arrests or were rearrested nine or more times.

Similarly, as shown in Table 14, no significant differences emerged between the two groups with respect to the number of violent offenses. Also, Cornell homicide type was not related to whether or not an offender was rearrested for a violent offense (see footnote). Notably,

at least 30% of crime-oriented offenders either did not commit any violent offenses or committed four or more violent offenses, and almost half of conflict-oriented offenders (46%) did not commit any post-release violent offenses.

**Table 13.** Total Number of Arrests by Cornell Homicide Type (n = 48)

Total number of arrests	Cornell Homicide Type		Total (%)
	Crime (%)	Conflict (%)	
0	3 <sub>a</sub> (8.6)	3 <sub>a</sub> (23.1)	6 (12.5)
1	3 <sub>a</sub> (8.6)	2 <sub>a</sub> (15.4)	5 (10.4)
2	6 <sub>a</sub> (17.1)	0 <sub>a</sub>	6 (12.5)
3	2 <sub>a</sub> (5.7)	1 <sub>a</sub> (7.7)	3 (6.3)
4	2 <sub>a</sub> (5.7)	2 <sub>a</sub> (15.4)	4 (8.3)
5	4 <sub>a</sub> (11.4)	1 <sub>a</sub> (7.7)	5 (10.4)
6	0	0	0
7	1 <sub>a</sub> (2.9)	1 <sub>a</sub> (7.7)	2 (4.2)
8	1 <sub>a</sub> (2.9)	0 <sub>a</sub>	1 (2.1)
9+*	13 <sub>a</sub> (37.1)	3 <sub>a</sub> (23.1)	16 (33.3)
Total	35 (100.0)	13 (100.0)	48 (100.0)

<sup>a</sup>Not significant Chi Square/Bonferroni factor

Note:  $\chi^2(8) = 6.963$ ,  $p = .541$ ; \* 9 or more arrests.

Dichotomous variable (1 = rearrested, 2 = not rearrested) = ns

**Table 14.** Total Number of Violent Offenses by Cornell Homicide Type (n = 48)

Total number of violent Offenses	Cornell Homicide Type		Total (%)
	Crime (%)	Conflict (%)	
0	12 <sub>a</sub> (34.3)	6 <sub>a</sub> (46.2)	18 (37.5)
1	5 <sub>a</sub> (14.3)	1 <sub>a</sub> (7.7)	6 (12.5)
2	4 <sub>a</sub> (11.4)	2 <sub>a</sub> (15.4)	6 (12.5)
3	1 <sub>a</sub> (2.9)	0 <sub>a</sub>	1 (2.1)
4+*	13 <sub>a</sub> (37.1)	4 <sub>a</sub> (30.8)	17 (35.4)
Total	35 (100.0)	13 (100.0)	48 (100.0)

<sub>a</sub> Not significant Chi Square/Bonferroni factor

Note:  $\chi^2(4) = 1.285$ ,  $p = .864$ ; \*4 or more offenses.

Dichotomous variable (1 = rearrested for violence,  
2 = not rearrested for violence) = ns

Table 15 displays the T-test analyses between Cornell homicide type and the two dependent recidivism variables. Crime-oriented offenders were arrested on the average 8.14 times; they committed a mean of 3.26 violent offenses. Conflict-oriented offenders accumulated a mean of 5.69 arrests and committed a mean of 2.46 violent offenses. Nevertheless, as indicated by the p-values in the table, there were no mean differences between the two groups on arrests and violent offenses.

**Table 15.** T-test Analyses of Cornell Homicide Type (n = 48)

Variables	Cornell Homicide Type	
	Crime	Conflict
<b>Number of Arrests</b>		
Mean (SD)	8.14 (8.088)	5.69 (6.762)
t (46) = .972		
p = .336		
<b>Number of Violent Offenses</b>		
Mean (SD)	3.26 (4.533)	2.46 (3.152)
t (46) = .581		
p = .564		

## Chapter 6: Results for Sexual Homicide Subsample

### *Sample Subject Classification*

Seven offenders from the sample were classified as juvenile sexual homicide offenders (hereinafter, JSHOs), representing four different cases. One of these cases involved four offenders, three of whom were juveniles; the remaining offender was 18 years old. Although the 18-year-old was not a sample subject due to his age, the decision was made to add this offender to the sexual homicide subsample because he was described as the “ringleader” by his three juvenile co-defendants, and relevant pre-homicide, homicide, and post-homicide data were available on him. His inclusion brought the total number of JSHOs in this subsample to **eight**. The four cases are represented in the tables and the case reports below by the letters A, B, C, and D. Pseudonyms were assigned to the JSHOs in order to protect their identity. All four cases ended in completed murders; no sample subjects were identified as having committed attempted murder with sexual elements.

### *Case Reports*

**Case A.** Karl, a 14-year-old White youth, was arrested and charged with first-degree murder and sexual battery, within hours after the body of a pre-teen White female was found near her school. The victim’s hands were tied together and her head was covered with a plastic bag. Her pants and underwear had been pulled down, and her shirt was pulled up to her breasts. It was indicated in the police report that the adolescent beat, strangled, and sexually defiled the young victim with a stick. Karl pled guilty to second-degree murder and was sentenced to 99 years in prison.

**Case B.** Thomas, a 16-year-old White youth, was charged with first-degree murder and sexual battery, after the discovery of the severely beaten body of a White female in her mid-20s; the victim was lying on the side of the road almost completely nude. The autopsy report revealed that she had been struck more than 40 times on her head and torso.

Available evidence at the crime scene led to Thomas's arrest four days after the body was discovered. He admitted to engaging in sexual intercourse with the victim shortly before the homicide and hitting her with a tire jack after she allegedly tried to rob him. Although Thomas denied killing the woman, he was convicted of first-degree murder by jurors and sentenced to life imprisonment with a 25 year mandatory minimum before parole eligibility.

**Case C.** Two 14-year-old White youths, Gene and Bobby, hustlers of adult men, were accused of fatally stabbing a White male in his late 20s who picked them up and brought them into his home. The boys admitted to tying up the victim at his request and engaging in anal and oral intercourse with him. During the sexual activity, the youths choked the victim to unconsciousness with a cord. Gene then proceeded to stab the victim more than a dozen times in the throat and back.

Following the killing, the two boys stole the victim's wallet and fled in his car. They were arrested one day later, and both were charged with first-degree murder, armed robbery, and auto theft. Both boys pled guilty to second-degree murder and received prison sentences. Gene was sentenced to 50 years; Bobby, to 20 years.

**Case D.** The naked body of a Black male in his early 40s with fatal head injuries was found in the bathtub of his home. Meanwhile, in a different state, four Black youths were taken into police custody for suspicious behavior: Gus, age 16; Donnell, age 17; Andrew, age 17; and Jack, age 18. Subsequent investigation connected the four boys to the above-mentioned brutal murder. It

was determined that two, possibly more, of the boys had engaged in consensual sexual relations with the victim in his home shortly before his death. Afterwards, the victim was punched, choked to unconsciousness, struck 10-20 times with a hammer, which ultimately killed him, and dumped in the bathtub after it had been filled with hot water. The police reports noted that the victim was placed in the tub in order to make the crime look like an accident, but given the severity of the injuries sustained by the victim, that appeared to be an unlikely scenario. The boys fled the state in the victim's car; they were arrested on the same day as the crime.

The boys' statements indicated that the motive for the killing was robbery; the victim was selected because he was a gay man and thought to be an easy mark. All four were charged with first-degree murder and armed robbery; Andrew was additionally charged with auto theft. Jack, the adult offender, was convicted of second-degree murder and armed robbery at trial and was sentenced to 40 years in prison. The other three boys pled guilty to second-degree murder. In addition, Gus and Andrew were convicted of armed robbery. Andrew was also convicted of auto theft. Gus was sentenced to 17 years in prison, and Donnell and Andrew were each sentenced to 22 years.

The eight offenders' prior delinquent histories and case processing and outcome information regarding the index homicides are presented in Table 15. Seven of the eight JSHOs had been previously arrested. The mean age at first arrest of these seven offenders was approximately 12, and they accumulated a mean of seven prior arrests. Half the offenders in the sample had been arrested for violent crimes prior to the index homicide. None of the offenders had been arrested for sexual crimes prior to their homicide arrest.

Regarding the homicide offense, the sample consisted of two lone offenders who killed female victims and two groups of offenders who killed adult gay men. Half the sample was

White and the other half was Black; the killings were all intra-racial. None of the JSHOs had used firearms to accomplish the murders. All eight offenders were charged with murder in the first-degree, but only one juvenile (Thomas, case B) was ultimately convicted of that charge; the rest were convicted of murder in the second degree. Three offenders were convicted of additional charges (e.g., armed robbery and auto theft).

### *Follow-Up Findings*

Table 16 displays data on dispositions pertaining to the index homicide, the time served by the JSHOs, and post-homicide arrests. Offenses that were committed during incarceration, either in jail or adult prison, as well as those that were committed after release from prison, are reported.

Follow-up data indicated that six offenders committed additional crimes while incarcerated. All four offenders in case D were arrested for additional crimes in jail prior to their first prison sentence (homicide); the arrests were for sexual battery, aggravated assault, assault/battery, and arson. Three offenders were arrested for new crimes while they were incarcerated in prison. Two of these offenders attempted to escape from prison, and the third offender was caught smuggling marijuana into his institution.

Six of the eight offenders in this subsample were released from prison during the 30-year period. All six had killed gay men in two group incidents. The two offenders who were not released from prison were the ones who committed their murders alone, Karl and Thomas, who both killed White female victims in separate incidents. The mean sentence length given by the Court to the six released offenders was 28 years and six months; however, the mean time they actually served in confinement was approximately 12 years and two months.

Of the six JSHOs who were released from prison, four recidivated. These offenders were arrested a total of 22 times. None of these arrests, however, was for homicide (sexual or

otherwise) or any other sexual offenses.

Among the four recidivists, three, all codefendants in Case D, were arrested multiple times for serious offenses. These three were arrested for post-incarceration violent crimes; the reported arrests were for aggravated assault and battery (including some that were committed with a deadly weapon), assault/battery, and robbery (Some of these violent offenses occurred during subsequent prison commitments). All three offenders were also rearrested for drug-related offenses, and two of the offenders were rearrested for property offenses and possession of a firearm.

Three of the six released JSHOs, again all co-defendants in Case D, were recommitted to prison. Two of these three offenders were recommitted to prison multiple times; one of them was recommitted for violent offenses and possession of a firearm, and the second offender, an individual with 12 post-release arrests, was recommitted for drug offenses and possession of a firearm. The remaining recommitted JSHO was sent back to prison for violent and drug-related offenses. At the time this manuscript was written, one of these three men (Andrew) was still in prison.

The remaining recidivist, Bobby from Case C, committed relatively minor offenses, in sharp contrast to the three JHOs in Case D. He was arrested on two occasions: once for trespassing and resisting arrest without violence, and the second time for driving under the influence of drugs.

It is noteworthy that the two JSHOs who have never been released from prison have accumulated an extensive record of disciplinary reports (DRs), spanning almost the entire follow-up period. Notable DRs included fighting, theft, disorderly conduct, possession of contraband, drug use, unauthorized possession of a cell phone, lying to staff members, and

disobeying orders. These two offenders have exhibited a consistent pattern of defiant and antisocial behavior in prison throughout their incarceration.

**Table 16.** Prior Offenses and Index Homicide (n = 8)

Case	Offender Name(age)	Index homicide charges	Index homicide convictions	Number of JUV priors	Prior Violent offenses?	Type of JUV violent offense	Age at first arrest
A	Karl (14)	Murder 1, sexual battery	Murder 2	0	No	N/A	No prior arrests
B	Thomas (16)	Murder 1, sexual battery	Murder 1	1	No	N/A	16
C	Gene (14)	Murder 1	Murder 2	12	Yes	Battery	8
C	Bobby (14)	Murder 1	Murder 2	3	Yes	Assault, battery	12
D	Gus (16)	Murder 1, armed robbery	Murder 2, armed robbery	2	No	N/A	16
D	Donnell (17)	Murder 1, armed robbery	Murder 2	4	No	N/A	14
D	Andrew (17)	Murder 1, auto theft, armed robbery	Murder 2, auto theft, armed robbery	14	Yes	Battery, aggravated battery, robbery	7
D	Jack (18)	Murder 1, armed robbery	Murder 2, armed robbery	10	Yes	Aggravated assault, attempted robbery	9

**Table 17.** Incarceration and Recidivism (n = 8)

Case	Offender name	Sentence	Offenses while incarcerated?	Time served	Time at risk	Post-release Offenses						Recommitted?
						Rearrested/ no. of arrests	Violent offenses Number	Violent offenses type+	Property offenses	Drug offenses	Poss. of firearm	
A	Karl	99 years	No	Never released (31 years)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
B	Thomas	Life with mandatory 25 years before parole eligibility	Escape (prison)	Never released (30 years)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
C	Gene	50 years	Escape (prison)	25 years	5 years, 6 months	No	0	N/A	No	No	No	No
C	Bobby	20 years	No	7 years, 2 months	8 years, 5 months*	2	0	N/A	No	No	No	No
D	Gus	17 years	Sexual battery (jail)	6 years, 8 months	2 years, 1 month*	12	4	Agg. assault, assault/ Battery	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
D	Donnell	22 years	Sexual battery, agg. assault, assault/battery (jail)	7 years, 7 months	1 year, 3 months*	3	2	Robbery	No	Yes	No	Yes
D	Andrew	22 years	Arson (jail)	7 years, 6 months	4 months*	5	6	Agg. assault (with deadly weapon), agg. Battery	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
D	Jack	40 years	Battery (jail), smuggling contraband (prison)	19 years	11 years, 3 months	No	0	N/A	No	No	No	No

*Note.* Poss. = Possession; Agg. = Aggravated; Recommitted = new prison commitment.

\*Until first post-release arrest; + no sex offenses.

## Chapter 7: Discussion

The present study employed the longest follow-up period in juvenile homicide recidivism research, provided extensive information regarding the types of offenses perpetrated by the JHOs in the sample, and analyzed post-release outcomes among certain subgroups within the sample. Accordingly, this study contributes to the literature by illustrating the long-term patterns of recidivism by this group of killers. Several findings in the study are worthy of further discussion.

The recidivism rate within the sample was troubling. Close to 90% of the 48 subjects who were released from prison after serving time for the index homicide conviction have been arrested, accumulating 30 post-release arrests in one case. More than 60% of released JHOs have engaged in post-release violence, and 10% were involved in new homicide incidents. Furthermore, given the violent past of these individuals, the fact that more than 20% of them were caught with a firearm is particularly alarming.

The only variable that was found to be significantly related to post-release violence was offender race. The specific factors that contributed to the greater prevalence of violent reoffending among the Black JHOs in the sample are unknown, due to limitations of the available data. Differential experiences during incarceration (e.g., possibly poorer treatment of the Black prisoners) could have contributed to the different outcomes in post-release violence between Black JHOs and their White counterparts. Furthermore, the vast majority of Black offenders (82%,  $n = 31$ ) committed the index homicide with accomplices; accordingly, it is possible that these JHOs resumed their relationships with violent peers after release from incarceration, and consequently continued engaging in violent behavior.

Due to the fact that the bivariate analyses of post-release violent offenses produced only one significant relationship, both in terms of the overall sample and the crime v. conflict typology, the decision was made not to explore predictors of violent recidivism at the multivariate level. The non-significant relationship between pre-homicide violence and post-release violence is particularly noteworthy, although perhaps not surprising, given prior research that has found juvenile violent offending to be an inconsistent predictor of violence in adulthood (Sampson & Laub, 2003; Tzoumakis, Lussier, Le Blanc, & Davies, 2012 ).

Many released offenders have also been arrested for a wide variety of non-violent transgressions that are indicative of their antisocial orientation, including theft-related offenses, drug-related offenses, forgery, obstruction of justice, carrying concealed weapons, and violations of probation/parole. The extensive criminal activity displayed by sample JHOs strongly suggests that incarcerated violent juvenile offenders do not receive the therapeutic intervention needed in order for them to desist from criminal activity after release.

The results indicated that JHOs are versatile in their offending, in that they generally engaged in a wide array of criminal behavior in adulthood, as opposed to specializing in violent behavior. This conclusion can be extended to the offenders in the sample who committed sexually-oriented index murders. Although two of the six released offenders in this subsample committed sexual assaults while awaiting trial in jail, none of them has been arrested for engaging in sexual violence since they were released from incarceration. Instead, they have been arrested for a variety of other offenses (violence, property crimes, drug, crimes, etc.). This finding is consistent with prior research, which has demonstrated that individuals who committed sexually-oriented offenses as juveniles tended not to specialize in sexual crimes in adulthood (Zimring, Jennings, Piquero, & Hays, 2009).

With respect to the comparison between crime-oriented JHOs and conflict-oriented JHOs, the findings did not provide support for the two tested hypotheses; the juveniles' homicide circumstances had no effect on general post-release recidivism or violent recidivism. The results were inconsistent with the follow-up study by Toupin (1993), who did observe significant differences between crime-oriented offenders and conflict-oriented offenders.

There are several possible explanations for the discrepancy in results between the two studies. First, the follow-up period in this study was much longer (30 years v. seven years). It is possible that the differences in reoffending patterns between the two groups in this study simply disappeared over time. Second, the sample in Toupin's study was collected from various institutional settings, such as prison and treatment facilities, whereas the sample in the present study only included JHOs who were incarcerated in adult prisons. Therefore, the inconsistent findings could be a product of differential experiences during confinement. Third, the offenders in Toupin's study were all from the Quebec province in Canada, whereas the offenders in the present study were all from one U.S. state; cultural differences between the two samples could have contributed to the recidivism outcomes.

The only variable in the crime v. conflict analysis that was significantly related to Cornell homicide type was presence of accomplices; crime-oriented offenders were much more likely to act with accomplices than their conflict-oriented counterparts. In terms of social science research, the strength of this association ( $\phi = -.485$ ) is moderate (Ferguson, 2009). A possible explanation for this finding is that many crime-oriented incidents in the sample—particularly the robbery incidents—occurred spontaneously, while juveniles were spending time with their friends or acquaintances.

Regarding the sexual homicide sample, the fact that none of the released JSHOs

committed another homicide or any other sexually violent acts is both encouraging and intriguing. This finding is consistent with the results in the study by Hill and colleagues (2008), but contradicts the results obtained by Myers and colleagues (2009), where three of the six JSHOs in the recidivism group committed additional sexual homicides. Psychopathy and sexual sadism data were not available for the present sample; perhaps, the differences in recidivism outcomes between the two samples are due to these clinical factors.

Among the sexual murderers who have been released thus far, the most serious recidivists were those who served less time. The two non-recidivists served at least 19 years before their release; in contrast, the three violent recidivists all served less than eight years. The discrepancy in post-release outcomes was not caused by treatment, due to the severe scarcity of group and individual therapy programs in the Southeastern state's adult prisons.

A more plausible explanation for the relationship between time served and lack of recidivism is that the JSHOs who were incarcerated longer may have been more mature at the time of their release due to older age. Since violent offenders are typically younger males, being released at an older age may have influenced these individuals not to become involved in violence and other types of serious crime. In other words, they may have "aged out" of committing crime (Farrington, 1986; Sampson & Laub, 2003). However, due to the small sample examined, this conclusion cannot be made definitively and future research should further explore the effect of longer incarceration on young sexually-oriented murderers.

### *Implications*

The poor post-release outcomes for the young killers in this sample highlight the need for effective treatment for violent juveniles during incarceration. These individuals need to be taught non-aggressive coping skills, anger management, appropriate communication and vocational

skills, and how to resist impulses that may have deadly consequences. A prison sentence alone is clearly not sufficient in deterring these individuals from engaging in criminal activity upon release, as further evidenced by the continued criminal behavior of many offenders even after multiple commitments.

Prior research has shown that intensive evidence-based treatment programs can reduce the rate of recidivism of many juveniles who committed murder and other serious violent offenses and can improve their post-incarceration adjustment (Texas Youth Commission, 1997, 2010; Heide, 2013). The enhancement of prison-based treatment services for JHOs would greatly benefit society as a whole, because unlike adult murderers, juvenile murderers will most likely be released from prison at some point (Heide, 1999, 2013).

The high prevalence of group homicides in the sample emphasizes the importance of monitoring JHOs after they are released from prison. They need to be closely supervised following their release, in order to prevent them from maintaining the type of toxic peer relationships and behavior patterns that resulted in their adolescent delinquent activity and the original homicide.

In the context of life-course theory, the findings in this study indicate that individuals who are involved in homicidal violence as juveniles are at risk for becoming chronic offenders in adulthood. As mentioned previously, the findings demonstrate that released JHOs are not only at risk for continued violent behavior, but also for a wide range of serious and minor non-violent transgressions up to middle adulthood. Many of the offenders in this sample would meet the criteria for Moffitt's "life-course persistent" offender (Moffitt, 1993), meaning that their offending careers started early, became increasingly serious, and continued throughout their lives. The versatile pattern of offending by JHOs suggests that treatment programs for these

offenders should address generalized deviant thinking, instead of focusing only on violent tendencies.

Post-release recidivism does not appear to be influenced by time at risk or severity of the offense. The non-recidivists in the sample had a much higher mean time at risk than the recidivists before they were rearrested (12 years, 5 months v. 2 years, 7 months), which suggests that spending a longer period of time in the community after release from prison does not increase the likelihood of reoffending.

Several non-recidivists were involved in particularly gruesome index homicides; one JHO repeatedly struck his younger sister in the head with a hammer, another JHO stabbed a man more than a dozen times in the throat and back during a sexual act (JSHO from case C), and a third juvenile was the ringleader in the brutal group beating of a robbery victim that was briefly described in the crime-related case excerpts. The absence of post-incarceration arrests by these offenders suggests that severity of a homicide incident would be a poor predictor of recidivism.

The findings in this study provide several implications for the crime v. conflict typology. First, in contrast to what Cornell, Benedek, and Benedek (1987) predicted, crime-oriented JHOs do not represent a greater risk to society than their conflict-oriented counterparts. Second, since there were no significant differences in post-release offending between the two groups, there is no indication that crime- and conflict-oriented JHOs should be exposed to different levels of treatment during incarceration (provided that treatment programs are even available). Lastly, in the context of the *Miller v. Alabama* Supreme Court case, the findings suggest that homicide circumstances have no effect on whether a JHO will be granted an early release from prison.

#### *Limitations and Directions for Future Research*

The findings in this study cannot be generalized to the overall incarcerated juvenile homicide

population in the United States, due to sample size and the fact that all subjects were from one U.S. state. Future research would benefit from selecting larger, nationwide samples, which would produce more generalizable conclusions about post-release prospects of JHOs. In the context of the crime v. conflict typology, a larger sample would allow researchers to examine whether there any differences in recidivism patterns between JHOs who acted alone and those who had accomplices, both within each homicide group and between the two groups.

The sample subjects in this study were all sentenced to adult prisons; future studies should compare JHOs who are treated as adults in court and JHOs who are treated as juveniles on post-release adjustment. It is possible that being surrounded by seasoned adult offenders exacerbates the criminogenic factors that led to the original homicide, resulting in continued criminal activity after release.

Future sexual homicide research should examine whether male killers of female victims differ from male killers of male victims on recidivism patterns. In the present study, the post-release analysis exclusively focused, unintentionally, on JSHOs who killed gay males. The two JSHOs who killed female victims were not taken out of this subsample due to the small number of cases and the exploratory nature of the analysis. However, as noted by Beauregard and Proulx (2007) in their analysis of adult offenders, male sexual murderers of same-sex victims are motivated by different factors (e.g., non-sexually motivated predatory behavior, which was exhibited by the offenders in cases C and D) than males who sexually murdered opposite-sex victims; accordingly, the post-release experiences of these two types of sexual murderers should be analyzed separately and compared in future studies.

Motivations to continue engaging in criminal activity or desist from it cannot be captured through the use of quantitative official data. Interview-based studies need to be designed in order

to identify protective factors that shield juvenile murderers from recidivating in adulthood after incarceration, as well as reveal the true extent of criminal behavior committed by JHOs.

Qualitative data is more suited to identify the precise set of circumstances that enable some young killers to become law-abiding citizens after incarceration and compel others to engage in a consistent pattern of antisocial and violent behavior from prison release in early adulthood to middle adulthood.

With respect to the sample in the present study, the goal is to conduct interviews with at least some of these JHOs in the near future, in order to identify variables that differentiate between the recidivists and the small number of non-recidivists in the sample. It is possible that the non-recidivists, as well as the low-frequency recidivists, experienced turning points that motivated and/or enabled them to stop engaging in criminal behavior at some point during adulthood; these turning points may have consisted of marriage, obtaining legitimate employment, joining the military, moving to a new neighborhood after release from prison, or other beneficial transitions (Laub & Sampson, 2003). Differences between JHOs who were rearrested for serious crimes (e.g., violence) and those who committed minor crimes will also be examined. Furthermore, the effects of risk and protective factors on recidivism will be explored. Long-term recidivism outcomes may have been influenced by factors such as level of educational attainment prior to the homicide and during incarceration, work history, number of criminal friends, substance abuse, levels of impulsivity and frustration tolerance, among others.

### References

- Anthony, E.J. (1973). Editorial Comment. In E.J. Anthony & C. Koupernik, *The Child in His Family* (pages 267-273). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bailey, S. (2000). Juvenile homicide. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 10 (3), 149-154.
- Beauregard, E., & Proulx, J. (2007). A classification of sexual homicide against men. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(4), 420-432.
- Blumstein, A. (2002). Youth, guns, and violent crime. *The Future of Children*, 12 (2), 38-53.
- Corder, B.F., Ball, B.C., Haizlip, T.M., Rollins, R., & Beaumont, R. (1976). Adolescent parricide: A comparison with other adolescent murder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 133 (8), 957-961.
- Cornell, D.G., Benedek, E.P., & Benedek, D.M. (1987). Juvenile homicide: Prior adjustment and a proposed typology. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57 (3), 383-393.
- Dent, R.J., & Jowitt, S. (2003). Homicide and serious Sexual offences committed by children and young people: Findings from the literature and a serious case review. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 9 (2), 85-96.
- Duncan, J.W., & Duncan, G.M. (1971). Murder in the family: a study of some homicidal adolescents. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 127 (11), 74-78.
- Farrington, D. P. (1986). Age and crime. *Crime and justice*, 7, 189-250.

- Farrington, D. P. (1989). Early predictors of adolescent aggression and adult violence. *Violence and victims*, 4 (2), 79-100.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2012). *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States 2011*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Ferguson, C.J. (2009). An effect size primer: A guideline for clinicians and researchers. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice*, 40, 532-538.
- Greene, E., & Evelo, A.J. (2013). Attitudes regarding life sentences for juveniles offenders. *Law and Human Behavior*, 37 (4), 276-289.
- Gottfredson, M.R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Grisso, T. (1996). Society's retributive response to juvenile violence: A developmental perspective. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20 (3), 229-247.
- Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., & Cormier, C. A. (1991). Psychopathy and violent recidivism. *Law and human behavior*, 15 (6), 625-637.
- Hagan, M.P. (1997). An analysis of adolescent perpetrators of homicide and attempted homicide upon return to the community. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 41 (3), 250-259.
- Heide K.M. (1992). *Why Kids Kill Parents: Child Abuse and Adolescent Homicide*. Ohio State University Press: Columbus, OH; paperback ed. 1995. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Heide K.M. (1999). *Young killers: The challenge of juvenile homicide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heide, K. M. (2003). Youth Homicide: A Review of the Literature and a Blueprint for Action. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 47 (1), 6-36.

- Heide, K.M. (2013). *Understanding parricide: When sons and daughters kill parents*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heide, K.M. (2015) Juvenile Homicide: Trends, Correlates, Causal Factors, and Outcomes. In C.A. Pietz & C.A. Mattson, *Violent Offenders: Understanding and Assessment* (pp. 127-150). New York, NY: Oxford U. Press.
- Heide, K.M., Sepowitz, D.R., Solomon, E.P., & Chan, H.C. (2012). Male and female juveniles arrested for murder: A comprehensive analysis of U.S. data by offender gender. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56 (3), 356-384.
- Heide, K.M., Solomon, E.P., Sellers, B.G., & Chan, H.C. (2011). 'Male and female juvenile offenders: An empirical analysis of U.S. arrests by offender age'. *Feminist Criminology*, 6 (1), 3-31.
- Heide, K.M., Spencer, E., Thompson, A., & Solomon, E.P. (2001). Who's in, who's out, and who's Back: Follow-up data on 59 juveniles incarcerated in adult prison for murder or attempted murder in the early 1980s. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 19 (1), 97-108.
- Hill, A., Habermann, N., Klusmann, D., Berner, W., & Briken, P. (2008). Criminal recidivism in sexual homicide perpetrators. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 52 (1), 5-20.
- Howell, J.C. (1995). (ed.) *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: Washington, D.C.
- Laub, J.H., & Sampson, R.J. (2004). *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Mack, J.E., Scherl, D.J., & Macht, L.B. (1973). Children who Kill Their Mothers. In E.J. Anthony & C. Koupernik (Eds.), *The Child in His Family* (pages 319-332). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Myers, W.C. (2002). *Juvenile Sexual Homicide*. London: Academic Press.
- Myers, W. C., Chan, H. C. O., Vo, E. J., & Lazarou, E. (2009). Sexual sadism, Psychopathy, and recidivism in juvenile sexual murderers. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 7(10), 49-58.
- Myers, W.C., Eggleston, C.F., & Smoak, P. (2003). A media violence-inspired juvenile sexual homicide offender 13 years later. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 48 (6) 1-6.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological review*, 100 (4), 674-701.
- Nagin, D. & Paternoster, R. (2000). Population heterogeneity and state dependence: State of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 16 (2), 117-135.
- Post, S. (1982). Adolescent parricide in abusive families. *Child Welfare*, 61 (7), 445-455.
- Reinhardt, J.M. (1970). *Nothing Left But Murder*. Lincoln, NE: Johnsen Publishing Co.
- Ressler, R. K., Burgess, A. W., & Douglas, J. E. (1988). *Sexual homicide: Patterns and motive*. New York: Free Press.
- Russell, D.H. (1984). A study of juvenile murderers of family members. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 28 (3), 177-192.
- Sampson, R.J., & Laub, J.H. (2003). Life-course desisters? Trajectories of crime among delinquent boys to age 70. *Criminology*, 41 (3), 301-339.

- Scherl, D.J., & Mack, J.E. (1966). A study of adolescent matricide. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychology*, 5 (4), 569-593.
- Tanay, E. (1973). Adolescents who kill parents- reactive parricide. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 7, 263-277.
- Tanay, E. (1976). Reactive parricide. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 21 (1), 76-82.
- Texas Youth Commission. (1996, December). *Review of treatment programs*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Texas Youth Commission. (1997, February). *Specialized treatment recidivism effectiveness summary*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Texas Youth Commission. (2010, December). *Annual review of agency treatment effectiveness*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Toupin, J. (1993). Adolescent murderers: Validation of a typology and study of their recidivism. In A.V. Wilson (Ed.), *Homicide: The Victim/Offender Connection* (pages 135-156). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Tzoumakis, S., Lussier, P., Le Blanc, M., & Davies, G. (2012). Onset, offending trajectories, and crime specialization in violence. *Youth violence and juvenile justice*, 11 (2), 143-164.
- Trulson, C.R., Caudill, J.W., Haerle, D.R., & DeLisi, M. (2012). Cliques up: The postincarceration recidivism of young gang-related homicide offenders. *Criminal Justice Review*, 37 (2), 174-190.
- Vries, A.M., & Liem, M. (2011). Recidivism of juvenile homicide offenders. *Behavioral Science and the Law*, 29 (4), 483-498.

Zimring, F.E. (2012). American Youth Violence- A Cautionary Tale. Berkley Law: From the Selected works of Franklin E. Zimring. Retrieved from

[http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=franklin\\_zimring&sei=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.bing.com%2Fsearch%3Fq%3Damerican%2520youth%2520violence%2520%2520cautionary%2520tale%26FORM%3DDLCBLB%26PC%3DMDDC%26QS%3Dn#search=%22american%20youth%20violence%20cautionary%20tale%22](http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=franklin_zimring&sei=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.bing.com%2Fsearch%3Fq%3Damerican%2520youth%2520violence%2520%2520cautionary%2520tale%26FORM%3DDLCBLB%26PC%3DMDDC%26QS%3Dn#search=%22american%20youth%20violence%20cautionary%20tale%22).

Zimring, F. E., Jennings, W. G., Piquero, A. R., & Hays, S. (2009). Investigating the continuity of sex offending: Evidence from the Second Philadelphia Birth Cohort. *Justice Quarterly*, 26 (1), 58-7.

### Appendix 1: Coding Instrument

Offender's ID \_\_\_\_\_

#### Homicide Arrest 1 \_\_\_\_\_

Date released \_\_\_\_\_

#### Arrest 2 Date \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

__	Violent offense total	
__	homicide (type _____)	__
__	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	__
__	aggravated assault	__
__	sex offense (type _____)	__
__	armed burglary / home invasion	__
__	other violent ( _____)	__
__	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	__
__	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	__
__	property (type _____)	__
__	loitering &/or prowling	__
__	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	__
__	other ( _____)	__
__	other ( _____)	__

#### Arrest 3 Date \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

__	Violent offense total	
__	homicide (type _____)	__
__	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	__
__	aggravated assault	__
__	sex offense (type _____)	__
__	armed burglary / home invasion	__
__	other violent ( _____)	__
__	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	__
__	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	__
__	property (type _____)	__
__	loitering &/or prowling	__
__	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	__
__	other ( _____)	__
__	other ( _____)	__

**Comments** \_\_\_\_\_

---



---

Offender's ID \_\_\_\_\_

**Arrest 4 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Arrest 5 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Comments**


---



---

Offender's ID \_\_\_\_\_

**Arrest 6 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
 (1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Arrest 7 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
 (1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Comments**

---



---

Offender's ID \_\_\_\_\_

**Arrest 8 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
 (1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Arrest 9 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
 (1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Comments**

---



---

Offender's ID \_\_\_\_\_

**Arrest 10 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Arrest 11 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Comments**

---



---

Offender's ID \_\_\_\_\_

**Arrest 12 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Arrest 13 Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Only or Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dism (2) Prn (3)Prob (4)Fine (5) SR (6) REV (7) ADJ (8) O

___	Violent offense total	
___	homicide (type _____)	___
___	robbery (A – SA – UNK)	___
___	aggravated assault	___
___	sex offense (type _____)	___
___	armed burglary / home invasion	___
___	other violent ( _____)	___
___	drug-related offense (cons, trf, poss, sale; viol CS-- _____)	___
___	possession of firearm (during commission of crime)	___
___	property (type _____)	___
___	loitering &/or prowling	___
___	willful obstruction of LEO, _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___
___	other ( _____)	___

**Comments**


---



---

Offender's ID \_\_\_\_\_

**PLEASE INDICATE ARREST NUMBER BETWEEN ARREST AND DATE**

**Arrest**    **Date**    \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dismissed (2) Prison (3) Probation (4) Fine (5) Other

- |     |                          |     |
|-----|--------------------------|-----|
| ___ | Violent offense          | ___ |
| ___ | homicide (type _____)    | ___ |
| ___ | robbery                  | ___ |
| ___ | aggravated assault       | ___ |
| ___ | sex offense (type _____) | ___ |
| ___ | armed burglary           | ___ |
| ___ | other violent ( _____)   | ___ |
| ___ | drug-related             | ___ |
| ___ | possession of firearm    | ___ |
| ___ | property (type _____)    | ___ |
| ___ | loitering &/or prowling  | ___ |
| ___ | other ( _____)           | ___ |
| ___ | other ( _____)           | ___ |
| ___ | other ( _____)           | ___ |

**Arrest**    **Date**    \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Charges \_\_\_\_

Most severe disposition per offense if known  
(1)Dismissed (2) Prison (3) Probation (4)Fine (5) Other

- |     |                          |     |
|-----|--------------------------|-----|
| ___ | Violent offense          | ___ |
| ___ | homicide (type _____)    | ___ |
| ___ | robbery                  | ___ |
| ___ | aggravated assault       | ___ |
| ___ | sex offense (type _____) | ___ |
| ___ | armed burglary           | ___ |
| ___ | other violent ( _____)   | ___ |
| ___ | drug-related             | ___ |
| ___ | possession of firearm    | ___ |
| ___ | property (type _____)    | ___ |
| ___ | loitering &/or prowling  | ___ |
| ___ | other ( _____)           | ___ |
| ___ | other ( _____)           | ___ |
| ___ | other ( _____)           | ___ |

**Comments** \_\_\_\_\_

---