

OVERVIEW OF THE CHICAGO HOMICIDE PROJECT*

CAROLYN REBECCA BLOCK

Statistical Analysis Center, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

RICHARD L. BLOCK

Loyola University of Chicago

The Chicago Homicide Dataset, one of the largest and most detailed datasets on violence ever collected in the United States, contains information on every homicide in police records from 1965 to 1990 -- over 200 variables and nearly 20,000 homicides. This unique set of data has been collected with the close cooperation of the Chicago Police Department over many years by Carolyn Rebecca Block of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and Richard L. Block of Loyola University Chicago. Researchers from the University of Chicago Law School and MacMaster University also have contributed to data collection, and numerous researchers have used the data for policy analysis or causal modeling.

Since 1979, the Chicago Homicide Dataset has been maintained by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. The 1965 through 1981 dataset, which includes 12,875 homicides, is available in the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the University of Michigan. Support for the Chicago Homicide Project has been provided over the years by Loyola University Chicago and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, under grants from the National Institute of Justice, the Ford Foundation, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation.

HISTORY

The establishment of the Chicago Homicide Dataset, and the collection of data from 1965 to 1978, were carried out over several years under grants from the Ford Foundation and the National Institute of Mental Health to the University of Chicago Law School (Frank Zimring and Richard Block). In 1984, under a grant from the Bureau of Justice Statistics to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (project director: Carolyn Rebecca Block), three years were added to the data (1979 to 1981), the years from 1971 to 1978 were updated, and a comprehensive codebook was published as a guide to the total dataset (Chicago Homicide Codebook by Carolyn Rebecca Block, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1984, revised 1987). However, data in the years 1965 to 1970 were not updated or cleaned at that time.

In 1989 and 1990, supported by a grant from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation to MacMaster University (co-directors: Margo Wilson, Martin Daly, Richard Block and Carolyn Block), data from 1982 through 1989 were added to the file, and cases from 1965 to 1981 were updated. In addition, a number of variables -- such as the Drug Use and Drug-Related variables, specific circumstances of domestic altercations, and variables indicating Expressive versus Instrumental motive -- were tested, checked for coder reliability, and coded or recoded throughout the 25 years.

* This article was excerpted from "Questions and Answers in Lethal and Non-Lethal Violence: Proceedings of the First Annual Workshop of the Homicide Research Working Group," edited by Carolyn R. Block and Richard L. Block. NCJ 142058. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1992. The full text of the proceedings are available at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/HRWG/PDF/hrwg92.pdf>.

In 1991 and 1992, under a grant from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to Loyola University of Chicago (co-directors: Richard Block and Carolyn Rebecca Block), the entire 25 year/18,500 case dataset (1965 to 1989) was cleaned, all cases were geocoded for computer mapping, and the entire dataset was combined from the earlier individual year files into one large file.

Currently, documentation and a completely revised codebook are being completed, 1990 is being added to the dataset, and a special analysis of street gang-related homicide is being written for an NIJ Bulletin. In addition, under a grant from the Bureau of Justice Statistics to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, the Chicago Homicide Project is combining lethal with nonlethal and other social indicator data, to develop an automated Early Warning System for law enforcement, which will identify potential neighborhood crisis areas, areas that are at high risk for suffering a "spurt" of serious street gang-related violence and homicide. This early warning system will be based on a statistical model, which consolidates spatial information obtained from a variety of sources, and uses automated hot spot identification and other geographic statistics as tools to target crisis neighborhoods. The project will then organize and document the early warning system and the "geo-archive" database that supports it, so that it will serve as a prototype for application in communities throughout the nation.

DATA AND DATA COLLECTION

The current Chicago Homicide Dataset contains over 200 variables (some of them recodes of other variables) and almost 20,000 cases. Data include all homicide cases known to the Chicago police department and occurring in Chicago from 1965 to 1990, except justifiable homicides. The source of the data is police investigation files; based on the preponderance of the evidence, the police determined that a homicide occurred in these incidents. Victims and offenders are those identified by police investigation. Victims are the people who died. Offenders do not include all known suspects, but only those suspects for whom the police found probable cause that they had committed the homicide. However, many offenders in the database were not arrested. This happens with exceptional clearances (the offender died, fled the country or was otherwise unavailable for prosecution). It is not uncommon for offenders to commit suicide during the incident, to be killed in the incident, or to die before being prosecuted.¹

In general, these homicides are defined at the police investigation stage, without regard to later criminal justice decisions (although some dispositional data are included in the dataset). The standard of proof required by the courts is not the same as the "preponderance of evidence" standard required at the police level. For example, in the 1960s, police investigation determined that an arson homicide, in which 14 elderly people in a nursing home were killed, was perpetrated by a nurse's aide. Although there was enough evidence to prosecute the aide, she was not convicted. These 14 victims are included in the Chicago Homicide Dataset, with the aide as the offender, because by police standards of proof a murder occurred committed by the aide.

¹Preliminary analysis shows that the death rate of homicide offenders is many times higher than the expected death rate for comparable age/gender/race groups. Murder/suicides are particularly frequent for white male offenders in domestic homicides. For a copy of this analysis, please contact the senior author.

The ultimate source of all information for all years is the Murder Analysis Report (MAR), a one-page (front and back) summary of each homicide, maintained since 1965 by the Crime Analysis Unit of the Chicago Police Department. In addition, in cases where there is some ambiguity in the MAR or a question arises, the research staff consults with officers in the Crime Analysis Unit as to the correct codes and definitions. The complete investigation file is available in the Crime Analysis Unit for current years, and is consulted when necessary to clarify details. Since 1982, the CPD has maintained data on murder cases in an automated system accessed by the "RAMIS" mainframe database management program. Beginning in 1982, data collection has begun by downloading RAMIS information to DBF (Dbase) files, which are then converted into SPSS DataEntry files. Using DataEntry, coders check the RAMIS information against the MAR for each case, and add variables not already coded in RAMIS (see discussion below). All coding and data entry are carried out in the Crime Analysis Unit.

Data are organized in order of date of occurrence, although date of death and date of police booking of the case are also available on the dataset. CPD Crime Analysis Unit data are organized by booking date. Because cases may become known to the police months or even years after the initial occurrence, or may be delayed because of a lengthy investigation or because the victim died some time after the attack, monthly or yearly totals based on the Chicago Homicide Dataset may not equal official police department totals based on booking date. Also because of the frequency of long investigations, we usually do not begin data collection for a year until at least June of the following year (depending on funding). When data for a new year are collected we also update the information on any earlier case that has been cleared in the interim. Updating for cases booked in a given year will increase the number of dataset cases occurring in previous years.² Therefore, the most recent years in the dataset should be considered preliminary.

After data collection in the Crime Analysis Unit, the dataset is geocoded, which means that each incident is located by longitude and latitude coordinates. The geocoding uses a Chicago street file, based on the Census TIGER file, but with numerous edits and corrections added by Richard Block to increase the accuracy of the file. All but four of the almost 20,000 cases from 1965 to 1990 have been successfully geocoded. Although, because of privacy constraints, the address data will not be available in the newly archived dataset, Census tract identifications will be included for each case.

Coders are supervised closely and trained continuously. The research staff (usually Richard and Carolyn Block) chooses cases randomly for reliability coding, and runs standard inter-variable consistency checks on the data. For example, if the victim's relationship is "son" the victim should be male and younger than the offender; most codes of "drug business motive" are instrumental homicides; if the victim was "killed while committing a predatory crime" the specific crime should be coded under Causative Factor; if "victim is a prostitute" under Causative Factor, then the victim's relationship should be prostitute and the offender's relationship is probably pimp, client or business partner. The research staff also checks for an unusual frequency of codes such as "general altercation," which an inattentive coder may use to "dump" cases, to assure that no other information is available, for police codes such as "sexual

²Four cases booked in 1965 actually occurred in 1964. They remain in the dataset, but are usually excluded from analysis.

perversion" or U.U.W. (Unlawful Use of Weapon), for which more specific detail must always be gathered (see below), and for a coder's neglect of completing the "remarks" section in situations when remarks are required (more than five offenders, id numbers of other related cases, explanations of "probable drug involvement" and so on). Staff and coders then meet periodically to discuss and clarify the results of these coder reliability analyses, and changes may be made in the coding instructions or additional categories added to variables as a result.

Unit of analysis: victim, offender, incident

Three types of risk need to be considered in the analysis of homicide -- the risk of becoming a victim, the risk of becoming an offender, and the risk of a given type of victim being killed by a given type of offender. The first is measured by victimization rates, and the second, by offender participation rates. Measuring the third (who is killing whom) involves calculating two different types of risk -- the likelihood that given offender groups are responsible for murders of various groups of victims versus the types of victims chosen by various groups of offenders. For example, we can ask, "What proportion of the murders of females are accounted for by male offenders?" or "What proportion of the victims of male offenders are female?" Because the denominators differ, the answer to these two types of question will not necessarily be the same.

In addition, there is a difference between offender participation rates (the risk of becoming an offender) and offender damage rates (the number of people murdered by a particular group of offenders). Because some offenders murder multiple victims and some victims are murdered by multiple offenders, participation rates of some groups (for example, Latino young men) may be relatively high, while the rate of homicides attributed to that group is lower.

A dataset organized for the most efficient analysis of victim rates will be cumbersome in producing offender participation rates, and vice versa. However, both perspectives are vitally important and should not be ignored. The risk of becoming a victim and the risk of becoming an offender are not necessarily the same for a given individual (for example, women and girls are at a higher risk of becoming a victim than of becoming an offender, while the opposite is true for men and boys). Further, the difference in these risks depends upon the Homicide Syndrome.³ In many kinds of expressive violence, the people who are at highest risk of becoming a victim and the people who are at the highest risk of becoming an offender may be the same people. In instrumental violence, the target tends to be rationally chosen by criteria such as vulnerability or potential gain, and as a result those who are at risk of becoming a victim and those who are at risk of becoming an offender may be different groups. The question of who is killing whom may be immaterial for expressive violence but vital for understanding instrumental violence. If we are to understand the process of violence and develop successful strategies for intervention, we must first accurately describe risk patterns.

The archived 1965-to-1981 dataset is victim level. It includes demographic data on up to four offenders, and victim-offender relationship data on the first offender. The current version (1965-to-1990) is also victim level, but includes demographic variables and relationship for up to five offenders on each victim record, and information on additional offenders in the "Remarks."

³For a definition of Homicide Syndrome, see R. Block and C. R. Block (1992).

Also, when the entire dataset was cleaned, we updated and checked the identification links between incident, victim and offender, and systematized the ID coding (this varies from year to year in the earlier archived dataset). Thus, we can link multiple victims and multiple offenders by incident. This allows us to calculate all of the types of risk outlined above (for examples, see C. R. Block, 1992). However, it is still cumbersome to calculate offender-based rates or to conduct incident-based analysis with a victim level file. Therefore, we plan to construct a separate offender level file, which includes one record per offender, deleting the duplicate records stemming from multiple-victim incidents, and including most of the victim and incident variables as well as offender information.

Consistency in definitions over time

The Chicago Homicide Dataset contains data compiled over many years, with some changes in definition over time. However, every effort has been made to produce key variables in which the definitions and interpretation are consistent over the entire time span. Some variables such as weapon, relationship, and causative factor or altercation have two sets of codes, the code used in the original 1965-1981 archive and the one used in the Crime Analysis Unit's "RAMIS" database (edited and expanded by the Chicago Homicide Project). In general, the categories in the two schemes are directly comparable, though the code numbers may differ. For example, the RAMIS weapon code for "22 caliber automatic" is A22, and the original 1965-to-1981 code for the same thing is "11". However, to avoid confusion and make it easier to use the final archived 1965-to-1990 version, in the recent cleaning and updating process, we not only cleaned the original codes for these variables back to 1965 but also added the new RAMIS-coded variable to 1965-to-1981 cases as well as to the recent years.

Motive, circumstance, and situation

This section outlines the variables and coding instructions developed and tested over the years for motive, circumstance and situation. In the early years, coding was based on a short check-list on the MAR, which was expanded in 1982 to a detailed variable, CAUSFACT. In this section, we describe all of the variables that are still part of the current dataset, and include excerpts from the codebook for clarification.

Many of these variables required extensive care in coder supervision and training, reliability checking, and the development of coding instructions. An important overriding coding instruction, particularly applicable to motive and circumstance variables but also applying to relationship, is to code only those circumstances or relationships that were relevant to the incident. For example, if the victim is a member of a street gang, but the incident did not involve a street gang motive, then the coder should indicate the actual motive (love triangle or strongarm robbery, for example), and the corresponding relationship (boyfriend/girlfriend, for example). Similarly, cases in which known drug dealers or prostitutes were killed should be coded according to the actual motive of the incident. In addition however, coders are asked to record "contextual" information, such as that the victim was a known drug dealer, or the gang affiliation of the victim, in the Remarks.

The MARs (Murder Analysis Reports) maintained by the CPD Crime Analysis Unit have contained information on a number of motive or circumstance variables. Some of these, such as "teen gang altercation," armed robbery, strongarm robbery, burglary, child abuse, UUW (unlawful use of a weapon) and rape or sexual assault, have appeared on the MAR since 1965 as codes to be checked by the investigating officer (child abuse was added in 1967). In coding the MARs for the original 1965-to-1981 archive, we relied heavily on these police codes, as well as on the narrative and any other collaborative information in the files.

Excerpts from the current Chicago Homicide Codebook for robbery and burglary show that the definition and meaning of these variables are fairly straightforward. Coders do have to be trained to differentiate robbery from burglary, and strongarm from armed robbery.

MOTVROB: MOTIVE ROBBERY?

Instructions: Code according to MAR.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 STRONG ARM (no weapon) | 2 ARMED (with any weapon, including |
| 3 VICTIM IS A ROBBER (eg:
robber kills a robber) | firearm, knife, blunt instrument,
etc.) |
| 0 ROBBERY NOT INVOLVED | |

MOTVBURG: BURGLARY MOTIVE?

Instructions: Code according to MAR.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 BURGLARY INVOLVED
(Causative factor 200) | 2 VICTIM IS A BURGLAR
(Causative factor 805) |
| 0 BURGLARY NOT INVOLVED | |

Since 1965, the MAR has included a "sexual perversion" motive for police investigators to check, and since 1982, "sexual perversion" has been one of the CAUSFACT codes. Analysis of these cases indicates that the definition and usage has always been extremely ambiguous. General coder instructions are to determine the exact situation in all "sexual perversion" cases, and code appropriately. See the notes to the MOTVSEX excerpt, below.

MOTVSEX: WAS RAPE, SEXUAL ASSAULT OR PROSTITUTION INVOLVED?

Instructions: Code according to MAR. Code "sexual assault" if a male or female victim was killed during a sexual assault or an attempted sexual assault.

- 1 SEXUAL ASSAULT OF A MALE⁴
- 2 SEXUAL ASSAULT OF A FEMALE⁵
- 3 INVOLVING HOMOSEXUALITY⁶
- 4 INVOLVING PROSTITUTION⁷
- 9 UNDETERMINED -- some evidence of sexual assault, but unclear
- 0 NOT INVOLVED

When the Crime Analysis Unit automated the murder analysis reports, they added a general "CAUSFACT" variable, which greatly expanded the short list of motives used previously. The coding for the current version of the Chicago Homicide Dataset uses both CAUSFACT and the original motive codes, edits and expands the CAUSFACT codes, and adds a variable for a secondary causative factor (CAUSFAC2). Although the original motive and circumstance variables are still being collected in the current dataset, CAUSFACT is an important source of information. The following excerpt from the codebook describes the specific codes and coding instructions.

⁴If MAR indicates "sexual perversion," but the incident involved sexual assault or attempted sexual assault of a male, use this code.

⁵If MAR indicates "sexual perversion," but the incident involved sexual assault or attempted sexual assault of a female, use this code.

⁶Cases coded "sexual perversion" in the MAR by police investigators, which cannot be determined to have involved sexual assault of a male or female, should be coded here.

⁷A rape or sexual assault of a prostitute should be coded 1 or 2 above, as appropriate.

CAUSFACT: TYPE OF ALTERCATION

Instructions: Use codes given in the MAR, but add detail according to total information available. Code according to the circumstance or motive that is relevant to the specific homicide incident. For example, "800" codes should be used only if the victim's occupation as a robber, cartage thief, and so on, was part of the cause of the homicide incident. If in doubt, use the MAR code. See Notes.

100 ALTERCATION OVER CHILDREN ⁸	105 ALTERCATION OVER GAMBLING
110 GENERAL DOMESTIC ALTERCATION	115 ALTERCATION OVER LIQUOR ⁹
117 ALTERCATION OVER DRUGS	120 ALTERCATION OVER MONEY ¹⁰
125 ALTERCATION OVER POLITICS	130 RACIAL/HATE ALTERCATION ¹¹
135 ALTERCATION OVER SEX ¹²	137 SEXUAL JEALOUSY ¹³
140 TEEN GANG ALTERCATION ¹⁴	
145 ALTERCATION OVER (ALLEGED) THEFT ¹⁵	
147 DRIVE-BY SHOOTING ¹⁶	150 TRAFFIC ALTERCATION ¹⁷
155 LOVE TRIANGLE ALTERCATION ¹⁸	157 SEXUAL RIVALRY ¹⁹
160 OTHER ALTERCATION	
167 ALTERCATION OVER DESERTION OR TERMINATING A RELATIONSHIP	
200 BURGLARY	300 ARMED ROBBERY
305 STRONGARM ROBBERY	400 SEXUAL ASSAULT OF WOMEN
405 SEXUAL PERVERSION ²⁰	

⁸This indicates a fight between adults about the children. In cases where the child was the victim, code 915 (child abuse), or other appropriate code.

⁹A fight or argument over drinking. Whether the participants have been drinking is not relevant to this code.

¹⁰This does not include robbery or attempted robbery.

¹¹Definition of hate crime: member(s) of one group attack member(s) of another group for no other reason than the group membership. Eg: gay bashing, racial attacks, religious or ethnic attacks. If a hate crime was the only motive, code it as the first causative factor. If the incident was a fight, brawl or argument between friends or acquaintances, but it was precipitated by a racial slur, code "Hate crime" under CAUSFAC2.

¹²Do not code rape or sexual assault here. If it really is an "argument" or altercation over sex, determine if the actual issue was a love triangle, sexual jealousy or sexual rivalry, and code accordingly.

¹³The offender is jealous of real or imagined infidelity. Homosexual relationships included.

¹⁴If the MAR code is "teen gang altercation," never change it. You may, however, indicate another second causative factor.

¹⁵This is an argument centered on an accusation of a theft. If a thief is killed in the act, code instead 905 (attempted theft) or other appropriate code.

¹⁶Shooting from a moving vehicle. If there is evidence that the motive was street gang-related or some other motive, CAUSFACT should be coded the appropriate code (eg: 140), and CAUSFAC2 should be coded 147.

¹⁷An altercation on the highway about right-of-way, being cut off, etc. Not a drive-by shooting.

¹⁸A triangle altercation differs from sexual rivalry and sexual jealousy in that there is clear evidence that infidelity was involved (not just the offender's perception). Includes homosexual as well as heterosexual triangles.

¹⁹Two people competing for or arguing over the affections of a third person, homosexual relationships included.

²⁰"Sexual Perversion" is an MAR code used since 1965. In cases of male-on-male rape or sexual assault, including attempts, code MOTVSEX=1 (sexual assault of a male). In cases of same-sex lovers or acquaintances, code the cause of the altercation (eg: 167, altercation over terminating relationship), and also code the appropriate

500 U.U.W. (INCLUDING CARELESS USE OF A WEAPON)²¹

600 UNDETERMINED

700 ORGANIZED CRIME	800 VICTIM IS AN ARSONIST
805 VICTIM IS A BURGLAR	810 VICTIM IS A CARTAGE THIEF
815 VICTIM RUNS A CHOP SHOP	820 VICTIM IS A COUNTERFEITER
825 VICTIM IS A FENCE	830 VICTIM IS A GAMBLER
835 VICTIM IS A LOAN SHARK	840 VICTIM IS DEALING NARCOTICS
845 VICTIM IS A PROSTITUTE	846 VICTIM IS A RAPIST
850 VICTIM IS A ROBBER	

900 ARSON VICTIM ²²	905 ATTEMPTED THEFT
910 BLACKMAIL (EXTORTION)	
915 CHILD ABUSE (BATTERED CHILD)	
917 MEDICAL TREATMENT ²³	
920 DECEPTIVE PRACTICE	925 VICTIM KILLED BY FLEEING FELON
930 INSURANCE FRAUD	935 VICTIM INTERCEDING IN A FELONY
940 MENTAL DISORDER	945 MERCY KILLING
950 RANSOM	955 SUICIDE PACT
960 RETALIATION	965 CONTRACT KILLING

Expressive versus instrumental motive

Expressive violence, whether the outcome is lethal or not, is violence that begins as an interpersonal confrontation; instrumental lethal or nonlethal violence begins as a predatory attack. In an expressive violent confrontation, violence or injury is the assailant's immediate and primary goal; other motives are secondary. In contrast, the primary purpose of an act of instrumental violence is not to hurt, injure or kill, but to acquire money or property. The expressive/instrumental extremes are "ideal types" that seldom occur in their pure form. Nevertheless, the degree to which either the expressive or the instrumental motive predominates illuminates much that seems paradoxical in lethal violence data. An increasing body of evidence suggests that expressive and instrumental violent confrontations follow distinctive patterns. They vary differently over time and across space, and relate differently to the descriptive and explanatory variables usually found in studies of violence. It is not surprising, then, that research studies that fail to

"RELATION" category.

²¹Random shootings, for example, at a schoolyard or into a crowd. If there is evidence that the motive was street gang-related or some other motive, CAUSFACT should be coded the appropriate code (eg: 140), and CAUSFAC2 should be coded 500.

²²In an arson murder, the second causative factor should always be "900" (arson). Use the first causative factor to code the kind of situation that led to the arson (eg: some altercation, burglary, insurance fraud, etc.).

²³For example: malpractice, illegal abortion.

distinguish between expressive and instrumental violence may fail to find significant explanatory patterns, or may find conflicting patterns from study to study.

The Chicago Homicide Project developed and tested the CIRCUM variable to capture whether an expressive or an instrumental motive was the offender's immediate and primary goal at the time of the incident. Because sexual assault often contains aspects of both, the CIRCUM variable puts rape/sexual assault into a separate category. Also, the infrequent cases in which there is another primary motive (for example, a suicide pact) are coded separately. The codebook instructions for CIRCUM are given below.

CIRCUM: CIRCUMSTANCES - EXPRESSIVE VERSUS INSTRUMENTAL

Instructions: What was the offender's primary goal at the time of the incident? Code according to the offender's immediate primary motive, regardless of the actual consequences (even if a bystander, not the "intended" victim, was killed). Code according to the definitions below, with attention to the notes.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 FIGHT OR BRAWL | 2 OTHER EXPRESSIVE |
| 3 INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVE | 4 BOTH EXPRESSIVE AND INSTRUMENTAL |
| 5 RAPE, SEXUAL ASSAULT | 6 OTHER KNOWN OFFENDER MOTIVE |
| 9 NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION TO TELL | |

(1) Fight or brawl: An expressive altercation in which both the intended victim and the offender participated. Primary and immediate goal of participants is to hurt, injure, or kill. Examples: street gang fight, barroom brawl, domestic fight, bystander killed in crossfire of such a fight.²⁴

(2) Other Expressive: Offender's immediate and primary goal was to hurt, kill or maim either the actual victim or someone else. No clear evidence of a fight. Not a contract killing. Examples: spouse abuse, child abuse, elder abuse, revenge or retaliation (saving "face" or honor), arson to injure or for revenge, "hate" killings (gay bashing, racial killings), "random" killings (firing a gun into the street), drive-by killings, murder/suicide, bystander killed by "accident" in such situations.²⁵

(3) Instrumental Motive: Offender's immediate and primary goal was to obtain money or property. Examples: robbery, burglary, attempted theft, arson for profit, contract killing. Street gang-motivated killings may also be instrumental, for example killings to support a gang enterprise such as a drug business.

(4) Offender's immediate motive included both expressive and instrumental aspects. Attempt to determine and code the primary motive - expressive or instrumental. However, if both motives were clearly present, code here. **Record details in "Remarks"**.

(5) Rape murder: Offender's goal was sexual assault (any kind), of a male or female victim. Code even if sexual assault was only threatened or attempted.

(6) Other Known Offender Motive: for example: mercy killing (euthanasia), medical treatment (eg: malpractice, illegal abortion), suicide pact.²⁶ **Record details in "Remarks."**

(9) Not enough information to code offender's motive. No "altercation," "causative factor," or other relevant narrative in Murder Analysis Report. Eg: Body found on street, no evidence of robbery.

²⁴If the choice is unclear between 1 (fight or brawl) and 2 (other expressive), code 2.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Only code "suicide pact" if there is evidence in the MAR of an actual agreement (pact) between victim and offender. Otherwise, code "murder/suicide" under DEATHOF and appropriate goal under CIRCUM.

Though expressive/instrumental orientation is a fundamental variable, it is certainly not the only important situational variable in violence. Homicides involving drugs or liquor are expressive homicides if they involve a fight, brawl, or argument. Homicides involving drugs are instrumental homicides if the motive is to obtain drugs or money to buy drugs, or to further a drug business. Similarly, street gang-motivated homicides may be either expressive (turf battles) or instrumental (drug business or other entrepreneurial gang activity); instrumental attacks occur among family and friends as well as strangers, and strangers may attack each other in an expressive "confrontational competition." Detailed definitions and coding of drug-related, street gang-motivated and relationship are given below.

Homicide syndromes

Almost all homicides correspond to a sibling offense -- similar incidents in which a fatal outcome did not occur. Expressive homicides, had they not had a fatal outcome, would have been assaults, and instrumental homicides would have been a robbery or a burglary. The primary determining factor in the Homicide Syndrome taxonomy is position on the expressive/instrumental continuum, which is determined by the offender's immediate and primary motive. Each Homicide Syndrome is similar to a sibling offense as a consequence of their common position on the expressive/instrumental continuum.

The Homicide Syndrome codes used in Chicago Homicide Project reports vary somewhat in the specific syndromes of interest, but a frequent classification is the following: Spousal-expressive, child abuse, other family-expressive, friend-expressive, stranger-expressive, street gang-motivated, rape/sexual assault, instrumental, other and mystery.

- Spousal-expressive homicides, including spouses, ex-spouses, common-law and ex-common-law relationship, and boyfriend/girlfriend, and ex-boyfriend/ex-girlfriend (see "relationship variables," below), accounted for 12 percent of all homicides in Chicago from 1965 to 1989.
- Child abuse homicides accounted for two percent of the total. Child abuse is coded only when the child was battered, not when a child was killed in another circumstance such as a robbery or in gang crossfire. (See CAUSFACT code 916, above.)
- Expressive homicides by other family members (for example, brothers, adult children and parents, cousins) accounted for four percent of Chicago homicides from 1965 to 1989, including only expressive homicides (CIRCUM codes 1 or 2, above).
- Expressive homicides by friends, neighbors and acquaintances accounted for 32 percent of 1965-to-1989 Chicago homicides. Again, these include only expressive homicides (CIRCUM codes 1 or 2, above). Street gang-expressive homicides are categorized separately.
 - Expressive homicides by strangers accounted for seven percent of total Chicago homicides from 1965 to 1989. These also include only expressive homicides (CIRCUM codes 1 or 2, above). Common examples are barroom brawls, hate crimes, or attacks by groups of strangers on the street.
- Instrumental homicides, predatory homicides to obtain money or property, accounted for 18 percent of the total over the 25 years. This number can be sub-divided into specific

relationship or situation, such as stranger-instrumental, neighbor or friend-instrumental, legal versus illegal business-instrumental, and so on. Street gang-instrumental homicides are categorized separately.

- In a rape/sexual assault homicide, the offender's goal was sexual assault (any kind) of a male or female victim (CIRCUM code 5, MOTVSEX 1 or 2, above). Rape homicide accounted for 1.6 percent of total homicides in Chicago from 1965 to 1989. In cases in which there was more than one motive (for example, a robbery/rape), we categorize the homicide syndrome as rape.
- In street gang-motivated homicides, there must be positive evidence that gang activity or gang membership was the motive of the incident. Neither gang membership nor age is a determining factor. See CAUSFACT code 140, above, and the detailed discussion in the following section. Although street gang-motivated homicides accounted for 6.5 percent of all homicides in Chicago from 1965 to 1989, the proportion ranged from only 1.8 percent in 1975 to 10.2 percent in 1984. Street gang-motivated homicides may be further divided into gang-instrumental and gang-expressive.
- Other homicide syndromes include murder-suicide pacts and mercy killings, and comprised only 0.4 percent of all Chicago homicides over the 25 years.
- Mysteries are unsolved homicides, cases in which the identity and characteristics of the offender(s) were unknown to the police, or in which an offender was identified but there was no evidence as to motive. Overall, mystery homicides accounted for 16 percent of homicides over the 25 years, ranging from 4.0 percent in 1965 to 22.6 percent in 1980.

Street gang-motivated homicide

The Chicago Police Department (CPD) defines street gang as "an association of individuals who exhibit the following characteristics in varying degrees: a gang name and recognizable symbols, a geographic territory, a regular meeting pattern, and an organized, continuous course of criminality" (CPD, 1992:1). This definition is not limited by the size of the gang or the age of the members. Analyses by Spergel (1990) and Block (1992), for example, found that a substantial number of street gang members and street gang-related homicide victims and offenders were in their thirties or older.

The Chicago Police Department's definition of an offense as "street gang-related" is based upon the motive of the offender. The preponderance of evidence must indicate that the incident grew out of a street gang function. Gang membership of either party is not enough, by itself, to determine gang-relatedness, unless other elements of the case establish a relationship. The determination is made according to the following investigatory process:

When a crime is reported to or discovered by the police, an investigation is initiated during which the reporting officer may note some evidence of street gang involvement. . . . When a case flagged as street gang related arrives at the Gang Crimes Section the report contents are carefully reviewed for evidence of criminal trademarks and traits normally indicative of street gang related offenses. These cases are further reviewed by application of a set of descriptors which delineate the circumstances of the event, and then are machine coded for report generation. . . . As a quality control measure, those cases reviewed for inclusion in the gang

crimes data base are periodically audited by a unit supervisor who assures a reasonable and consistent application of the definitions and criteria required by the system (Bobrowski, 1988:6-7).²⁷

Investigators reviewing a case report to determine gang-relatedness by the following descriptors of possible street gang motives (CPD, 1992:11-12; Bobrowski, 1988:15-29):

1. Representing: the offense (frequently robbery or assault) grew out of a signification of gang identity or alliance (by hand signs, language, clothing, and so on);
2. Recruitment: offense related to recruiting of members for a street gang;
3. Intimidation: (eg: of a victim or witness);
4. Turf Violation: offense committed to disrespect another gang's territory, often the defacing of one street gang's logo by another;
5. Prestige: offense committed either to glorify the street gang or to gain rank within the gang;
6. Personal conflict: within the rank and file of a gang, either conflicts over leadership or punitive action when violation of street gang rules results in a member being "violated" by other gang members;
7. Extortion: efforts to compel membership or to exact tribute for the gang, including protection money from local business or a "street tax" from independent narcotics dealers within the street gang's turf;
8. Vice: generally the street level distribution of narcotics by street gang members; and
9. Retaliation: repayment for offenses against the gang by rival gang members, non-gang victims or complaining witnesses, often resulting in a cycle of violence.

Although street gang members may commit many crimes, not every crime committed by a street gang member is related to the street gang affiliation. A street gang member who beats his girlfriend has not committed a street gang-motivated crime unless his action was inspired by membership in the street gang. A drug deal among street gang members that goes bad and results in death is not a street gang homicide unless the drug deal was street gang-motivated (for example, an argument over street gang marketing turfs).

The Los Angeles City and County Police Departments define street gang-related offenses by affiliation rather than motivation (Maxson & Klein, 1990). Street gang crimes are crimes committed by street gang members, whether or not the incident had any relationship to a street gang function. This definitional difference is one reason for the substantially greater number of

²⁷An exception applies only to "vice" offenses (narcotics, prostitution, gambling, and so on). In 1987, the Gang Crime Section began to count vice offenses as gang-related if they involved a known gang member (Bobrowski, 1988:14). Fortunately, this policy does not apply to homicide (even drug-related homicide) or to any other offense except vice offenses.

"street gang-related" crimes in Los Angeles than in Chicago. The accuracy of a membership definition depends on the accuracy of the list of street gang members. Such lists may be outdated, may not differentiate between core and peripheral members, and may expand or contract according to police resources rather than actual street gang membership. For example, an officer in the Los Angeles County Police Department told the Juvenile Justice Digest (Jan. 24, 1990) that, "one reason for the higher number of gang-related killings was the growing list of known gang members that enables police to blame more killings on gang activity."

Both definitions of street gang-related crime are reasonable, depending on the question being asked. To discover the rates of gang membership within a neighborhood or the vulnerability of gang members to become a victim or an offender, we would need data on offenses attributed to gang members (the Los Angeles definition). On the other hand, to accurately describe the harm done (people murdered, thefts committed, vandalism) by street gang activity, and to discover patterns across time or place of offenses generated by street gangs, we need data on offenses motivated by street gang activity (the Chicago definition).

Victim Precipitation

Marvin Wolfgang (1958:252) defined victim precipitation in the following way: The term **victim-precipitated** is applied to those criminal homicides in which the victim is a direct, positive precipitator in the crime. The role of the victim is characterized by his having been the first in the homicide drama to use physical force directed against his subsequent slayer. The victim-precipitated cases are those in which the victim was the first to show and use a deadly weapon, to strike a blow in an altercation -- in short, the first to commence the interplay of resort to physical violence.

Although this concept seems clear, it is difficult to apply in practice. Victim precipitation, as Wolfgang defined it, was an integral part of the Chicago Homicide Project from its inception. For many years and through several phases of data collection, project staff made an earnest and persistent effort to determine whether or not each incident was victim precipitated. However, it was difficult to resolve reliably and objectively the issue of identifying who struck the first blow or who was the first to show and use a deadly weapon. Despite our efforts, inter-coder reliability remained very low. Finally, during data collection of 1979-to-1981, we gave up.

The current codebook has dropped victim precipitation as a separate variable, but retains items that capture related information, such as victim **participation** (victim was committing either a predatory or a "victimless" crime in the incident),²⁸ vengeance (victim killed in revenge for an earlier predatory crime), and retaliation (victim killed in reaction to an earlier confrontation), as well as information on the past arrest record of the victim and liquor or drug use in the incident. The following variables give some indication of victim participation. Also see the "800" codes under CAUSFACT, above, and the liquor and drug-related variables, below.

VICINTER: VICTIM KILLED WHILE INTERVENING IN A CRIME?

²⁸Examples of victims committing a predatory crime during the incident are robbers, burglars and arsonists. Examples of victims committing a "victimless" crime during the incident are gamblers or clients of a prostitute. Drug buyers and sellers are included in a separate category (see VICCRIME, below).

Instructions: Code if victim was a third person intervening in another crime.

- 1 YES, VICTIM IS A POLICE OFFICER
- 2 YES, VICTIM IS NOT A POLICE OFFICER (eg: Good Samaritan assisting victim of robbery; person intervening in a fight)
- 3 YES, VICTIM WAS A PASSIVE BYSTANDER (eg: person caught in gang crossfire, person killed as a witness to another crime)

- 0 NOT INDICATED; NOT INVOLVED

VICCRIME: WAS VICTIM KILLED WHILE COMMITTING A CRIME?

Instructions: Code if victim killed while committing or as a result of committing a predatory crime (eg: robbery, rape). Do not count assault (fight, brawl, altercation), or an alleged theft as a predatory crime.

- 1 VICTIM KILLED WHILE COMMITTING A PREDATORY CRIME
(see "800" codes under Causative Factor)
- 2 NO, VICTIM NOT INVOLVED IN COMMITTING A CRIME
- 3 VENGEANCE;
OFFENDER'S MOTIVE WAS REVENGE FOR AN EARLIER PREDATORY CRIME
- 4 VICTIM WAS COMMITTING A "VICTIMLESS" CRIME
(eg: using drugs, visiting a prostitute)
- 5 VICTIM INVOLVED IN A DRUG TRANSACTION²⁹

- 0 NOT INDICATED; NOT INVOLVED; NO INFORMATION

Thus, while we have found it possible to capture the victim's participation in the incident, we have not found it possible to capture reliably the victim's precipitation of the incident. In fact, we question whether the concept of victim precipitation is measurable or even definable. There are several reasons for this. First, in most cases, only one of the key participants is alive to testify about "who started it." This is the offender, whose account of events may be biased. The other key participant is dead, and there are often no other witnesses or available evidence. Second, even when witnesses and other evidence are available, it may be difficult or impossible to determine the exact temporal sequence of events in a confrontational situation in which many things are happening simultaneously or in quick progression. Finally, as victimization survey methodologists have discovered, it is often difficult to distinguish between successive incidents, in order to differentiate between precipitation of the specific incident versus retaliation or revenge for some earlier incident.

²⁹A prior drug transaction (eg: the victim failed to deliver) is also included here.

Drug and alcohol involvement in incident

The Chicago Homicide Dataset contains variables that measure separately and distinguish between 1) liquor use by participants (intoxication during the incident), 2) drug use by participants (being high during the incident), and 3) drug-related motive for the incident (see Goldstein, 1985). In addition, other variables capture "altercation over liquor," "altercation over drugs" and "victim is dealing narcotics" (see CAUSFACT), "drug pusher/ drug buyer or user" (see VRAMREL and ORAMREL) and "victim involved in a drug transaction" (see VICCRIME).

Since 1965, the Chicago Homicide Project has collected information on alcohol involvement in the incident, based on police investigation records. Occasionally, there is information from the Medical Examiner's Office, but this is rare. The usual case is a designation based on evidence at the scene. Unfortunately, the determination of whether the victim, the offender, both, or neither were intoxicated is not possible with any reliability, though we have attempted to gather that information over the entire time period (see LIQUOR, below). However, the aggregate information as to whether or not either victim or offender (or both) were intoxicated is more reliable. DRUGUSED (see below) was developed in the current data collection effort, but all cases back to 1965 were coded. It's interpretation and limits are similar to LIQUOR.

LIQUOR: WHO WAS USING ALCOHOL AT TIME OF INCIDENT?

Instructions: Was victim or offender intoxicated during the incident? Indicate in remarks if evidence is based on blood tests.

- 1 YES, VICTIM; NO, OFFENDER (or no information about offender)
 - 2 NO, NEITHER; NO INVOLVEMENT INDICATED
 - 3 NO, VICTIM; NO INFORMATION ABOUT OFFENDER
 - 4 NO, VICTIM; YES, OFFENDER
 - 5 YES, BOTH VICTIM AND OFFENDER
 - 6 YES, UNDETERMINED WHO
- 0 CAN'T TELL, NO INFORMATION

DRUGUSED WHO WAS USING DRUGS AT TIME OF INCIDENT?

Instructions: Was victim or offender high during the incident? Indicate in remarks if evidence is based on blood tests.

- 1 YES, VICTIM
 - 2 NO, NEITHER VICTIM NOR OFFENDER
 - 3 NO, VICTIM; BUT NO OFFENDER INFORMATION
 - 4 NO, VICTIM; YES, OFFENDER
 - 5 YES, BOTH VICTIM AND OFFENDER
 - 6 YES, UNDETERMINED WHO
- 0 NO INFORMATION; CAN'T TELL

The variable capturing drug-related motive, DRUGSINV, was intended to be analogous (in conjunction with DRUGUSED) to Goldstein's tripartite taxonomy. In an incident with a drug-related motive, there is positive evidence that drugs formed a motivation or cause of the incident. For example, the cause could have been the business of drugs (a dealer putting out a contract on another dealer), an argument over drugs (a couple fighting over using limited money to buy drugs versus feed the baby), the acquisition of drugs (robbery of drugs or robbery to get money to buy drugs), or other types of causation (a baby starving to death because the parents were high).

DRUGSINV: DRUGS INVOLVED IN THE INCIDENT?

Instructions: If there is positive evidence that drug involvement was a cause of the incident, code 1, 2, 3, or 4. If there is some indication, but no positive evidence, code 5 and describe the situation in "Remarks." If the victim or the offender was high, but there is no other involvement, code under DRUGUSED, not here.

- 1 INVOLVED: SELLING OR DRUG BUSINESS³⁰
- 2 ARGUMENT OVER POSSESSION, USE OR COST OF DRUGS
- 3 GETTING MONEY FOR DRUGS, ACQUIRING DRUGS FOR PERSONAL USE
- 4 OTHER DRUG INVOLVEMENT³¹
- 5 PROBABLE DRUG INVOLVEMENT, BUT NO POSITIVE EVIDENCE³²
- 0 NO INVOLVEMENT INDICATED; NO INFORMATION

The development of DRUGSINV involved extensive testing and reliability checking. In 1988, Officer Jack Gavin of the Crime Analysis Unit coded all cases drug-related versus not drug-related as they were booked. He explained his decision process to us, and we attempted to capture those decisions in the draft of the DRUGSINV codes. He went on to use the same scheme in 1989, while the coders used DRUGSINV to code the years 1982-to-1989. Following extensive inter-coder reliability checking and checking of Project codes against Officer Gavin's designation in 1988 and 1989, we coded all cases back to 1965. As an example of the development of DRUGSINV, in reviews of coding errors and meetings with coders, it became apparent that many coders were coding drug motive when there was circumstantial evidence only. Therefore, we provided a new code for incidents in which there was circumstantial, but not positive, evidence that drugs were a motive, such as a known dealer being found dead with no other evidence. (In addition, coders are encouraged to explain such situations in the Remarks.) This mechanism retained the integrity of the four "positive evidence" codes, while providing some information about ambiguous situations.

³⁰Code when the business is the motive for the incident. Eg: both victim and offender involved in dealing, victim killed as a bystander, victim killed because he interfered with the business. Acquiring drugs for personal use is coded as 3.

³¹Example: baby dies of malnutrition because parents high.

³²Examples: victim found in room strewn with needles and other paraphernalia; victim was known dealer and found dead at usual place of business.

Relationship variables

In the original 1965-to-1981 dataset, the offender-to-victim relationship was coded in a single code (see RELATION, below). In the current 1965-to-1990 dataset, these original codes are retained, but in addition all 20,000 cases are also coded with two separate variables for victim relationship and offender relationship (see, for example, VRAMREL, below). In addition, the current version has included additional variables to clarify the exact victim/offender relationship -- the surnames of victim and offender, whether or not they co-reside, and the victim's and offender's marital status (for detail, see below).

RELATION: RELATIONSHIP OF FIRST OFFENDER TO VICTIM (1965-to-1987 codes)

Instructions: Enter **OFFENDER-to-VICTIM** relationship, using the codes below. Code only relationships that are relevant to the incident. See Notes.

0	UNDETERMINED BY POLICE, MYSTERY, RELATIONSHIP NOT ESTABLISHED				
1	FRIENDS	2	NEIGHBORS	3	SOME ACQUAINTANCE
4	NO RELATIONSHIP, STRANGER				
5	MOTHER-IN-LAW/SON-IN-LAW	6	DAUGHTER-IN-LAW/FATHER-IN-LAW		
10	HUSBAND/WIFE - LEGAL	11	HUSBAND/WIFE - COMMONLAW		
12	WIFE/HUSBAND - LEGAL	13	WIFE/HUSBAND - COMMONLAW		
14	EX-HUSBAND/EX-WIFE COMMONLAW	15	EX-WIFE/EX-HUSBAND - COMMONLAW		
17	STEPDAUGHTER/STEPFATHER	18	NEPHEW/UNCLE		
19	SISTER-IN-LAW/BROTHER-IN-LAW				
20	FATHER/DAUGHTER	21	FATHER/SON	22	MOTHER/SON
23	SON/FATHER	24	SON/MOTHER	25	DAUGHTER/MOTHER
26	DAUGHTER/FATHER	27	STEPFATHER/STEPSON		
		28	STEPSON/STEPFATHER		
29	BROTHER/BROTHER	30	SISTER/BROTHER		
		31	HALF-BROTHER/HALF-BROTHER		
32	HALF-BROTHER/HALF-SISTER	33	GREATAUNT/GRANDNEPHEW		
34	UNCLE/NEPHEW	35	AUNT/NEPHEW	36	NIECE/UNCLE
37	FATHER-IN-LAW/SON-IN-LAW	38	BROTHER-IN-LAW/BROTHER-IN-LAW		
39	SISTER-IN-LAW/SISTER-IN-LAW				
40	EX-HUSBAND/EX-WIFE-LEGAL ³³	41	EX-WIFE/EX-HUSBAND-LEGAL ³⁴		
42	GIRLFRIEND/BOYFRIEND	43	BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND		
44	EX-BOYFRIEND/EX-GIRLFRIEND	45	EX-GIRLFRIEND/EX-BOYFRIEND		
46	MOTHER/DAUGHTER	47	COUSIN/COUSIN		
48	GRANDFATHER/GRANDSON	49	GRANDSON/GRANDFATHER		
50	EMPLOYER/EMPLOYEE	51	TENANT/LANDLORD or LANDLADY		
52	LANDLADY/TENANT	53	LANDLORD/TENANT		
54	HOTEL CLERK/TENANT	55	CO-WORKERS OR BUSINESS PARTNERS		
56	BABY-SITTER/BABY	57	CUSTOMER/PROPRIETOR OR STAFF		
58	PROPRIETOR OR STAFF/ CUSTOMER	59	SON-IN-LAW/FATHER-IN-LAW		
60	EMPLOYEE/EMPLOYER	61	GRANDUNCLE/GRANDNEPHEW		
62	BROTHER/SISTER	63	POLICE (OFF-DUTY)/SUSPECT		
64	PATIENT/DOCTOR	65	HALF-SISTER/HALF-BROTHER		
66	FATHER-IN-LAW/DAUGHTER-IN-LAW	67	FARE/CAB DRIVER		
68	SUSPECT/POLICE	69	LEGAL GUARDIAN or FOSTER PARENT/CHILD		
70	UNCLE/NIECE	71	SON-IN-LAW/MOTHER-IN-LAW		
72	DAUGHTER-IN-LAW/MOTHER-IN-LAW	73	BOTH PARENTS/CHILD		
74	BROTHER-IN-LAW/SISTER-IN-LAW	75	SUSPECT/SECURITY GUARD		
76	NEPHEW/AUNT	77	STEPFATHER/STEPDAUGHTER		
78	STEPBROTHER/STEPBROTHER	79	STUDENT/TEACHER		
80	SECURITY GUARD/SUSPECT	81	GRANDDAUGHTER/GRANDMOTHER		
82	NIECE/AUNT	83	GRANDSON/GRANDMOTHER		
84	DOCTOR/PATIENT	85	HOMOSEXUAL - LONG TERM, DOMESTIC		
86	HOMOSEXUAL - ACQUAINTANCES	87	AUNT/NIECE		
88	STEPMOTHER/STEPSON	89	SISTER/SISTER		
90	FOSTER CHILD/FOSTER PARENT or LEGAL GUARDIAN				

³³Include separated couples under "ex-husband and ex-wife" relationships, if there is evidence in the MAR that the couple has established separate residences.

³⁴Ibid.

In the 1965-to-1981 archive, only information on the first offender's relationship to the victim was collected, but in the 1965-to-1990 dataset, separate variables are included for up to five offenders per victim. Information on additional offenders is included under the "remarks." This reduces the likelihood of one of the most frequent coder errors (reversing the victim and offender relationship, such as husband/wife versus wife/husband). In addition, the current coding scheme includes relationship detail not previously captured, such as drug buyer/ drug pusher, prostitute/ pimp, contract killer/ witness, or gang member/ rival gang member.

VRAMREL1: RELATIONSHIP OF VICTIM TO FIRST OFFENDER (current codes)

Instructions: Enter **VICTIM'S** relationship to offender, using RAMIS codes. Code only relationships that are relevant to the incident.

Note: There are up to ten victim/offender relationship variables collected, VRAMREL1 and ORAMREL1 for the first offender, VRAMREL2 and ORAMREL2 for the second offender, and so on. Information for the sixth or more offender is recorded in the "Remarks" narrative.

101 HUSBAND (LEGAL)	102 WIFE (LEGAL)	
103 HUSBAND (COMMON-LAW)	104 WIFE (COMMON-LAW)	
105 EX-HUSBAND	106 EX-WIFE	
201 FATHER	202 MOTHER	203 SON
204 DAUGHTER	205 BROTHER	206 SISTER
209 UNCLE	210 AUNT	211 NEPHEW
212 NIECE	213 COUSIN	214 GRANDFATHER
215 GRANDMOTHER	216 GRANDSON	217 GRANDDAUGHTER
218 MOTHER'S BOYFRIEND	301 STEPFATHER	302 STEPMOTHER
303 STEPSON	304 STEPDAUGHTER	307 FOSTER FATHER
308 FOSTER MOTHER	309 FOSTER SON	310 FOSTER DAUGHTER
311 FATHER-IN-LAW	312 MOTHER-IN-LAW	313 SON-IN-LAW
314 DAUGHTER-IN-LAW	315 BROTHER-IN-LAW	316 SISTER-IN-LAW
401 BOYFRIEND	402 GIRLFRIEND	
501 LANDLORD	502 LANDLADY	503 TENANT
504 JANITOR	505 ROOMER/ROOMMATES	507 EMPLOYER
508 EMPLOYEE	509 CO-WORKERS,PARTNERS	510 PROPRIETOR
511 CUSTOMER	601 FRIENDS	602 NEIGHBORS
603 ACQUAINTANCES		
604 RELATIONSHIP NOT ESTABLISHED	605 NO RELATIONSHIP,STRANGERS	
617 CHILD		
701 HALF-BROTHER	702 HALF-SISTER	
703 EX-BOYFRIEND	704 EX-GIRLFRIEND	
705 CHILD (BEING WATCHED)	706 BABYSITTER, SITTER	
707 TEACHER	708 STUDENT	
709 SECURITY GUARD	710 POLICE	
711 SUSPECT(ROBBER,BURGLAR,ETC.)	712 CAB DRIVER	
713 FARE IN CAB	714 RESTAURANT/BAR STAFF	
715 CUSTOMER/DINER/DRINKER	716 PROSTITUTE	
717 PROSTITUTE'S CLIENT	718 GAMBLER	
719 DRUG PUSHER	720 DRUG BUYER/USER	
721 DOCTOR	722 PATIENT	
723 GANG MEMBER (SAME GANG)	724 MEMBERS OF RIVAL GANGS	
725 PIMP	726 SEXUAL RIVALS	
727 CELL MATE	728 HIRED KILLER	
729 TARGET FOR CONTRACT	730 NONGANG MEMBER,TARGET OF GANG	
731 HOMOSEXUAL ACQUAINTANCES	732 HOMOSEXUAL LOVERS (LONG-TIME)	
734 WITNESS,INFORMANT OF CRIME	735 EX-COMMONLAW WIFE	
736 EX-COMMONLAW HUSBAND	738 FIREMAN	

In order to specify a more specific relationship between the victim and the offender, particularly in intimate violence cases, the following variables were added to the current 1965-to-1990 dataset:

SAMESUR1: ARE VICTIM'S AND OFFENDER'S SURNAMES THE SAME?

Instructions: Code as indicated, using all available information in MAR.

- 1 YES - FIRST OFFENDER HAS SAME SURNAME AS VICTIM
- 2 NO - FIRST OFFENDER AND VICTIM HAVE DIFFERENT SURNAMES
- 0 NO INFORMATION; OFFENDER NOT IDENTIFIED

SAMEADD: DOES VICTIM RESIDE WITH OFFENDER?

Instructions: Code as indicated, using all available information in MAR. Assume "no" unless there is positive evidence or strong indication otherwise.

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 3 NO INFORMATION, CANNOT BE DETERMINED

VMARITAL: VICTIM'S MARITAL STATUS

Instructions: Code as indicated, using all available information in MAR.

- 1 MARRIED - LEGAL
- 2 MARRIED BUT SEPARATED
- 3 WIDOWED
- 4 DIVORCED
- 5 SINGLE³⁵
- 6 COMMONLAW MARRIAGE³⁶
- 7 COMMONLAW BUT SEPARATED
- 0 NO INFORMATION, CANNOT BE DETERMINED

OMARITAL: FIRST OFFENDER'S MARITAL STATUS

Instructions: Code as indicated, using all available information in MAR.

- 1 MARRIED - LEGAL
- 2 MARRIED BUT SEPARATED
- 3 WIDOWED
- 4 DIVORCED
- 5 SINGLE³⁷
- 6 COMMONLAW MARRIAGE³⁸
- 7 COMMONLAW BUT SEPARATED
- 0 NO INFORMATION, CANNOT BE DETERMINED

³⁵If there is no information about marital status, but the victim is aged 15 or younger, code "single".

³⁶With no other evidence, do not assume commonlaw, even if they have been co-residing for many years. Maintain the police definition, but note length of time co-residing in "remarks".

³⁷If there is no information about marital status, but the victim is aged 15 or younger, code "single".

³⁸With no other evidence, do not assume commonlaw, even if they have been co-residing for many years. Maintain the police definition, but note length of time co-residing in "remarks".

SELECTED PRODUCTS

Possibly the best guide to the attributes of a dataset is a review of the reports and other publication that have used it. Below, we include a selected bibliography of some of the more significant pieces of research that have been based on the Chicago Homicide Dataset. We would like to invite the reader to obtain a copy of the dataset from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, and to add to this list of publications. Please do not hesitate to contact either one of us with questions about the data, and please send us a copy of your report or publication for our files.

The Chicago Homicide Dataset has been widely used by researchers and decision makers interested in the analysis of violence. Some of the more significant research products are listed below.³⁹ In addition to the codebook, these reports include extensive and detailed coding instructions, and also further detail about the Chicago Police Department's use of specific terms (such as "street gang-related" homicide). Please see this documentation before attempting to interpret the data.

- Block, Carolyn Rebecca (1985). Race/ethnicity and patterns of Chicago homicide: 1965 to 1981. *Crime and Delinquency*, 31(1,January):104-116.
- Block, Carolyn Rebecca (1987a). *Homicide in Chicago*. Chicago: Loyola University of Chicago, Urban Insights Series.
- Block, Carolyn Rebecca (1987b). Lethal Violence at Home:Racial/Ethnic Differences in Domestic Homicide: Chicago, 1965 to 1981. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology.
- Block, Carolyn Rebecca (1988). Lethal Violence in the Chicago Latino Community: 1965-1981. Pp. 31-66 in *Violence and Homicide in Hispanic Communities*, Jess Kraus, Susan Sorenson & Paul Juarez (eds.), Office of Minority Health, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services.
- Block, Carolyn Rebecca (1992). Lethal violence in the Chicago Latino Community. Chapter in *The Dynamics of the Victim-Offender Interaction*, Anna V. Wilson (ed.). Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Block, Carolyn Rebecca and Richard L. Block (1980). Patterns of Change in Chicago homicide: The Twenties, the Sixties, and the Seventies. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
- Block, Carolyn Rebecca and Richard L. Block (1980). Preliminary Analysis of Chicago Homicide Data, 1965 to 1989. Report prepared for the Panel on the Understanding

³⁹Because, unfortunately, ICPSR cannot maintain a record of users of particular datasets, it is not possible to compile a comprehensive inventory of publications based on the Chicago Homicide Dataset. This list, therefore, is a sample of the more significant publications known to the author.

and Control of Violent Behavior of the National Academy of Sciences, Neil Alan Weiner, Senior Research Associate.

- Block, Carolyn Rebecca and Richard Block (1992). Beyond Wolfgang: An Agenda for Homicide Research in the 1990s. *The Journal of Criminal Justice* 14:31-70.
- Block, Carolyn Rebecca, Craig McKie and Louise Miller (1983). Patterns of change over time in Canadian and United States homicide. *Policy Perspective*, 3(2):121-180.
- Block, Richard L. (1976). Homicide in Chicago: A nine-year study (1965-1973). *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 66(4):496-510.
- Block, Richard L. (1977). *Violent Crime: Environment, Interaction and Death*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington-Heath.
- Block, Richard L. (1979). Community, environment, and violent crime. *Criminology*, 17:46-57.
- Block, Richard L. (1981). Victim-offender dynamics in violent crime. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 72:743-761.
- Block, Richard and Carolyn Rebecca Block (1992). Homicide Syndromes and Vulnerability: Violence in Chicago's Community Areas over 25 Years. *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention*, Vol 1. Oslo/Stockholm, Scandinavian University Press.
- Block, Richard, and Franklin E. Zimring (1973). Homicide in Chicago, 1965-1970. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 10:1-7.
- BJS (Bureau of Justice Statistics) (1988). *Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice*. U.S. Department of Justice, second edition.
- Daly, Martin and Margo Wilson (1990). Killing the competition. *Human Nature*, 1(1):83-109.
- Roncek, Dennis W. and Richard L. Block (1983). The effect of neighborhood change on homicide in Chicago. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology meetings.
- Roncek, Dennis W., Richard L. Block and James S. Vassar (1981). Ethnic change and homicide: Structural conditions and individual behavior. Paper 2presented at meetings of the Law and Society Association.
- Roncek, Dennis W. and Pamela A. Maier (1991). Bars, blocks, and crimes revisited: Linking the theory of routine activities to the empiricism of "hot spots." Manuscript.
- Zimring, Franklin E. (1979). American youth violence: Issues and trends. Chapter 3 in Norval Morris and Michael Tonry (eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zimring, Franklin E., Satyanshu K. Mukherjee and Barrik Van Winkle (1983). Intimate violence: A study of intersexual homicide in Chicago. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 50(2):910-930.

REFERENCES

- Block, Carolyn Rebecca (1992). Lethal violence in the Chicago Latino Community. Chapter in *The Dynamics of the Victim-Offender Interaction*, Anna V. Wilson (ed.). Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Block, Richard and Carolyn Rebecca Block (1992). Homicide Syndromes and Vulnerability: Violence in Chicago's Community Areas over 25 Years. *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention*, Vol 1. Oslo/Stockholm, Scandinavian University Press.
- Bobrowski, Lawrence J. (1988). Collecting, organizing and reporting street gang crime. Presented at the American Society of Criminology meetings. Chicago Police Department, Special Functions Group, Gang Crime Section.
- Chicago Police Department (CPD) (1992). *Street Gangs*. Gang Crime Section, internal report.
- Goldstein, Paul J. (1985). The drugs/violence nexus: A tripartite conceptual framework. *Journal of Drug Issues* 14:493-506.
- Maxson, Cheryl L. and Malcolm W. Klein (1990). Street Gang Violence: Twice as Great, or Half as Great? Pp. 71-100 in C. Ronald Huff (ed.), *Gangs in America*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Miller, Walter B. (1975). *Violence by Youth Gangs and Youth Groups as a Crime Problem in Major American Cities*. U. S. Department of Justice, National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Spergel, Irving A. (1990). Youth gangs: Continuity and change. Pp. 171-275 in *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*. Vol. 12. Michael Tonry & Norval Morris (eds.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E. (1958). *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., First Science Editions, printing 1966.