DEVELOPING THEORETICAL PROPOSTIONS OF FAR-RIGHT IDEOLOGICAL VICTIMIZATION

by

William S. Parkin

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Criminal Justice in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2012

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Criminal Justice in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy.

Joshua D. Freilich, Ph.D.

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

Joshua D. Freilich, Ph.D.

Date

Executive Officer

Lila Kazemian, Ph.D.

Amy Adamczyk, Ph.D.
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

DEVELOPING THEORETICAL PROPOSITIONS OF
FAR-RIGHT IDEOLOGICAL VICTIMIZATION.

by

William S. Parkin

Adviser: Joshua D. Freilich, Ph.D.

This study develops theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization using empirical data from the Extremist Crime Database, a unique, relational database that collects information on criminal activities, both ideological and routine, committed by domestic extremists in the United States. Data related to far-right ideological homicide events was collected, cleaned, and analyzed on the individual, situational, and macro-levels of analysis. Ideological victims were compared to other types of homicide victims, such as far-right non-ideological victims and "routine" homicide victims. Univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistical analyses were conducted to determine whether far-right ideological victims were similar or different to any of the comparison groups. After presenting the empirical results, theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization were formally stated, focusing on the concept of differential identity. It is argued that the presence and magnitude of differential identity on multiple levels of analysis can help to explain and predict ideological victimization risk. The study ends with a discussion of its contributions, limitations, and policy implications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Joshua Freilich, my committee chair, and Dr. Steven Chermak. Their years of tireless effort studying extremist violence, their generosity in making the data accessible, and their selfless mentoring made this research, and my education, possible. Similarly, I would also like to thank Dr. Roberta Belli and Dr. Jeffrey Gruenewald, whose contributions to the project, as well as their friendship, were invaluable.

Throughout the dissertation process, the advice of Dr. Lila Kazemian and Dr. Amy Adamczyk, my committee members, was instrumental in keeping me focused and on the right track.

I am also grateful to the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism who partially supported this study through a Terrorism Research Award.

Finally, I am eternally indebted to my family, friends and colleagues who supported me throughout the graduate school process. Without them, this achievement would be the less.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT……..……..iv

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS…….……...……v

TABLE OF CONTENTS…….…….…...vi

LIST OF TABLES…….……...ix

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....1

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW…….5

2.1 IDEOLOGICAL VIOLENCE & THE EXTREME FAR-RIGHT.....5

2.2 VICTIMIZATION RESEARCH.....….10

2.3 HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION.....14

2.3.1 Individual Characteristics.....15

2.3.2 Situational Characteristics.....24

2.3.3 Macro Characteristics.....31

2.4 CONCLUSION.....35

CHAPTER 3. DATA, METHODS & ANALYTICAL PLAN.....37

3.1 DATA.....37

3.1.1 The Extremist Crime Database.....40

3.1.2 The Supplementary Homicide Report.....54

3.1.3 Demographic, Political, Religious & Extremist Data.....61

3.2 ANALYSIS PLAN.....63

3.2.1 Variation Within FRI Victims.....63

3.2.2 Variation Between FRI, FRR & RTN Victims.....64

3.3 CONCLUSION AND A NOTE ON THEORY BUILDING.....68

CHAPTER 4. VARIATION WITHIN FAR-RIGHT IDEOLOGICAL VICTIMS……..70

4.1 GROUPING FAR-RIGHT IDEOLOGICAL VICTIMS.....71

4.2 INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FRI VICTIMIZATION.....72

4.3 SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FRI VICTIMIZATION.....81

4.4 MACRO CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMIZATION.....95

4.5 CONCLUSION.....100

CHAPTER 5. VARIATION BETWEEN FRI, FRR & RTN VICTIMS.....103

5.1 INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMIZATION.....103

5.2 SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMIZATION.....108

5.3 MACRO CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMIZATION.....117

5.4 MULTILEVEL CHARACTERISTICS OF VICTIMIZATION.....125

5.5 CONCLUSION.....128

CHAPTER 6. DIFFERENTIAL IDENTITY: THEORETICAL PROPOSTIONS OF FAR-RIGHT IDEOLOGICAL VICTIMIZATION.....130

6.1 DIFFERENTIAL IDENTITY.....132

6.2 DIFFERENTIAL IDENTITY ON THE INDIVIDUAL LEVEL.....135

6.3 DIFFERENTIAL IDENTITY ON THE SITUATIONAL LEVEL.....142

6.4 DIFFERENTIAL IDENTITY ON THE MACRO-LEVEL.....148

6.5 CONCLUSION.....154

CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION.....157

7.1 LIMITATIONS & CONTRIBUTIONS.....157

7.2 POLICY IMPLICATIONS.....160

7.3 FUTURE RESEARCH.....161

7.4 CONCLUSION.....163

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....165

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....5

2.1 STUDIES PRESENTING INDIVIDUAL & SITUATIONAL VICTIMIZATION CHARACTERISTICS.....16

2.2 STUDY RESULTS PRESENTING INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS.....17

2.3 STUDY RESULTS PRESENTING SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS.....25

CHAPTER 3. DATA, METHODS & ANALYTICAL PLAN.....37

3.1 ABBREVIATIONS.....38

3.2 DATA SOURCES.....39

3.3 VARIABLES EXAMINING VARIATION WITHIN FRI VICTIMS.....41

3.4 VARIABLES EXAMINING VARIATION BETWEEN FRI, FRR & RTN VICTIMS.....43

3.5 ANALYSES TO COMPARE FRI, FRR, RTN & TV.....65

CHAPTER 4. VARIATION WITHIN FAR-RIGHT IDEOLOGICAL VICTIMS.....70

4.1 PERCENT OF INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS WITHIN FRI AND BETWEEN TVS.....74

4.2 SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTCS OF FAR-RIGHT IDEOLOGICAL VICTIMIZATION ACROSS GROUPS.....83

4.3 AVERAGES OF COUNTY CHARACTERISTICS OF FAR-RIGHT IDEOLOGICAL VICTIMIZATIONS ACROSS GROUPS.....97

CHAPTER 5. VARIATION BETWEEN FRI, FRR & RTN VICTIMS.....103

5.1 CROSS TABULATIONS OF VICTIMIZATION GROUPS BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS.....104

5.2 MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH FRI COMPARISON.....105

5.3 T-TESTS COMPARING INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FRI & FRR VICTIMS TO TYPICAL VICTIM.....107

5.4 BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSION COMPARING FRI & TYPICAL VICTIMS.....107

5.5 BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSION COMPARING FRR & TYPICAL VICTIMS.....108

5.6 CROSS TABULATIONS OF VICTIMIZATION GROUPS BY TEMPORAL & GEOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS.....109

5.7 CROSS TABULATIONS OF VICTIMIZATION GROUPS BY SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS.....110

5.8 MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF TEMPORAL & GEOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS WITH FRI COMPARISON.....112

5.9 MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH FRI COMPARISON.....113

5.10 T-TESTS COMPARING SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FRI & FRR VICTIMS TO TYPICAL VICTIM.....116

5.11 BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSION COMPARING SITUATIONAL CHRACTERISTICS BETWEEN FRI & TYPICAL VICTIMS.....116

5.12 BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSION COMPARING SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN FRR & TYPICAL VICTIMS.....117

5.13 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN VICTIMIZATION GROUPS & MACRO CHARACTERISTICS.....119

5.14 MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION WITH MACRO CHARACTERISTICS WITH FRI COMPARISON.....123

5.15 MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION WITH CLUSTERED ROBUST STANDARD ERRORS WITH FRI COMPARISON.....126

Chapter 1

Introduction

In 1978, Hindelang, Gottfredson, and Garofalo published *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization*. Through the analysis of survey and official crime data, the authors inductively developed and presented their theory of personal victimization. Contrary to the majority of sociological and criminological research, which uses data to formally test already developed theories, these researchers grounded their theoretical propositions within an in depth analysis of victimization data. More than 30 years later, the current study acknowledges the spirit of that seminal piece of victimological research through a victim-centric analysis of ideologically motivated, fatal violence in the United States, the goal of which is to inductively develop theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization. Although the number of victims of this type of crime is relatively small, even in comparison to the rare act of homicide, the research addresses important gaps in the extant bodies of victimological and terrorism research. Very few theories of crime and violence exist that incorporate the attributes and actions of the victim into a model of victimization risk. In addition, almost no research on terroristic and extremist violence focuses on identifying and understanding victimization patterns. Through the analysis of victimization incidents extracted from the Extremist Crime Database – a unique source of domestic far-right extremist violence – individual, situational and macro-level characteristics are studied and identified for the purpose of developing theoretical propositions that can help researchers and policymakers better understand and predict the risk of ideologically motivated violence.

As the purpose of this study is to develop, not test, theory, there are no research hypotheses to address. However, there are broad questions driving the analyses and framing the research. At the heart of the theory development is a simple question, what, if anything, increases or decreases an individual's risk of ideological victimization? From that one idea, many additional questions form. What is it about an individual's characteristics that increases or decreases the risk of ideological victimization? How is an ideological victim similar or different from other homicide victims? How does an individual who is murdered differ from a person who is not murdered in the same area? How do the situations in which ideological victims are killed vary from other forms of homicide? Are there differences between a location where an ideological homicide occurs and one where an ideological homicide has not occurred? All of these questions are relevant to the degree that their answers have the ability to inform theory by allowing one to identify attributes that vary the risk of ideological victimization. Therefore, the primary questions that drive this research can be phrased as the following: What can individual, situational, and macro-level characteristics related to ideological victimization tell us about risk? How can this empirical information be used to develop a theory of ideological victimization?

This study is important because if furthers the field of victimology by developing a multilevel model that has the potential to explain and predict a very specific type of victimization –individuals killed during ideologically motivated homicides perpetrated by the extreme far-right. In addition, this research broadens the field of terrorism and extremism research by examining the role of the victim in an effort to understand risk. No attempts have been made in the field of ideologically motivated violence (i.e. terrorism and extremist studies) to quantitatively study the victim as the focus of theory development. One reason for this is the untested assumption that victims of ideologically motivated violence are random, and therefore

there are no patterns to uncover, either theoretically or empirically. However, ideologically motivated violence is an important topic to research. Its purpose is to terrorize a population larger than that of the specific victims killed or injured, each act having the potential to negatively impact thousands, if not millions.

In addition to its contributions to the fields of victimology and ideological violence, this study also furthers the methodologies used to research homicide victims and terrorism. For example, the data collection process utilizes a unique combination of both open-source materials and government records to reduce missing values. Also, homicide victims are compared to the typical victim in the areas and time periods where they are murdered, a technique that controls for regional differences in comparison groups. Both the theoretical and methodological contributions of the study are important for the advancement of victimology and ideological violence research.

As this study progresses, Chapter 2 begins with a review of the prior literature related to the extreme far-right, victimization theory in general, and then victim-centric homicide research, specifically. The purpose of the literature review is to not only highlight the phenomenon being studied – victims of far-right ideologically motivated homicide – but to ground the analyses and theory development in the extant body of similar research. In Chapter 3, the data collection and cleaning process is highlighted, as well as the proposed analyses that will focus on understanding both the within group variation of far-right ideological victims and the between group variation of far-right ideological victims and "routine" homicide victims. Specifically, in Chapter 4, the far-right victims are broken into several groups based primarily on the reasons for which they were targeted and compared across multiple levels of analysis through the presentation of descriptive statistics. The following set of analyses, the results of which are presented in Chapter

5, compare far-right ideological victims to a random sample of "routine" homicide victims. In addition, the victims of interest are also compared to the typical homicide victim killed in the same county. Using inferential statistics, the differences between the groups are examined using individual, situational, and macro-level characteristics. In Chapter 6, theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization are proposed that seek to explain and predict ideological victimization risk on multiple levels of analysis. The research concludes with a summary of the study, a discussion of its limitations and contributions, before suggesting ideas for how future research can further develop and formally test the proposed theory.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Aspects of this study cut across several areas in criminological research, namely ideologically motivated violence, victimization theory, and homicide research. The purpose of this chapter is to touch on each area, identifying and discussing the pertinent studies. To begin, the chapter outlines the extreme far-right in the United States, focusing on defining the extremist ideology, before presenting empirical data from prior research that discusses trends of far-right, criminal behavior. Next, victimization theory in general will be briefly discussed before focusing on homicide victimization, specifically, to identify prior studies that look at individual, situational, and macro-level characteristics associated with homicide. Although this research is about theory development, not testing, prior research will be used as a framework to help focus which variables may be important to look at for data collection and analysis. The chapter concludes with a summary of the information pertinent to developing theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization.

2.1 Ideological Violence & the Extreme Far-Right

Research on ideological victimization has been limited because it has been hypothesized that victims of ideologically motivated violence are "randomly" targeted and, subsequently, there are no risk factors to uncover. Specifically, the "randomness hypothesis" argues that crimes, which are ideological in nature, such as terroristic or extremist violence, offer no victimization patterns (Damphousse, Smith & Sellers, 2003; Canettit-Nisim, Mesch, & Pedahzur, 2006). The existence of patterns, however, may depend on how one conceptualizes randomness.

Researchers have stated that a terrorist incident "is typically called indiscriminate or 'random' terrorism because it makes no distinctions among the individual identities of its targets. In another sense, however, such terrorism is very discriminate, being directed against specific categories of people and not others" (Goodwin, 2006, p. 2031). In other words, victims who appear to be "random" were not chosen for who they are, but for what they represent. Similarly, Schmid and Jongman (2005) state that "terrorism is a method of combat in which random or symbolic victims serve as an instrumental *target of violence*. These instrumental victims share group or class characteristics which form the basis for their selection for victimization" (p. 6). The Extremist Crime Database stratifies randomness into three categories – random, representative, and purposeful. The stratification of randomness is used to measure whether an individual truly a random victim of ideological violence, whether they are targeted for something they represent, such as a religion or race, and finally whether they are purposefully targeted by an offender specifically for who they are (Freilich & Chermak, 2010).

A handful of studies have used inferential statistics to examine randomness, finding that there is limited support for the idea that individuals of ideologically motivated violence are random in its purest sense (Canetti-Nisim, Mesch, & Pedahzur, 2006; Berrebi and Lakdawalla, 2007). This empirical evidence justifies a closer look at whether patterns of ideological victimization exist based on individual or representative characteristics and, if so, how can their causes be theoretically explained and empirically tested.

This research, however, does not examine ideological motivated victimization in general. Instead, it focuses on violent acts committed by the extremist far-right in the United States, as this group presently, as well as historically, is a threat to the safety of American citizens. One study found that white racists were responsible for more than a third of the deaths related to

domestic terrorism between 1955 and 1998 and this excluded the 168 individuals killed in the Oklahoma City bombing (Hewitt, 2000). The Southern Poverty Law Center reported a 40% increase in active hate groups in the U.S. between 2000 and 2006, including neo-Nazi groups, the Ku Klux Klan, racist skinheads, neo-confederates, and white nationalists (Beirich et al., 2007). In 2007, state police agencies identified racist skinheads, neo-Nazi groups, and militia/patriot groups as significant threats to national security 70%, 68%, and 68% of the time, respectively (Chermak, Freilich, & Simone, 2010).

The domestic far-right has shown itself to be a violent threat to the well-being of specific individuals and groups within the United States. What, however, constitutes the extreme far-right? This research project adapts Freilich, Chermak, and Caspi's (2009) definition, which states that:

> the domestic far-right is composed of individuals or groups that subscribe to aspects of the following ideals: they are fiercely nationalistic (as opposed to universal and international in orientation), anti-global, suspicious of centralized federal authority, reverent of individual liberty (especially their right to own guns, be free of taxes), believe in conspiracy theories that involve a grave threat to national sovereignty and/or personal liberty and a belief that one's personal and/or national 'way of life' is under attack and is either already lost or that the threat is imminent (sometimes such beliefs are amorphous and vague, but for some the threat is from a specific ethnic, racial, or religious group), and a belief in the need to be prepared for an attack either by participating in paramilitary preparations and training and survivalism (p. 499).

This definition encompasses many organizations and ideologies that exist on the outskirts of society. Although they admit there is overlap, Berlet and Vysotsky (2006) split the far-right into two groups, the white supremacists and the right-wing dissidents, such as the patriot or militia movements. For example, the first group contains the Christian Identity movement, which is distinguished by its theology of anti-Semitism, its followers believing that they are living in the end days and that Jews are the biological offspring of Satan and the biblical figure, Eve (Barkun, 1997). Christian Identity adherents are also antigovernment, paramilitary survivalists who spend time preparing for the coming race wars, fearing a conspiracy to eliminate the white race, specifically white, Anglo-Saxon protestants (Sharpe, 2000). Although the World Church of the Creator rejects Christian Identity theology, it still maintains the anti-Semitic, racist, neo-Nazi ideologies familiar in white supremacy organizations (Michael, 2006). Blazak (2001) claims that individuals who perpetrate hate crimes are revered by groups such as the Aryan Nations, the Ku Klux Klan, and the World Church of the Creator, as they are saving the white race from extinction. It is estimated that hundreds of violent acts in the United States were attributed to skinhead groups during the late 1980s, the trend continuing well into the 1990s. Racist skinheads follow a belief system based on the superiority and dominance of heterosexual, white males, violently opposed to gay rights, feminism, and multiculturism, which they perceive as a direct threat against their way of life (Blazak, 2001).

The patriot movement, which opposes gun control and taxation, views the legal system as irreparably flawed and is against a large, centralized federal government. It contains such organizations as the Posse Comitatus and Montana Freemen. Incited by deadly confrontations between civilians and federal law enforcement officers at Ruby Ridge, Idaho and Waco, Texas,

individuals involved with the patriot movement gave rise to the militia movement (Durham, 1996). These militias that appeared in the early 1990s rallied around the threat of a New World Order conspiracy (Barkun, 1996), their existence necessary to protect United States citizens against a corrupt government that had no regard for individuals' rights (Crothers, 2002).

Engrained in the far-right is the notion of leaderless resistance, "a kind of lone wolf operation in which an individual, or a very small, highly cohesive group, engage in acts of anti-state violence independent of any movement, leader or support network" (Kaplan, 1997, p. 90). Although first devised as a means to fight Communist cells that members of the far-right believed existed in the U.S. during the sixties and seventies, former Klan leader Louis Beam (1992) called for renewed dedication to the idea as a means to successfully oppose the modern police state. When examining far-right loners (those who operate alone with no group affiliation) and lone wolves (those who operate alone and are group affiliated) who have committed homicide, Gruenewald, Chermak, and Freilich (Forthcoming) found that 61.5% had prior arrests, 32.3% had a history of mental illness, 32.3% had a history of alcohol or drug abuse, 41.5% were motivated by an anti-race ideology, and 19.9% were anti-government. In addition, 60.2% of their victims were non-white, 81.6% were male, the victims and offenders were strangers in 76.1% of the homicides, and a firearm was used to kill 66.6% of the victims.

Other empirical studies looking at far-right criminal activity have begun to complement the qualitative research published by researchers that specialize in domestic extremism. Smith (1994) found that between 1980 and 1989, 103 individuals federally indicted on terrorism or terrorism-related charges were members of the right-wing. When compared to characteristics of left-wing offenders, he found far-right offenders were slightly older at the time of the indictment, more often male, white more than three times as often, had lower levels of educational

attainment, and were more likely to live in rural areas of the country. Focusing on the time period between 1990 and 2006, Gruenewald (2011) identified 124 ideologically motivated homicide incidents that were perpetrated by the extreme far-right. Compared to a sample of non-ideological homicides, the study found that far-right offenders were more often male, disproportionately white, yet similar in age. A follow-up study (Gruenewald & Pridemore, 2012), which extended the time period under study to 2008, and also used a multiple imputation technique to account for missing data in both datasets, found similar results.

It is important to note that this research further builds on the methodological and substantive advancements of these empirical studies. In addition, individuals victimized by adherents to the aforementioned ideologies and organizations represent the universe of ideologically motivated, fatal victimizations of which this project focuses.

2.2 Victimization Research

Victimization research's "first systematic treatment of victims of crime in appeared in 1948 in Hans Von Hentig's book *The Criminal and His Victim*" (Fattah, 2000, p. 22). Since then, empirical victimization research has grown into a well-established sub discipline of criminology. The National Crime Survey and its successor, the National Crime Victimization Survey, have been used to study personal and property victimization (Rennison & Rand, 2007). Recent examples of research utilizing the dataset have focused on police reporting (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010), gender differentials in violence (Schwartz, Steffensmeier, Zhong & Ackerman, 2009), elder victimization (Lanier & Dietz, 2012), and stalking victimization (Englebrecht & Reyns, 2011). The Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report, which collects data on serious crimes such as homicide and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, also collects data

on crime victims (Barnett-Ryan, 2007). In addition to studying victimization in the context of criminal and deviant events, over the last few decades researchers have expanded outside of an empirical understanding of crime victims to focus on assisting victims and victims' rights (Jaishankar, 2008).

In the empirical research on non-fatal violent victimization, investigators have focused on varying levels of analysis, including individual, situational, family and community characteristics that have a relationship with victimization risk. On the individual level, gang membership has been shown to increase violent victimization risk (Peterson, Taylor & Esbensen, 2004; Taylor, Peterson, Ebersen & Freng, 2007). Also, Lauritsen & Heimer (2008) examined the relationship between gender and violent victimization. The study showed that victimization rates have decreased over the last thirty years and the gender gap has closed significantly for assaults, but has remained stable for homicide and robbery. In a similar study examining fluctuations in violent victimization rates over time, it appears that economic conditions have a relationship with victimization levels which, when disaggregating the data by race and ethnicity, most prominently impacts Latino and non-Latino black populations (Lauritsen & Heimer, 2010). Risk of violent victimization also increases for women who are employed, have low incomes, are highly mobile, are separated or divorced, and are out every night of the week (Dugan & Apel, 2003).

Including both situational and individual characteristics in their model, Shreck, Wright and Miller (2002), found that self-control had a significant effect on violent victimization risk (see also Gibson, 2012). Another study that employed situational factors, reported that increases in violent victimization risk for adolescents can be attributed to the time of day in which individuals are out in public as well as whether the activities in which they are engaged involve alcohol.

Specifically, young men who go out at night, adolescents who spend time in public settings, and activities that involve alcohol increase the risk of violent victimization (Felson, Savolainen, Berg, & Ellonen, 2012). Lauritsen & Carbone-Lopez (2011) combined multiple levels of analysis when examining gender differences in the risk of violent victimization. The research concluded that a woman's age, whether she was single, and how long she lived in her home all significantly predicted the risk of intimate partner violence. Another multilevel study of victimization risk found that risk of overall violent victimization significantly increase for males, those who lived in a city center, and those whose communities had higher levels of disadvantage. Risk decreased the older an individual was, the longer they lived in their residence, and if they were married (Lauritsen, 2001).

Even with the large body of victimization research, however, only a few theories have been developed to understand a victim's role in a criminal event. General theories of victimization predict that certain characteristics, such as an individual's lifestyle, increase or decrease victimization risk. Even though the extant body of victimization literature has not looked at terrorism or extremism, it has routinely focused on homicide events, and this body of literature will be used as a foundation on which to determine what variables have the potential to inform theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization. As previously stated, Hindelang, Gottfredson, and Garafalo (1978) utilized victimization data and statistical analyses to develop a theory of victimization. According to Meier and Meithe (1993), that lifestyle theory posited "that demographic differences in the likelihood of victimization are attributed to differences in the personal lifestyles of victims. Variations in lifestyles are important because they are related to the differential exposure to dangerous places, times, and others-that is, situations in which there are high risks of victimization" (p.466). Building from lifestyle theory, routine activities

theory incorporates the attributes and actions of the victim to argue that crime rates are related to the convergence of a suitable target, a motivated offender, and the lack of a capable guardian in the same spatial and temporal location (Cohen & Felson, 1979). After its initial formulation, measurements related to a victim's amount of exposure to offenders were added (Cohen, Kluegel, & Land, 1981).

Lifestyle and routine activities theory are unique in the respect that they incorporate attributes and actions of the victim into an explanatory model of crime. This, however, has led to controversy among criminologists as to what degree should a victim's actions be analyzed and how much does it imply that individuals are responsible for their own victimization (Lauritsen, 2010). It can be argued, however, that understanding the situational context of a crime and the victim's reasoning and actions for being in a specific place at a specific time are not placing blame on the victim, but creating a complete picture of how a crime unfolds. As most crime research is offender-centric, it is important to examine the dynamics between the offender and the victim, and even the victim and the community in which they are victimized.

The constructs used to explain non-ideological violent victimization can guide the development of theoretical propositions to explain ideological victimization. For example, key concepts addressed in prior theoretically driven studies include the victim-offender relationship (e.g. Messner & Tardiff, 1985; Nelson & Huff-Corzine, 1998; Silverman & Kennedy, 1987), occupation (e.g. Broidy et al., 2006; Caywood, 1998), the victim's criminal history (e.g Ezell & Tanner-Smith, 2009), sex (e.g. Messner & Blau, 1987), age (e.g. Cohen and Felson, 1979; Roncek & Maier, 1991) and race and ethnicity (e.g. Messner and Tardiff, 1985; Caywood, 1998). Leading victimologists have called for research and theory that incorporates these constructs at varying levels of analysis, understanding that the context of each act of victimization is

important in explaining variation across victims (Lauritsen & Laub, 2007, Lauritsen, 2010). The following section examines homicide victimization, specifically, outlining significant variables and constructs on the individual, situational and macro levels that have been used to study the phenomenon.

2.3 Homicide Victimization

Homicides are one of the most frequently researched crimes. One reason for this is the seriousness of any act that takes the life of another. In a methodological sense, it is also one of the most frequently reported types of crime with widely available data increasing the validity and reliability of any findings. Researchers have used many resources to collect information on homicide events, such as medical records, police departments, court records, state and federal agencies, and even open-source documents such as newspaper archives. Geographically, studies have examined homicides in one city or county (e.g. Broidy et al, 2006; Grunewald & Pridemore, 2009), one state (Kazerouni et al, 2009; Wu, 2008), nationally (e.g. Avakame, 1999; Burton, 2005; Felson & Messner, 1996), or internationally (e.g. Gartner, 1990; LaFree, 2005). Research can be very specific, focusing on subtypes of homicides such as those involving the elderly (e.g. Karch & Nunn, 2010; Kreinert & Walsh, 2009; Weaver et al, 2004), intimate partner violence (e.g. Mize & Shackelford, 2008; Mize, Shackelford, & Shackelford, 2009; Shackleford, 2001), sexual homicide (e.g. Safarik et al, 2002; Van Patten & Delahuer, 2007), juvenile homicide (e.g. Dahlberg, 1998; Hiede et al, 2007), or homicides followed by offender suicide (e.g. Barber et al, 2008; Bridges & Tankersley, 2010).

Additionally, homicide research might include variables measuring individual characteristics (e.g. Kposowa, 1999; Moracco et al, 1998; Pizarro et al, 2011), situational

characteristics (e.g. Dalessio & Stolzenberg, 2009; Jia, 2007; Last & Frizon, 2005), and/or macro characteristics (e.g. Kaminski, 2008; Land et al, 1990; Marvell & Moody, 1999). The following sections focus on homicide research that incorporates individual characteristics of the victims, as well as situational and macro characteristics. In addition, research that presents individual and situational attributes of victims killed in the United States during the time period understudy (1990-2007) will be highlighted.[1] The purpose of presenting the results of prior homicide victimization is to develop an understanding of who is killed and how, so that the results of this study can be placed in context.

2.3.1 Individual characteristics. Attributes of homicides victims, both demographic and behavioral, that have been utilized in past studies include variables such as sex, age, race, marital status, prior victimization, and criminal history. Sex is an important variable when studying homicide victims because victimization theories hypothesize that individuals of different sexes should have different lifestyles and routines. Males are disproportionately victims of homicide compared to their representation in the general population and have a greater risk of fatal victimization (Kposowa & Breault, 1998). In all of the samples from the studies reported in Table 2.2, the percentage of victims who were male ranged from 69.0% to 90.9%. The 69.0%

[1] Table 2.1 lists the studies used to highlight characteristics of homicide victims and situations. The articles were located by searching Criminal Justice Abstracts using the keywords 'homicide and victimization' or 'homicide and victim' and included if empirical data on homicide victims and situations from the United States were presented. In addition, the sample of victims must have been killed, at least partially, within the 1990-2007 time period for this study. Highly specialized studies, where the victims of interest were not representative of the geographic area where the sample was collected were ignored, unless that phenomenon of interest is directly related to this study, such as far-right or LGBT victims, or if a comparison of routine homicides was presented next to the specialized homicides, or the subsamples could be aggregated based on the data presented. Examples of topics that were too specific or irrelevant and therefore were not included: eldercide, intimate partner homicide, and paracide. Studies used in the general discussions related to individual and situational characteristics were not limited to those found in this table or by the aforementioned inclusion criteria. Table 2.2 presents information on the sex, age, and race of homicide victims studied in the research listed in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Studies presenting individual & situational victimization characteristics.

Citation		N*	Victimization Type	Abbr.	Location	Period
Broidy et al, 2006	1	321	Routine (Non-Domestic Violence)	RTN	Bernalollo County, NM	1996-2001
Caywood, 1998	2	744	Routine	RTN	Milwaukee, WI	1987-1992
Dejong et al, 2011	3A	314	Routine	RTN	Indianapolis, IN	1997-2005
(see also Pizarro et al, 2010)	3B	425	Routine	RTN	Newark, NJ	1/97-6/01
Dobrin, 2001	4	105	Routine	RTN	Prince George's County, MD	1993
Fox & Zawitz, 2012	5	594276	Supplementary Homicide Report	SHR	United States	1976-2005
Gruenewald & Pridemore, 2009	6	3293	Routine	RTN	Chicago, IL	1998-2002
Gruenewald & Pridemore, 2012	7A	108	Far-Right Ideological	FRI	United States	1990-2008
	7B	183	Far-Right Routine	FRR		1990-2008
	7C	540	Routine (Random Sample)	RTN		2000
Gruenewald, 2012	8A	120	Anti-LGBT	LGBT	United States	1990-2008
	8B	610	Routine (Random Sample)	RTN		2000
Kazerouni et al, 2009	9A	212	Non-firearm	XGUN	New Mexico	2001-2003
	9B	240	Firearm	GUN		
	9C	452	All	ALL		
Palmiotto & Janeksela, 1999	10	1586	Routine	RTN	Kansas	1980-1992
Sobol, 1997	11	145	Routine	RTN	Buffalo, NY	1992-1993
Sorenson & Lew, 2000	12A	3535	Immigrant	IMMGT	Los Angels County, CA	1990-1994
	12B	5516	Native	NATIVE		
	12C	9051	All	ALL		
Tita & Griffiths, 2005	13	20	Routine	RTN	Pittsburgh, PA	1987-1995
Titterington & Reyes, 2010	14A	537	65 or Older	65+	Chicago, IL;	1985-1994
	14B	13725	Younger than 65	<65	Houston, TX;	
	14C	14262	All	ALL	Miami, FL	
Wu, 2008	15A	1805	Asian	ASIAN	California	1991-1999
	15B	30298	Non-Asian	XASIAN		
	15C	32103	All	ALL		

*Overall sample size reported in article. Actual N varied based on variables and analyses.

Table 2.2. Study results presenting individual characteristics.

		1 RTN	2 RTN	3A RTN	3B RTN	4 RTN	5 SHR	6 RTN	7A FRI	7B FRR	7C RTN	9A XGUN	9B GUN	9C ALL
Sex	Male	81.3%	81.6%	76.0%	72.0%	79.0%	76.5%	84.8%	90.0%	77.0%	80.0%	69.8%	81.7%	76.1%
Race	White	33.1%	21.2%				50.9%		33.0%	82.0%	50.0%	27.8%	28.8%	28.3%
	Black	10.2%	78.8%	66.0%	80.0%	81.9%	46.9%	73.7%						
	Other						2.1%							
Ethnicity	Hispanic	50.5%		3.0%	17.0%							38.2%	56.7%	48.0%
Age	Average			30.8	30.2	28.7			36.8	35.9	32.9	37	30	
	<15	12.5%												
	15						9.8%							
	18							59.7%						
	20	43.0%												
	25						52.7%							
	30		83.9%											
	35													
	40													
	45						22.8%							
	50	44.5%												
	55													
	60						14.7%							
	65													
	>65													

Table 2.2. Study results presenting individual characteristics (cont.).

		10 RTN	11 RTN	12A IMMGT	12B NATIVE	12C ALL	13 RTN	14A 65+	14B <65	14C ALL	15A ASIAN	15B XASIAN	15C ALL
Sex	Male	69.0%	73.1%	90.9%	82.9%	86.1%	77.6%	63.3%	83.5%	82.8%	76.6%	83.1%	82.7%
Race	White	62.0%	20.7%	5.3%	17.5%	12.7%	23.8%	34.9%	12.7%	13.6%			
	Black	35.0%		4.5%	52.4%	33.7%	76.2%	54.1%	63.3%	62.9%			
	Other	3.0%	79.3%	8.3%	1.1%	3.9%		1.1%	1.5%	1.4%			
Ethnicity	Hispanic			80.5%	27.8%	48.4%		9.9%	22.5%	22.1%			
Age	Average						31.8						
	<15	11.0%	22.1%	1.7%	5.1%	3.8%							
	15												
	18	25.0%		16.8%	19.7%	18.6%							
	20		55.6%	24.7%	19.5%	21.5%							
	25	28.0%		17.9%	15.1%	16.2%							
	30			12.4%	12.6%	12.5%							
	35	16.0%					86.7%						
	40												
	45	9.0%											
	50		21.4%	26.5%	26.6%	26.6%							
	55												
	60	11.0%											
	65												
	>65												

came from a sample of homicide victims killed in a single, Midwestern state and the 90.9% came from a sample composed of only immigrants in Los Angeles county. Interestingly, a sample of far-right ideological victims had the second highest rate of male victims, at 90.0%. Fox and Zawits's (2007) report on the FBI's Supplementary Homicide Report data found that 76.5% of victims were male, while Gruenewald and Pridemore's (2012) study, which used a sample of the same dataset, found that 80% of victims were male. The differences across these studies, however, are expected based on the temporal and geographic variation of the samples.

Using Canadian data, Silverman and Kennedy (1987) also showed that women are victims and offenders of homicide disproportionately less than one would expect based on their general numbers in the population. In addition, males are more than four times as likely to be offenders in a homicide incident involving a lover or spouse when compared to females, and 26 times more likely to be offenders in an incident where the victim is a stranger. Messner and Tardiff (1985), and Caywood's (1998) replication of their study, found that females were more likely than males to be killed at home and by family members as it is hypothesized their routine activities keep them closer to their domicile. When examining the interplay between the location of the incident and the victim and suspect's residences, sex only predicted the risk of victimization when the suspect crossed into a victim's neighborhood to kill a female, or when a female is killed outside of her neighborhood by an offender from her neighborhood (Tita & Griffiths, 2005).

Many criminological theories hypothesize that age has a relationship with both offending and victimization risk. As a reference point, the average age of all homicide victims killed in the United States between 1968 and 1975 was 35.2, where women were slightly younger than men (34.3 versus 35.5), and whites were slightly older than blacks (36.9 versus 33.8; Bridges &

Tankersley, 2010). Depending on the study, age is reported in two ways in Table 2.2, in averages, and in the percentage of the sample that fell into certain age brackets. The average age of homicide victims varied between 28.7 years of age and 37. The older age averages appeared in specialized samples, such as victims of far-right ideological homicides, far-right routine homicides, and non-firearm related homicides. The average age of the random sample of U.S. homicide victims in the year 2000 was 32.9. There was no consistent way in which homicide researchers decided to break down victim's age into groups, making it difficult to compare the distribution of age across the different samples. Where groupings are similar, patterns do emerge. For example, the three studies that examined samples of all homicides, found that a large majority of homicide victims were below the age of 35. Most of the studies reported that more than half of their homicide victims are below the age of 25.

Multivariate analyses have shown that increases in age are significantly associated with decreases in homicide risk. For victimization theories, specifically, the question posited is whether ones' lifestyle and routines systematically vary based on age. It has been shown that the elderly (those over 65) have a decreased risk of victimization when compared to those under 65 years of age (Breault & Kposowa, 1997). Messner & Tardiff (1985) found a significant relationship between age and whether someone was victimized at home when controlling for the influence of other sociodemographic variables, noting that the very old and the very young were more likely to be killed in their residence (Caywood (1998) found similar results, but only with a bivariate analysis). Also looking at elderly victims of homicide, Nelson and Huff-Corzine (1998) found support for the supposition that elderly females are at higher risk for theft related homicide victimization because they are seen as suitable targets, lacking the ability to defend themselves.

Race and ethnicity are typically examined in homicide victimization research, sometimes as a variable of theoretical interest and sometimes only as a control variable. Studies that presented victim race and/or ethnicity within different populations of homicide victims varied greatly based on the location of the sample. For example, one study from Table 2.1, which used all homicide victims in Los Angeles County between 1990 and 1994, only had 12.7% of its population coded as white. Conversely, 62% of the Kansas homicide victims were white. The national random sample from the FBI's Supplementary Homicide Report reported that 50% of homicide victims were white (Gruenewald & Pridemore, 2012), almost identical to the statistics reported by Fox and Zawitz (2007), whose victims were white 50.9% of the time. The smallest percentage of homicide victims that were Hispanic came from a sample out of Indianapolis, Indiana (3%) and the largest percentage was recorded in a sample from Bernalollo, New Mexico (50.5%). Although the variation in results is not surprising and is almost certainly correlated, at least in part, with the racial and ethnic backgrounds of the populations where the homicides occur, it does show the need to control for contextual factors in studies, as well as caution in not overgeneralizing the results.

Modeling homicide risk, Ezell and Tanner-Smith (2009) found that race was a significant predictor for increased victimization risk; blacks consistently were at a higher risk of victimization when compared to whites. Breault and Kposowa (1997) published similar results when comparing homicide victims to individuals who died of natural causes. Specifically, blacks and Asians had a higher homicide risk when compared to whites. A similar study showed that when compared to whites, the odds of being a victim of a homicide where 2.6 times greater for blacks, two times greater for Native Americans, one and a half times greater for Asians, and more than two times greater for Hispanics. A multivariate analysis by Messner and Tardiff

(1985) found that when compared to blacks and Hispanic, whites and Asians were more likely to be killed by strangers during a homicide incident. Also related to ethnicity, Broidey et al (2006) found that Hispanic homicide victims were more likely to have a criminal history when compared to non-Hispanic victims.

Other victim level characteristics have shown, through multivariate analyses, to either increase or decrease ones risk of homicide victimization. For example, being married has been hypothesized to increase guardianship and also cause an individual to desist from risky lifestyles that might increase homicide victimization risk. In an examination of marital status and the odds of homicide victimization for females, Breault & Kposowa (1997) found that, when compared to married women, females who are widowed have a significantly lower homicide risk, while females who are divorced or separated have a significantly higher homicide risk.

Another variable, criminal history, measured as a victim's past experience as an offender who was arrested and successfully prosecuted for a crime, measures the amount of risk that might be inherent to one's routine activities. The hypothesis is that individuals who engage in criminal behaviors are at higher risk for victimization. Ezell and Tanner-Smith (2009) decided to test this assumption and found that offenders with gang history were at greater risk of homicide victimization, risk of homicide victimization increases after spending time incarcerated, and homicide risk increases with each violent arrest. In a case-control study, Dobrin et al (2005) found that the odds of homicide victimization were 4.6 times higher for individuals with prior arrests, when controlling for individual and macro-level characteristics. Additionally, Broidy et al (2006) found that "offenders and victims engage in similar kinds of nonviolent offending behavior and live and travel within similarly disadvantaged areas and that,

where there is evidence of risky behavior patterns, these patterns are similar across offenders and victims" (p. 174).

Although not as frequently tested or reported, other individual level variables may be important in understanding homicide victimization. In their sample of homicide victims, Pizarro et al (2011) found that 14% were members of a gang, 27.9% drug dealers, 51.9% were arrested on a weapons or violence related charge, 58.6% had been arrested on a drug related charge, and 44.4% had a prior arrest for a property related charge. Breault and Kposowa (1997) reported that homicide risk was higher for immigrants and those working in the service industry, when compared to those in professional occupations. A similar study showed that homicide risk increased for individuals who had did not have a college degree and/or were divorced (Kposowa, 1999).

It has also been hypothesized that individuals who are unemployed will have higher rates of victimization. Messner and Tardiff (1985) found that employment status was a significant predictor of where one was victimized, as employed individuals were killed further away from their homes than the unemployed. Replicating Messner and Tardiff's original study, Caywood (1998) found a moderate relationship between homicide victims' employment status and their relationship with the offender and the location where they were killed. Specifically, the employed were killed further away from home more often than the unemployed, while the unemployed were killed by strangers, less often than the employed. It is important to keep in mind all of these individual level characteristics, especially those which have been shown to increase victimization risk, when developing theoretical propositions.

2.3.2 Situational characteristics. Characteristics related to the homicide incident have also been studied to understand how and why an individual was victimized. Once again, using the literature from Table 2.1, Table 2.3 presents information on situational characteristics as found in the different samples of homicide victims. Looking at victim-offender relationships, the rate of stranger victimization for the routine or aggregated samples ranged from 21% to 29%. For the specialized samples, far-right ideological victims were killed by strangers 80% of the time, LGBT victims 33.7%, and immigrants 31%. Only the far-right ideological deviated severely from what appears to be the norm, that is homicide victims are more likely than not to know their killer.

The range in percent killed by a family member or intimate partner was broader. Examining the samples of routine victims, the smallest percentage was 7.5% in the population of victims in Los Angeles County and the greatest was 36.4%, reported in the population of victims from Chicago, Illinois. No far-right ideological victims were killed by a family member or intimate partner. Part of this large discrepancy may be explained by varying ways in how authors accounted for missing values. For example, the SHR data for homicide victims between 1976 and 2005 has 32.5% of victim-offender relationships coded as undetermined. If a researcher decides to systematically exclude all incidents where the victim-offender relationship is unknown, the percentage of stranger relationships increase from 13.9% to 21.5% percent.

Using the victim-offender relationship as a dependent variable, Messner and Tardiff (1985) found that women and whites/Asians were more likely to be killed by someone they knew when compared to males and blacks/Hispanics. A replication of their study found a relationship on the bivariate level between the victim-offender relationship and sex, age, employment status, and the day and season of the homicide (Caywood, 1998). Men and the employed were more

Table 2.3. Study results presenting situational characteristics.

		1 RTN	2 RTN	3A RTN	3B RTN	5 SHR	6 RTN	7A FRI	7B FRR	7C RTN	8A LGBT	8B RTN	9A XGUN	9B GUN	9C ALL
Relationship	Stranger		28.0%			13.9%	26.8%	80.0%	27.0%	28.0%	33.7%	29.0%			
	Intimate/ Family		21.0%			18.8%	36.4%	0.0%	7.0%	29.0%	1.0%	26.7%			
	Friend/ Acquaintance		50.0%			32.1%		18.0%	65.0%	44.0%	65.3%	44.2%			
	Undetermined					35.2%									
Weapon	Firearm	62.3%		70.0%	67.0%	64.2%	78.5%	53.0%	59.0%	73.0%	27.0%	58.6%	0.0%	100%	53.1%
	Knife			10.0%	16.0%	16.6%	9.5%	17.0%	18.0%	13.0%	28.7%	16.4%	32.1%	0.0%	15.0%
	Blunt Object/ Bodily Weapon						11.2%	24.0%	21.0%	12.0%	28.5%	18.6%	37.3%	0.0%	17.5%
	Other						0.8%	6.0%	3.0%	2.0%	5.7%	6.4%	30.7%	0.0%	14.4%
Location	Victim Residence		34.0%												
	All Residences	33.1%													
	Indoors														
	Outside														

Table 2.3. Study results presenting situational characteristics (cont.).

		10 RTN	11 RTN	12A IMMGT	12B NATIVE	12C ALL	13 RTN	14A 65+	14B <65	14C ALL	15A ASIAN	15B XASIAN	15C ALL
Relationship	Stranger			31.0%	21.4%	25.1%	21.0%	32.7%	28.1%	28.3%			
	Intimate/ Family		17.9%	5.3%	8.9%	7.5%	27.2%	31.8%	24.9%	25.1%	29.8%	23.0%	23.4%
	Friend/ Acquaintance			34.5%	38.0%	36.6%	57.9%	35.5%	47.0%	46.5%	47.0%	51.8%	51.5%
	Undetermined			26.9%	28.0%	27.6%							
Weapon	Firearm	59.0%		79.3%	75.2%	76.8%	60.0%	24.4%	56.0%	54.8%			
	Knife	14.0%		11.2%	10.2%	10.6%		30.6%	16.5%	17.1%			
	Blunt Object/ Bodily Weapon	11.0%		4.9%	6.6%	5.9%		26.9%	8.7%	9.3%			
	Other			2.2%	3.8%	3.2%		18.0%	18.9%	18.8%			
Location	Victim Residence		29.0%										
	All Residences										31.9%	29.2%	29.4%
	Indoors							81.5%	44.9%	46.3%			
	Outside						51.2%	18.5%	55.1%	53.7%			

often killed by strangers. Children and the elderly were more often killed by family. As no multivariate analysis was performed, however, it is not clear whether the weaker relationships would disappear when controlling for other variables. There also appears to be a relationship between the geographic distance of victims and offenders and their relational distance. In homicide incidents where the offender and victim live in the same community where the event occurred, the victim and offender are more likely to have closer social ties than incidents where the offender and the victim are not part of the same community (Tita & Griffiths, 2005).

Homicide victimization studies have also considered the type of weapon as a variable of interest. Of the studies using routine victims presented in Table 2.3, the use of firearms in a homicide incident ranged from 54.8% to 78.5% of the time, a knife or sharp instrument was used 9.5% to 17.1% of the time, and blunt objects or bodily weapons between 5.9% and 18.6% of the time. Of the specialized populations of victims, far-right ideological victims were beaten to death 24% of the time and stabbed to death 17% of the time. When compared to routine victims, LGBT victims were more often stabbed (28.7%) and beaten (28.5%), and less often shot (27%). The weapons used to killed immigrants were similar to the routine populations of homicide victims.

Using homicide data to examine the association between the victim-offender relationship and the means of the offense (i.e. shooting, stabbing, beating), Silverman & Kennedy (1987) found that "men are most likely to kill their spouses or lovers and other female family members by shooting them" and that "female strangers are killed most often by other means, such as strangulation, suffocation, and drowning" (p. 300). In addition, the elderly are more likely to be beating to death, possibly because of the physical vulnerability that comes with old age. In other

words, an assault that might only place a younger person in the hospital, quite possibly could be lethal to an elderly individual (Kennedy & Silverman, 1990; Nelson & Huff-Corzine, 1998).

The geographic location of a homicide incident and its actors are important theoretical variables when framing a study using lifestyle or routine activities theory, and can be captured in different ways. Information on the location of the homicides was not as prominent as the other situational characteristics reported in Table 2.3. In two samples of routine homicide victims, 29.0% and 34.0% of the homicide incidents occurred in the victim's home. Similarly, two additional studies found that 29.0% and 29.4% of victims were killed in any residence, whether the victim's, offender's, or a third party. In a sample of victims from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, it was reported that 51.2% were killed outdoors, while 53.7% of victims from a multi-city study were also killed outdoors.

A significant relationship was been found between the location of a homicide incident and the sex and age of the victim, and the victim's employment status. Males, individuals between 15 and 59 years of age, and the employed, were more likely to be killed further away from their homes (Messner & Tardiff, 1985). Caywood (1998) corroborated the original study, but also found a relationship between location and the race of the victim, as well as the temporal location of the homicide event. This is to say that whites/Asians were more likely to be killed at home than blacks/Hispanics and homicide incidents were more likely to occur away from home at night and between the Spring and Fall seasons. Silverman and Kennedy (1987) found that women are more likely to kill and be killed in their own home, and homicide events involving strangers are more likely to occur in public places. Location is also important in homicide involving the elderly, as they are most likely to be killed at home (Kennedy & Silverman, 1990, Silverman & Kennedy, 1987, Nelson & Huff-Corzine 1998).

Messner and Tardiff (1985) hypothesized that a person's routine activities will change based on the time of day, the day of the week, and the month of the year. For example, risk of homicide victimization should not be uniformly spaced across time and the risk of victimization on Tuesday morning will be different than the risk posed on a Saturday night. Although this makes sense, intuitively, out of the six bivariate tests they conducted using variables that measure temporal location of an incident, only one was statistically significant, the association between the day of the week and victim-offender relationship. Although the relationship was weak, they found that risk of homicide victimization by a spouse was greater on the weekend, while the victimization risk by a stranger was greater during the week. Fairing somewhat better, Caywood (1998) found evidence that supported a significant relationship between the location of the homicide incident and time of event, the day of the week and victim-offender relationship, and the month of the year for both location and victim-offender relationship. In addition, homicide risk has been shown to be greatest on the weekends and during summer months (Breault & Kposowa, 1997; Kposowa & Breault, 1998).

Alcohol and drug use by a victim prior to and during the incident has also been researched. According to a meta-analysis conducted by Kuhns et al (2009), on average, the literature shows that 6% of homicide victims have marijuana in their system when killed, compared to 11% with cocaine, and 5% with opiates. Although males and females had similar levels of the illicit substances, 36% of Hispanic victims had cocaine in the system, compared to 24% of blacks, and 15% of whites. In a similar study examining blood alcohol levels of homicide victims, Kuhns et al (2011) reported that 48% of victims had alcohol in their system when killed, while 33% were legally intoxicated.

An important situational variable for the current research study is whether homicide events are typically intra-racial or inter-racial. In a summary of official homicide data, Fox & Zawitz (2007) reported that homicide incidents where the victim and offender were friends or acquaintances were inter-racial only eight percent of the time. For victims and offenders who were strangers, however, the percentage of inter-racial homicides increased to 25%. In a sample of homicides in Chicago, Cook (1987) found that inter-racial homicides varied across homicide type. For example, homicides that occurred during a robbery were inter-racial seven percent of the time if the victim was black (white offender) and 49% of the time if the victim was white (black offender). For non-felony homicides, however, the murder of a white victim was inter-racial seven percent of the time and four percent of the time for black victims. Also using Chicago data, Block (1985) published similar results, that is, robbery-homicides are more likely to be inter-racial when compared to non-felony homicides.

Although a situational factor, differences between inter-racial and intra-racial homicides have also been studied on the macro-level, looking at the relationship between homicide rates and predictor variables. For example, Messner and South (1992) used criminal opportunity theory to model inter-racial homicide rates and found that they "are shaped to a considerable degree by the fundamental properties of urban social structure" (p. 531). That is say that the more diverse a city, the higher the rates of inter-racial homicide. Approaching the question from a racial conflict perspective, Jacobs and Woods (1999) found that urban areas with increased economic competition between black and white, along with a black mayor, increased levels of inter-racial homicide. The importance of these macro-level studies, and their ability to help understand homicide victimization, is the focus of the next section.

2.3.3 Macro characteristics. The utilization of macro-level data, whether at tract, block, city, county, or state level, has typically been reserved for studies examining aggregated victimization rates, although a growing body of research has looked at homicide victimization using multiple levels of analysis (e.g. Broidey et al, 2006; Dalessio & Stolzenbeg, 2009; Dejong et al, 2011; Dobrin, 2001; Kposowa, 1999; Kposowa et al, 2006; Ousey & Lee, 2010). For victimization research that has examined homicide incidents there is mixed evidence of whether theoretical variables help explain variation across units of analysis. For example, aspects of household composition, both on the individual and community level, can have an impact on homicide risk because of its influence on capably guardianship and the presence of suitable victims. In an attempt to control for the effects of housing composition, Roncek and Maier (1991) used the percentage of primary individuals, which are "household heads who do not live with relatives" (p. 734), and the percentage of female-headed families because they believed it to be a "more class-free measure of the presence of nonintact families than the percent divorced" (p. 734). Neither variable, however, was significant in the regression model that attempted to predict homicides. Broidy et al (2006) used the percentage of vacant housing, the percentage of renter-occupied housing, and the percentage of one-person households to measure the impact that housing composition had on decreased guardianship. Of these characteristics, only the percentage of one-person households could differentiate between the neighborhoods of victims, offenders, and victims who were previously offenders.

Employment status and poverty rates on the community level have also been introduced into models meant to explain victimization. In their original formulation of routine activities theory, Cohen and Felson (1979) identified unemployment rates as a necessary control variable. Their regression analysis, however, showed that the decrease in unemployment rates had almost

no impact on their model using homicide rates as the dependent variable. In a study looking at the overlap between offenders and victims, unemployment rates were collected at the community level to measure exposure to motivated offenders, a key component of routine activities. The research found no significant differences in the unemployment rates of neighborhoods where offenders, victims, and victims with criminal histories lived (Broidy et al, 2006). Utilizing census data, Messner and Blau (1987) used the percent of the population that lived below the poverty line in metropolitan areas as a control variable. The researches discovered a statistically significant relationship between criminal homicide rates and the percent living in poverty. In addition, Broidy et al (2006) found that when using poverty rates to measure exposure to motivated offenders, there was a significant difference in the community characteristics of victims and victims with a previous criminal history. The same research discovered that victims with a criminal history lived in neighborhoods with lower levels of education and higher levels of poverty when compared to the neighborhoods where victims without a criminal history lived. In multivariate models, Dobrin et al (2005) and Dobrin (2001) found that the odds of homicide victimization significantly decreased as high school graduation rates increased.

Other demographic measurements, such as sex, age, and race, are also important for models examining homicide victimization. Measuring sex on the community level as a statistical control, one study found a positive relationship between homicide rates and the percentage of city that was male (Messner & Blau, 1987). Pridemore and Freilich (2005) researched female homicide victimization through the theoretical lens of gender equity and masculine culture. In the multivariate models, female earnings, percent young, divorce rates, and resource deprivation all had some ability to significantly predict female homicide rates. In another study seeking to explain variation in female homicide victimization rates, Vieraitis and Williams (2002) found

partial support for the hypothesis that female victimization is affected by the absolute status of women and gender equality. Geographic regions with higher levels of resource deprivation had higher rates of female victimization. In addition, white women were at a higher risk of homicide victimization in areas where their employment levels and income were closer to that of males.

In a multivariate analysis, Cohen and Felson (1979) did not identify age as a theoretical variable of interest, but instead used age as a control, measuring the proportion of the population that was between the ages of 15 and 24. For homicide, specifically, they found that there was a positive relationship between homicide rates and the proportion of individuals within that age range. However, no relationship was found between age and the average homicide rate of Cleveland city blocks (Roncek & Maier, 1991) and one study found a significant, negative relationship between the homicide rates in metropolitan areas and the percent of individuals who were between 18 and 24 (Messner & Blau, 1987).

For specific victim types based on race, macro variables vary based on the theory and purpose of the study. For example, when examining Latino homicide rates, Shihadeh & Barranco (2010) found that the proportion Latino, proportion black, and Latino economic deprivation all had a significant relationship with the outcome variable. Similarly, research comparing family and nonfamily victim types in Asian and non-Asian homicide victims reported that social disadvantage, acculturation, the size of the population between ages 15-29, prior homicide rates, median income, and measures of stability were significant in at least one of the regression models (Wu, 2008). For black homicide rates, specifically, Phillips (1997) tested whether social control, rational choice, or structural inequality theories could better explain variation across metropolitan areas. Measuring each predictor variable based on its representation of the black population, the research found that social control variables did a

better job at significantly predicting black homicide rates than the structural inequality and rational choice variables. Across all theories, however, percent black divorced, black population, gun control, black GINI coefficient, and percent males unemployed all had a significant relationship with the dependent variable. In one study, a positive relationship was found between the percentage of a metropolitan area that was black and the homicide rate (Messner & Blau, 1987).

Concerning ideologically motivated violence using macro-level variables, a negative relationship was found between the percent of county populations that were black or lived below the poverty level and whether a far-right extremist who had committed an ideologically motivated homicide lived there (Adamczyk et al, 2012). In the same study, a positive relationship was found between the presence of Muslims, percent of female-headed households, and county emigration patterns and whether a far-right perpetrator lived in that county. Although only significantly related at the .1 level, the study also looked at the total number of white hate groups in counties where far-right perpetrators lived. Similar to the extremist group measure, Freilich & Pridemore (2007) measured mobilization at the state level when examining violent and non-violent criminal acts against abortion clinics. When controlling for other variables, however, mobilization was not significant in any of the models. For specific types of victims, such as law enforcement, counties with greater levels of economic disadvantage, black populations, and individuals between the ages of 25 and 34 increased the risk of a police officer being murdered. In addition, for all counties in the U.S., the more urban a city, the lower the risk of law enforcement homicide (Kaminski, 2008).

Finally, many macro-level homicide studies, in addition to those listed above, have used Land, McCall and Cohen's (1990) suggested baseline model to study structural covariates of

homicide. These variables have consistently correlated with homicide rates across time and place. In addition to independent variables of theoretical interest, the authors suggested that researchers examining homicide rates include measurements of population structure, resource deprivation, percentage of the population that is divorced, percentage of the population between the ages of 15 and 29, the unemployment rate, and whether the geographic unit being analyzed was located in the South. In a study published 20 years after the original, McCall, Land & Parker (2010) confirmed that the variables originally suggested had a consistent and reliably relationship in models predicting homicide rates. These macro level variables are important to any research hoping to understand homicide risk or victimization, but should be considered controls in models that also include theoretical predictors.

2.4 Conclusion

Although the body of empirical literature related to ideologically motivated violence is growing, no study has focused primarily on ideological victimization. Also, victimization theory, which focuses on the relationship between a person's lifestyle and routine activities, and their victimization, have not been utilized, or developed, to study victims of terrorism or domestic extremism. The purpose of this chapter was not only to review the literature relevant to this study, but to also present data on homicide victims, so that parallels can be made between what is known about the individual, situational, and macro-level characteristics of previously studied homicide victims and what one might expect to find when examining ideological victims.

On an individual level, homicide victims are disproportionately young, male minorities, when compared to the general population. In some respects, we would expect this segment of the population to also be at higher risk for ideological victimization, as white supremacist would

target racial and ethnic minorities for ideological purposes. The situations in which victims are killed tend to be intra-racial, although there is evidence that levels of intra-racial/inter-racial homicides vary with differences in circumstances (i.e. felony-murder compared to non-felony murder). Where victims are targeted for their minority status, far-right ideological victimization events are probably more inter-racial, however victims of anti-government violence have the potential to mirror past research results and be killed in intra-racial homicide events. In addition, victims are more often killed by someone they know, whether an acquaintance, family member, or intimate partner. How this parallels to ideological victimization is yet to be seen and is tied into the idea of randomness. One would expect that if the "randomness hypothesis" is correct, ideological victims would more often be killed by strangers. Overall, firearms are the weapon of choice in the majority of fatal victimizations and there is some reason to believe this may differ for far-right victims, as a large proportion are killed by neo-Nazis and skinheads, a segment of the population known to use knives and bodily weapons. Finally, relationships have been found between homicide rates and levels of social disorganization, social control, and poor economic health, as well as may of the correlates recommended by Land, McCall, and Cohen (1990). With these studies in mind, the research will next address the methodologies used for data collection and analysis for the creation of an empirical foundation for developing theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization.

Chapter 3

Data, Methods & Analytical Plan

The purpose of this research is to develop theoretical propositions based on empirical data about far-right ideological homicide victims, the incidents in which they are killed, and the counties where the homicides occur. To do this, data from the Extremist Crime Database (ECDB) [2] was collected, cleaned, and analyzed so that comparisons could be made within they varying types of far-right ideological (FRI) victims and between FRI victims, far-right routine (FRR) victims, and routine (RTN) homicide victims. These comparisons were then used to develop theoretical propositions. This chapter, which focuses on the study's data and methods, progresses with a discussion of the data collection and cleaning process, the empirical analyses within FRI victims and the statistical analyses between types of homicide victims, before concluding with a brief note related to theory building.

3.1 Data

To address the research goal, empirical data on ideological victims, the incidents in which they were victimized, and the geographies where they were killed was collected. Varying levels of analysis were utilized to develop an understanding between the differences and similarities of ideological victims to victims of other types of homicide, as well as other individuals in society. Several types of data were used to identify the population of interest and create appropriate comparisons. The data sources, which are described in more detail below and listed in Table 3.2, include the Extremist Crime Database (ECDB), Fox and Swatt's (2009) imputed data file of the Federal Bureau's Supplementary Homicide Report (iSHR), United States

[2] Table 3.1 lists repeatedly used abbreviations.

Table 3.1. Abbreviations.

Abbreviation	Full Title	Notes
ECDB	Extremist Crime Database	The Extremist Crime Database developed by Freilich and Chermak (2006), and funded by the Department of Homeland Security, collects information on violent and financial crimes committed in the United States by individuals who adhere to an extremist ideology.
FRI	Far-Right Ideological	Far-right ideological victims are individuals killed during homicide incidents that are perpetrated by offenders who adhere to a far-right, extremist ideology and the incident was motivated, at least in part, by that ideology.
FRR	Far-Right Routine	Far-right routine victims are individuals killed during homicide incidents that are perpetrated by offenders who adhere to a far-right extremist ideology and the incident was in not motivated by that ideology.
iSHR	Imputed Supplementary Homicide Report	The imputed Supplementary Homicide Report is an augmented data file that collects information on all homicide victims and suspects reported through the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report program. Missing values are filled in using a hot deck multiple imputation methodology developed by Fox & Swatt (2008).
RTN	Routine	Victims who are killed during "routine" homicide incidents perpetrated by individuals who do not adhere to a far-right, extremist ideology and whose actions are in no way motivated by a far-right ideology.
SHR	Supplementary Homicide Report	The Supplementary Homicide Report is a collection of homicide data collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and disseminated through their Uniform Crime Report program.
TV	Typical Victim	A typical victim is an aggregate of all victims killed in a single geographic unit during a specified time period.

Table 3.2. Data sources.

Data Source	Years	Notes
Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections	1988; 1992; 1996; 2000; 2004; 2008	Years between elections were matched to the closest election year.
Extremist Crime Database (ECDB)	1990-2007	Collects data on homicide incidents committed by the domestic far-right and reported in open-source documents between 1990 and 2007.
Imputed Supplementary Homicide Report (iSHR)	1990-2007	Collects and imputes data on homicide incidents reported throughthe FBI's Uniform Crime Report. Only data for 2000-2007 in the 48 contiguous states was used for the sampling frame and county-level aggregation.
Religious Congregations & Membership Study	2000	Measures religious adherents for different denominations at the county level. Only 2000 was used as (1) year closest to middle of time frame under study; (2) data has little variation between studies; and (3) changes in data collection methodologies make comparisons difficult.
Southern Poverty Law Center's (SPLC) Annual Hate Crime Listing Reports	1990-2008	Based on the work of Adamczyk, et al (2012), the presence of far-right extremists, in addition to offenders involved in homicide incidents, is measured at the county level by reporting whether a white hate group was active in a specific county during a specific year.
United State Decennial Census	1990; 2000; 2010	Interpolation was utilized to estimate values for years between censuses.

census data, the Atlas of U.S Presidential Elections, and the Association of Religion Data Archives. From the ECDB and the iSHR, individual and situational data specific to homicide incidents was collected. In addition, macro-level demographic, political and religious data was used for information on the counties in which individuals were killed. Additional steps were taken to fill in missing values for the ECDB and interpolate information from the macro-level measurements. From these three types of data, descriptive and multivariate statistics were produced and presented in the next two chapters. The following sections outline, in detail, the sources of data and the analytical plan. All analyses consisted of descriptive, bivariate, and/or multivariate statistics. Through an empirical examination of the between and within differences of FRI victims to the appropriate comparisons, a profile of ideological victimization was developed from the individual, situational, and macro characteristics of each victimization incident.[3]

3.1.1 The Extremist Crime Database. The Extremist Crime Database (ECDB) offers the only systematically collected information on homicide victims killed during ideologically motivated incidents that were perpetrated by the extremist far-right in the United States during the time period under study. Through the ECDB, the population of interest, victims of ideologically motivated homicide, have been identified. The ECDB was developed through grants provided by the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), one of the Department of Homeland Security's Centers of Excellence. The purpose of the ECDB is to track criminal acts committed by extremists within the United States. Through the use of open source materials, the ECDB identifies both violent and financial crimes

[3] Tables 3.3 and 3.4 list the variables of interest for both the within and between analyses at multiple levels of analysis. Please refer to these tables for variable and coding information.

Table 3.3. Variables examining variation within FRI victims.

Level	Variable	Values	Source(s)
Individual	Sex	Male; Female	ECDB
	Age	<18; 18-24; 25-34; 35-49; 50+	ECDB
	Race	White; Black; Other	ECDB
	Hispanic	Yes; No	ECDB
	Occupation	String	ECDB
	Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual; Homosexual	ECDB
	Law Enforcement	Local; State; Federal	ECDB
	Killed in Line of Duty	Yes; No	ECDB
	Homeless	Yes; No	ECDB
	Religion	String	ECDB
	Community Status	High; Low	ECDB
	Prior Victimization	Yes; No	ECDB
	Prior Arrest	Yes; No	ECDB
Situational	Intra-Racial	Yes; No	ECDB
	Multiple Suspects	Yes; No	ECDB
	Multiple Victims	Yes; No	ECDB
	Non-Fatal Victims	Yes; No	ECDB
	Others Around	0; 1-10; >10	ECDB
	Victim-Offender Relationships	Intimate; Family; Acquaintance; Stranger	ECDB
	Victim-Victim Relationships	Intimate; Family; Acquaintance; Stranger	ECDB
	Level of Randomness	Purposeful; Representative; Random	ECDB
	Weapon	Gun; Knife,; Blunt Object; Bodily Weapon; Other	ECDB
	Evidence of Overkill	Yes; No	ECDB
	Location	Business/Church/School; Prison; Private Residence; Remote; Area/Park/Vacant Lot; Street	ECDB
	Parking Lot/Street	Yes; No	ECDB
	Activity	Work; Home; Leisure	ECDB
	Time of Incident	00:00-05:59; 06:00-11:59; 12:00-17:59; 18:00-23:59	ECDB
	Victim Residence/Killed Same County	Yes; No	ECDB
	Season	Winter; Spring; Summer; Fall	ECDB
	Year	1990-1994; 1995-1999; 2000-2004; 2005-2007	ECDB
	Region	Northeast; Midwest; South; West	ECDB
	Victim Type	Anti-abortion; Anti-Government; Anti-Race/Ethnic Minority; Anti-Social Minority	ECDB

Table 3.3. Variables examining variation within FRI victims (cont.).

Level	Variable	Values	Source(s)
Macro	Population/1000	Numeric	Census
	Population Density	Numeric	Census
	% Rural	0-100	Census
	% Urban	0-100	Census
	% Male	0-100	Census
	% Female	0-100	Census
	% White	0-100	Census
	% Black	0-100	Census
	% Other	0-100	Census
	% Hispanic	0-100	Census
	% Native Born	0-100	Census
	% Under 18	0-100	Census
	% 18 to 24	0-100	Census
	% 25 to 34	0-100	Census
	% 35 to 49	0-100	Census
	% 50 and up	0-100	Census
	% No High School Degree	0-100	Census
	% High School Degree	0-100	Census
	% Some College	0-100	Census
	% College Degree or More	0-100	Census
	% Unemployed	0-100	Census
	% Population in Poverty	0-100	Census
	Median Family Income	Numeric	Census
	% Female headed households	0-100	Census
	GINI Index	0-100	Census
	Evangelical Adherence Rate	Numeric	Religious Congregations & Membership Study
	Jewish Adherence Rate	Numeric	Religious Congregations & Membership Study
	Islamic Adherence Rate	Numeric	Religious Congregations & Membership Study
	% Voting Democrat	0-100	Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections
	% Voting Republican	0-100	Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections
	% Voting Independent	0-100	Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections
	White hate group	Yes; No	SPLC

Table 3.4. Variables examining variation between FRI, FRR & RTN victims.

Level	Variable	Values	Source(s)
Individual	Sex	Male; Female	ECDB; iSHR
	Age	<18; 18-24; 25-34; 35-49; 50+	ECDB; iSHR
	Race	White; Black; Other	ECDB; iSHR
	Hispanic	Yes; No	ECDB
Situational	Intra-Racial	Yes; No	ECDB; iSHR
	Multiple Victims	Yes; No	ECDB; iSHR
	Victim-Offender Relationships	Intimate; Family; Acquaintance; Stranger	ECDB; iSHR
	Weapon	Gun; Knife,; Blunt Object; Bodily Weapon; Other	ECDB; iSHR
	Season	Winter; Spring; Summer; Fall	ECDB; iSHR
	Year	1990-1994; 1995-1999; 2000-2004; 2005-2007	ECDB; iSHR
	Region	Northeast; Midwest; South; West	ECDB; iSHR
Macro	Population/1000	Numeric	Census
	Population Density	Numeric	Census
	% Rural	0-100	Census
	% Urban	0-100	Census
	% Male	0-100	Census
	% Female	0-100	Census
	% White	0-100	Census
	% Black	0-100	Census
	% Other	0-100	Census
	% Hispanic	0-100	Census
	% Native Born	0-100	Census
	% Under 18	0-100	Census
	% 18 to 24	0-100	Census
	% 25 to 34	0-100	Census
	% 35 to 49	0-100	Census
	% 50 and up	0-100	Census
	% No High School Degree	0-100	Census
	% High School Degree	0-100	Census
	% Some College	0-100	Census
	% College Degree or More	0-100	Census
	% Unemployed	0-100	Census
	% Population Below Poverty Level	0-100	Census
	Median Family Income	Numeric	Census
	% Female headed households	0-100	Census

Table 3.4. Variables examining variation between FRI, FRR, & RTN victims (cont.).

Level	Variable	Values	Source(s)
Macro	GINI Index	0-100	Census
	Evangelical Adherence Rate	Numeric	Religious Congregations & Membership Study 2010
	Jewish Adherence Rate	Numeric	Religious Congregations & Membership Study 2010
	Islamic Adherence Rate	Numeric	Religious Congregations & Membership Study 2010
	% Voting Democrat	0-100	Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections
	% Voting Republican	0-100	Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections
	% Voting Independent	0-100	Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections
	White hate group	Yes; No	SPLC

committed by individuals whose interpretations of normative ideologies place them at the fringes of said ideologies. Specifically, the ECDB collects data on the extremist far-right, animal and environmental rights extremists, and Jihadists. It is a relational database that houses variables at different levels of analysis such as the incident, suspect, victim, and target levels. In addition, network variables are collected to assess the relationships between the victims, the suspects, the targets, and the locations where the incidents occur. This research project is specifically concerned with the victims of ideologically motivated homicide incidents committed by far-rightists.

Between 1990 and 2008, 329 homicide incidents occurred where an individual was killed in an incident that involved at least one far-rightist, 39% of which were ideologically motivated (Chermak et al, 2012). The ECDB data was selected for this project because it is the only database that collects victim level data on ideologically motivated homicides in the United States. Importantly, it offers a unique opportunity to study a small, but complete, population of victims of extremism. These deaths, although no more horrible than victims of "routine" homicides, are symbolic. The purpose of the offenders was to further the agenda of a fringe political ideology and to terrorize others with similar characteristics to their chosen victims. Information about these victims, the situations in which they were killed, and the communities where they died, were extracted from the ECDB and used to support the theory development.

There are three types of victims in the study, the FRI victims killed by far-rightists during an ideologically motivated incident who are the primary focus of the research, FRR victims killed by far-rightists during "routine" homicide events, and RTN victims killed by non far-rightists during "routine" homicide events. The latter two groups are included in the study as comparisons to the victims of interest. Data on FRI and FRR victims and incidents originate

from the ECDB and because of this, the population under study is based on the ECDB's inclusion criteria. For FRI victims to be included in the study, they had to have been killed by a far-rightist whose motivation to commit the homicide was based on their extremist ideology. One example of this might be a biracial couple that is targeted and killed by white supremacists for race mixing, which in their view dilutes the Aryan bloodline. The second category, FRR victims, are included if they are killed in an incident that included a far-rightist, but was not ideologically motivated. For example, the wife of a Ku Klux Klan member killed by her husband during an act of domestic violence. The last category, RTN victims, represents individuals killed by non far-right extremists during "routine" homicides. These might include a clerk at a gas station who was shot during a robbery. The inclusion criteria for FRI and FRR victims are discussed below, while the RTN victim inclusion criteria and sampling methodology are discussed in the iSHR data section.

ECDB incident identification and coding is a multi-stage process. First, the principal investigators used open-source publications and databases to identify cases that could potentially fit the inclusion criteria. These sources included, but were not limited to, the Southern Poverty Law Center's Intelligence Report, the Anti-Defamation League's Militia Watch-Dog, the FBI's Terrorism in America publication, Hewitt's chronology of terrorism events in the United States (2005), the American Terrorism Study, and the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism's (2011) Global Terrorism Database.[4] Additional incidents were identified in online newspaper articles, which were searched using keywords such as homicide and Klan, homicide and militia, homicide and sovereign citizen, homicide and Aryan Nations, and homicide and skinheads. The use of multiple sources increased the probability that all cases

[4] For a more detailed discussion of the incident identification process, see Chermak, Freilich, Parkin & Lynch (2012); Gruenewald, 2011; Gruenewald & Pridemore, 2012.

needed to capture the entire population of interest were identified. Due to the identification process used by the ECDB, the risk of inclusion and exclusion errors are minimized, especially when compared to other sources and databases that have been used to study terrorism and ideologically motivated crime (Chermak et al, 2012).

Once potential incidents were identified, research assistants systematically searched more than two-dozen open-source search engines and databases to collect all publically available information on the homicide events. After the open-source materials were collected, they were forwarded to a coder who read the documents, verified that the incident met the appropriate inclusion criteria, conducted additional open-source searches, and coded each incident. Variables coded related to the incident, the suspects, the victims, and the reliability of the open-source documentation. This coding process was iterative and reliability was increased through coder training (Freilich et al, Under Review; Grunewald, 2011). Importantly, this research took several additional steps, which are detailed below, in confirming existing values and filling in missing values for variables of interest.

The ECDB inclusion criteria is relevant to this project as the incidents identified and coded represent a population of victims in the United States who were killed during ideologically motivated and "routine" homicide incidents committed by far-rightists. As stated, the primary research focuses on the FRI victim, those killed during far-right ideologically motivated homicide incidents, and the inclusion criteria related to the inclusion of this population will be specifically discussed.[5] For a homicide victim to be coded in the ECDB as a FRI victim, they must fit several criteria; (1) they must have been killed in an incident that (2) involved at least one suspect who adhered to a far-right ideology, (3) was charged by the police for the crime and

[5] The inclusion criteria for a FRR victim, who are included for comparison purposes and represent individuals killed by far-rightists during a "routine" homicide, are similar, except for the removal of criteria (4).

(4) whose actions were motivated by the aforementioned extremist ideology. In addition, (5) the victim must have been killed in an incident that occurred after 1990 (6) within the United States of America.

The ECDB collects information on homicides that are ideologically motivated (inclusion criteria (4)) and homicides that are not ideologically motivated, but committed by extremists. As the only difference between these two types of victims is suspect motive, it is imperative to have a set of criteria that differentiates the two, especially when one group of victims represent the phenomena of interest, and the other group are used primarily for comparative purposes. A homicide case was coded as ideologically motivated when specific indicators were found in the open-source materials that include, but are not limited to (1) written or verbal statements made by the suspects that say the victim was selected based on their status or identity, (2) evidence found at the crime scene, such as drawings or symbols that are ideological in nature or can be related to the victim's status or identity, or (3) the victim was killed in a location symbolic of their status or identity (Gruenewald, 2011). The ECDB allows coders to capture up to five pieces of evidence that are proponents of ideological motivation and five pieces of evidence that contradict ideological motivation. For an individual to be a FRI victim, an incident must have at least one piece of proponent evidence pointing towards ideological motivation. The importance in capturing this evidence is apparent in the analysis phase of any research project using ECDB data, as the proponent and contradictory evidence can be converted into a scalular variable which allows researchers to control for differences between incidents based on the strength of the ideological motivation.

In addition, inclusion criteria (2) must be operationalized so that it can be reasonably argued that the universe of homicide victims being studied includes all victims killed by

members of the extreme far-right motivated by the extremist ideology and excludes individuals killed in all other types of homicide incidents. The main purpose for only looking at victims of far-right homicide incidents is because it represents a cohesive political ideology, which, at its base, is either anti-abortion, anti-government or anti-minority. The aforementioned inclusion criteria creates a population of homicide victims that were killed in ideologically motivated incidents perpetrated by far-right extremists in the United States between 1990 and 2007.[6]

Even though the ECDB methodology represents one of the most scientifically reliable databases on ideological violence in the United States, there are several possible sources of error that impact the ability of the researchers to identify every FRI victim. It is important to note that, from a statistical perspective, any missing cases, except those missing completely at random, could bias the data and the results of the analyses used to develop theoretical propositions. Also, it is relevant to future research that these errors are acknowledged for each dataset so that potential biases are known and other researchers can attempt to account for and correct these biases.

As discussed, for an individual to be included as a FRI victim, first, that individual must be murdered, law enforcement must be aware of the death, and that death must be labeled a homicide. Next, a suspect must be identified, the suspect would need to be connected to an extremist ideology, that connection needs to be reported in an open-source document, that document would need to be found, and an ECDB researcher would need to discover that information so that it can be coded into the database. In addition, evidence must be documented that shows that the suspect's extremist ideology was a motivating factor for killing the victim. Even if an individual is a FRI victim, if any link in the chain of discovery between incident to

[6] Although the ECDB has data until 2012, only victims killed between 1990 and 2007 are used because of the restricted timeframe of the iSHR's comparison data.

coding is missing, that victim will be missing from this study. Homicide researchers state that the homicide data is reliable as few homicides go unreported (Messner, 1983; Wadsworth & Roberts, 2008) and that the "dark figure" of homicide data was greatly reduced early in the twentieth century (Eckberg, 1995).

Instead of the homicide not being reported, the more probable error is that a suspect was not identified in a murder investigation, as approximately 30% of homicide incidents reported to the FBI between 1976 and 2007 had no identified offender when the SHR form was filled out (Fox & Swatt, 2007). It is also probable that ideological extremism is either not discovered by police or not reported in open-sources. Similarly, it is also possible that even if a suspect's ideological connections are reported in the open source, police and prosecutors may inaccurately identify a suspect's motivation and in doing so, fail to identify an individual's death as being part of an ideological victimization, instead determining it is a "routine" homicide. Conversely, there is also the possibility that individuals who are identified as FRI victims, may actually not be, if a suspect is incorrectly identified as being a far-rightist, when they are not, or their motivation is ascribed to be ideological when, in fact, it is not.

The second group of homicide victims used in this study, those killed by far-rightists during "routine" homicide incidents, also have the potential for being excluded from the study because of the aforementioned errors. One error that could potentially have a larger impact on the identified population of FRR victims, when compared to FRI victims, is the identification and reporting of the suspect's ideological connection. For example, if a survivalist gets in a heated debate with an individual who rear ends his car and that altercation escalates into a homicide incident, the police might have no reason to question, write down, or repeat the suspect's fringe beliefs. Even if law enforcement is aware that the individual is anti-government,

conducts paramilitary exercises on his property, and holds conspiratorial beliefs, it would still need to be conveyed in an official document or reported in a media account for that information to made public, and the murdered individual to be coded in the ECDB as a FRR victim.

The purpose of this discussion is not to invalidate the data. The purpose is to offer an accurate picture of the data as it is being presented. Error profiles, such as though recommended for terrorism databases such as the ECDB are important for the incremental improvement of scientific information (Chermak et al, 2011). In addition, it may be helpful to think of the population of victims in the ECDB as a subset of a super-population (Berk, 2010), and that the purpose of conducting inferential statistics in the analysis is so that the results discovered about the populations and samples under study can be inferred to FRI victims outside of the sample and time period under study.

As stated, after a potential incident was identified, a trained research assistant searched for all available open-source documentation related to the incident, suspects, and victims. These documents represent the universe of information that is available on the internet and through news and legal databases about each FRI and FRR victimization incident. A standardized procedure was utilized for the collection of all open-source documentation. After a far-right homicide incident was identified, a trained searcher used information about the incident, the victims, and the suspects to search for documents pertaining to the event. As stated previously, over two-dozen search engines were systematically searched in the compilation of the open source documentation. Victim names, suspect names, and situational characteristics were used by the searchers in an effort to collect every news article, press release, court document, blog entry, and television news video, to name a few, that could contain information about the incident. A trained coder then reviewed the documentation and determined, based on the evidence at hand,

whether the incident met the inclusion criteria. If it did not, reasons for exclusion were documented and passed along to the principal investigators. If the incident did meet the inclusion criteria, the coder read through each open-source document and gleaned it for information that would allow for the coding of specific variables in the ECDB. In addition, coders also conducted targeted follow up searches to collect information not in existence at the time of the initial search and information that might have been missed. Open-source search files could include only one document or as many as a hundred plus documents, depending on the newsworthiness of the incident.

When assessing the validity and reliability of the open-source data, it is important to remember that these documents originate from different sources and are created by a multitude of authors. In addition, the process by which each document is created, the purpose for its creation, and its intended audience vary widely. Newspaper articles, for instance, might be written by a journalist assigned to the crime desk, follow a uniform narrative, and be limited by page space. Some crime articles might be more in depth, reporting on a homicide's connection to similar crimes, especially if ideological motivations are involved. In some articles, experts on hate crimes or terrorism are interviewed. Similarly, it is possible that witnesses, victims not killed, family members, or law enforcement will be interviewed and quoted. An appeals document published by the court might contain a narrative of the incident and a legal summation of the facts that appellate judges referenced in their decisions. Some documents might share information about the victims in the form of social media postings or an obituary in a local newspaper. Individuals who support the ideological motivations of the offenders might create a website that glorifies the acts of violence or highlights their humanity. These documents are all subjective manifestations of individuals with specific beliefs and agendas. The journalist must

report on stories that their editors will publish. A blogger might be outraged, or encouraged, by the violent act because of their personal ideological beliefs. A grieving mother might write her son's obituary. A public relations officer for a local police department drafts and releases information about an incident and the suspects at large for a specific law enforcement purpose. All of these documents represent cultural artifacts that were created and made openly accessible through varying organizational and individual processes. It is important to understand what the open-source documents encompass, because from those, the ECDB was created. Any potential sources of bias in the creation of the documents could transfer to the ECDB. Research assistants could only code a variable in the ECDB if that information was found in an open-source document. Systematic exclusions of certain information, such as the race of the offender or victim, impact a researcher's ability to conduct statistical analyses because of missing data.

Several important steps were taken to validate the data and reduce missing values for the variables of interest. First, all open-source documentation was imported into qualitative data analysis software for further analysis. This allowed for a systematic review and understanding of each victimization incident. Also, highly targeted follow up searches utilized court documents, department of corrections websites, ancestry databases, and online news aggregators to fill in missing values and confirm existing values. This additional layer of searching and coding was necessary because new resources and information continually become accessible on the internet. An incident that was coded in the ECDB two years ago, most likely did not have the amount of information accessible about it then, that is accessible now. This effort decreased the number of missing values, at least for the variables used in the between victims analyses, to almost 0% (i.e. victim race, age, sex). As the population of FRI victims is small, it was imperative to reduce missing values as much as possible as lost cases introduced further bias into the data. Although

labor intensive, this process of data verification through additional analyses of already collected open-source files and follow-up searches for missing-values allowed for almost all FRI victims to be included in the quantitative analysis portion of the research.[7]

In conclusion, the ECDB offers the most complete set of victims of ideologically motivated homicides committed in the United States. Although potential biases exist due to missing victims or missing values, both the ECDB's inclusion and coding criteria, and this project's systematic follow-up searching and coding verification, go to great lengths to reduce this bias as much as possible. From this data, two samples of victims have been identified for analysis in this project. The first set, FRI victims, represent the phenomenon under investigation, victims of fatal, ideologically motivated violence. The second set, FRR victims, represent a sample of "routine" homicide victims who were killed by far-rightists. As little empirical research has been down on far-right violence, it is important that both sets of victims are included. When developing the theoretical propositions, it is essential to understand whether differences found between FRI victims and "routine" homicide victims identified in the iSHR are attributed to the motivation of the suspect or the ideology of the suspect. That is to say that differences in situational and individual characteristics might be specific to far-right victims in general, not ideological far-right victims, specifically. Finally, the dataset related to the third comparison group, victims of non-far-right, "routine" homicides, is discussed in the next section.

3.1.2 The Supplementary Homicide Report. The main goal of this research, to collect empirical data to generate theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization, hinges

[7] Only one FRI victim (out of 141) was excluded from the individual level analyses. This victim was the unborn child of a pregnant woman who was killed. For theoretical and quantitative reasons, however, this loss of data was not substantial. Two FRR victims were excluded from macro-level analyses due to missing data (2 out of 238). For both victims, the county in which they were killed could not be identified with any confidence, therefore removing the ability to match corresponding macro-level data.

on the identification and selection of appropriate comparison groups. One comparison group, FRR victims and their corresponding dataset, has already been discussed. For the other comparison group, RTN or "routine" homicide victims, we turn to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report (UCR) which releases yearly data on homicide incidents in the United States called the Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR, 2010). The purpose of the SHR is to collect information on all homicides committed inside the United States. Utilizing the SHR data allows for a comparison group of "routine" homicides to be constructed so that differences and similarities can be identified between victims of ideologically motivated homicide and victims of "routine" homicide. The data collection process, issues, and solutions to using SHR data are discussed below.

The data collection process begins when officers at local law enforcement agencies fill out an SHR form because a homicide is committed in their jurisdiction. These forms are turned over monthly, either to a state level agency in charge of collecting the information, or the FBI directly. The form collects data on the incident level and requests information related to the homicide incident, offender, victim, and the offender-victim relationship (Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d.). Homicide researchers use SHR data to study the fluctuation in homicide rates at both the micro and macro-levels (e.g. Braga, Piehl & Kennedy, 1999; Maxfield, 1989; Kellerman et al., 1993; Radelet & Pierce, 1985). Although the SHR can be used to assist in the creation of a sampling frame for a comparison group, one should do so with caution because of issues with missing data and cases (Pridemore, 2005; Fox, 2004; Langford, Isaac & Kabat, 1998; Flewelling, 2004; Fox, 2004; Maxfield, 1989; Williams & Flewelling, 1987). Related to this, the SHR suffers from several well-documented weaknesses, which include (1) the inability to easily capture all information when multiple suspects and offenders are involved, (2) missing homicide

incidents from precincts that do not report, and (3) missing values from reported cases. Each of these weaknesses will be addressed before discussing why the imputed SHR file (Fox & Swatt, 2009) is a more appropriate data source for this project.

To start, the SHR collects data on the incident level. When there is only one offender and one victim, this is not an issue, as the victim and offender data inputted into the SHR form is an accurate reflection of the incident in relation to the actors, their individual characteristics, and the situations characteristics. If there are multiple victims or suspects the dataset needs to be disaggregated so that variables, such as victim-offender relationship, are accurately measured. Even then there are mismeasurement issues, as victim-offender relationship is only measured between each unique offender and the primary victim. The SHR, however, does not have the ability to measure the relationship between every offender and every victim. Also, instead of disaggregation, many homicide researchers use the primary victim and primary offender to study homicides using SHR data. This data then becomes biased, as incidents with multiple victims or suspects lose information about anyone involved in the homicide event who was not the first person written down on the official SHR form.

An additional issue with using the SHR data is the incomplete response rates that result in missing homicide incidents. Depending on state and jurisdiction, and based on the fact that reporting to the FBI is strictly voluntary, there can be months or even years where a jurisdiction does not report the number of homicides. In some cases where the law enforcement jurisdictions are small, it makes sense that they will submit homicide numbers for only several months out of a year because the other months have zero homicides. In large jurisdictions, however, such as major metropolitan areas, months with zero homicide should be suspect as missing data (Fox, 2004). Research has been conducted to validate SHR numbers with other data sources, such as

the National Vital Statistics System (Loftin, McDowall & Fetzer, 2008) or the internal records of local law enforcement agencies (Braga, Piehl & Kennedy, 1999), and has found differences between the data sources. This is a problem, especially when SHR data is used to access homicide rates on a macro-level (Pridemore, 2005). Fox (2004) argues that missing incidents should be considered missing at random (MCAR) because the fact that they are missing, although dependent on attributes of the jurisdiction in which they occur, is not dependent on attributes of the homicide incident itself. That is to say that if a township police chief in Pennsylvania fails to report that his jurisdiction had a homicide in January of 1997, this missing data is related not to the homicide, but to the police chief. If the data is MCAR, it can be assumed that the missing data is a randomized subset of the entire population being studied and therefore the fact that it is missing should not bias the outcome of a study. However, as there is no way to test this assumption by comparing reported SHR cases to non-reported cases, this research does not claim that victims not in the SHR dataset are MCAR. Instead, the defensibility of utilizing SHR data, even with missing cases, lies in the understanding that the SHR is the only accessible national dataset of homicide incidents that covers the time period understudy available to researchers, as well as the use of SHR data utilized in research published in top-tier, peer-reviewed journals in the field of criminology (e.g. Tennenbaum & Fink, 1994; Ousey & Lee, 2007; Gruenewald & Pridemore, 2012) as well as specialized journals such as *Homicide Studies*. Regardless, the reader should keep in mind that the missing cases in the SHR has the potential to bias the random sample of "routine" homicides used for this study if there are systematic reasons for why some homicides are reported, while others are not.

Lastly, when SHR forms are submitted to the FBI they still may suffer from additional sources of missing data. Missing value errors refers to the fact that all variables on the form may

not be filled in or the data that is recorded, is incorrect. These errors are partially an artifact of the data collection protocol set forth by the FBI. Since the SHR forms are filled out almost immediately after a homicide incident, a suspect may not yet be identified. In these cases, the offender variables and the victim-offender variable are left blank. As there is no way for SHR data to be updated, if an offender is identified later on in the investigation, the data in the SHR that is being analyzed by researchers misrepresents the facts of the incident. Similarly, if an offender is identified immediately, but is later found not to have committed the homicide and a new offender is identified, the SHR data will reflect the information related to the person originally identified as the primary offender.

In addition to updated information, there is also the chance that forms are filled out incorrectly. The SHR, unlike the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS), requires no training on the part of the respondent who fills out the form. Another issue is that the documentation accompanying the form is minimal (Addington, 2004). Therefore, values for each variable may be incorrectly assigned because of poor interrater reliability. Lastly, respondents may choose simply not to fill out certain variables and return the forms with incomplete information. Several researchers have suggested, and implemented, ways of dealing with the data collection error of missing values through statistical imputation, a technique utilized in data used for this research (Fox, 2004; Flewelling, 2004; Grunewald & Pridemore, 2012).

Fox and Swatt (2009) released a cumulative SHR dataset on all reported homicides between 1976 and 2007 through the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), identified in this research as the iSHR. This dataset disaggregates incident level data into both victim and offender level files, using a multiple imputation methodology to fill in

missing values, allowing for statistical estimates of missing values based on the completed data that had been collected over the same period (Fox, 2004). Although there are still missing cases from jurisdictions that did not report incidents, it can be argued those cases represent a random sample of missing data, and therefore the remaining cases are representative of the overall population of homicides. With no missing values, the iSHR acts as sampling frame of homicide victims that were killed during the same time period as the ECDB victims (1990 to 2007) allowing for the creation of a second comparison group of homicide victims. The type of homicide is also important as the SHR collects data on murder, voluntary homicide, and non-voluntary homicide. By definition, offenders who killed during ideologically motivated incidents had the intent to target and injure their victims and because of this, victims of non-voluntary homicide incidents are not directly comparable to FRI victims. The iSHR, however, has removed victims of non-voluntary homicide, making the groups of victims more comparable.

The sample of RTN victims was collected in several steps. First, the victim file of the iSHR was downloaded from ICPSR. The data was then limited to victims killed between 1990 and 2007 in the 48 contiguous states. Next, efforts were made to identify both FRI and FRR victims in the iSHR and to remove them by comparing the non-imputed victim records to ECDB victims. One of the basic requirements of inferential statistics is that the observations under study are mutually exclusive. That is to say that a homicide incident that is identified a FRI incident cannot also appear in the RTN sample. If it does, this introduces bias into the results of the analysis. To remove FRI victims from the RTN sampling frame, victims were first filtered by their geographic and temporal location. If victims were identified in the RTN sampling frame that were killed in the same county around the same time as the FRI victim, individual and situational characteristics were then used to determine whether they were the same victim and

therefore had to be removed from the iSHR. Of the total number of FRI and FRR victims, 228 out of 380 (60%) were identified in the RTN sampling frame based on the time and place of their death, their characteristics, and the characteristics of the homicide incident.[8] These victims were then removed from the sampling frame so that they could not be randomly selected and then appear in to more than one of the samples.[9] Also, as the file contained six records for each victim (one record of original data and five imputed records), every record was removed except for first imputed record, ensuring that each victim could only be selected once for the RTN sample. Finally, a random sample of RTN victims was selected from the iSHR for a 5:1 ratio. That is, five RTN victims were selected for every one FRI victim, a method utilized in similar research by Gruenewald and Pridemore (2012).

The random sample of 705 RTN victims from the same geographic (contiguous United States) and temporal (1990-2007) location of the FRI victims offers an additional comparison group that allows one to determine if, and how, FRI victims may differ from the typical homicide victims. As the SHR has many issues related to missing cases and missing values, Fox and Swatt's (2009) imputed SHR victim data was chosen as the appropriate sampling frame from which to sample a comparison group. From these two datasets, information on the individual and situational aspects of FRI, FRR, and RTN homicide victimizations was collected for analysis. This data, however, needed to be augmented to understand the macro-level characteristics of the environments in which these victimization events occur.

[8] Multiple reasons might explain why 40% of the victims were not identified, the most likely being that the jurisdiction where the victim was killed did not report any homicides, or that homicide, to the FBI for the month or year in which it occurred. Unreliable victim and incident information between the iSHR and open-source documents could also account for non-matches, as the variables used to match could vary between sources.

[9] Specific to the reduction of missing data, this process was important as it helped fill in missing values for those ECDB victims that were identified in the iSHR. For example, in several cases no open-source documentation reported the age of the victim. However, because a match could be made based on other characteristics, the age reported in the iSHR could then be used to fill in the missing age from the ECDB.

3.1.3 Demographic, political, religious & extremist data. Although the ECDB and iSHR were used to identify homicide incidents and events, demographic, political, and religious data was used to collect information on geographic regions where the victimization events occurred. The macro-level data was collected at the county level from three primary sources, the United States Census Bureau (1990; 2000; 2010), the Association of Religious Data Archives (2000), and the Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections (Leip, 2011). The following section offers a brief explanation of each dataset and the method of data collection for this study.

Every ten years, the United States Census Bureau conducts a biennial census of individuals living in America. Demographic information on persons and households are gathered through mail in surveys, while follow up surveys are conducted for households that do not respond. In addition, short and long forms of the surveys are given, where hypothetically data on everyone in the country is collected through the short forms, while the long forms only are given to a sample of households and their results are then inferred to the rest of population (U.S. Census, 2000). Demographic data such as the proportion of males, proportion of white non-Hispanics, and proportions of individuals in specific age groups has been collected on the county level every ten years. For this study, specifically, data from the 1990, 2000, and 2010 biennial censuses will be used.

As victims could be killed any year between 2000 and 2007, the three censuses are used to estimate values for years between those dates through linear interpolation.[10] For example, say that in 1990, 83% of the respondents in the Dauphin County, Pennsylvania were identified as being white non-Hispanic and in 2000, only 78% identified as being white non-Hispanic. That constitutes a 5% decrease over a 10-year period, or .5% per decrease per year. If a homicide

[10] For some recent examples of this technique utilized in crime related research, see Ellen & O'Regan, 2010; Chauhan et al, 2011; Hipp, 2011; Ren, Zhao & Lovrich, 2011.

victimization occurred in that county in 1995, then the percent of white non-Hispanics estimated for Dauphin County during that year would be 80.5%. This method of estimation is based in basic linear algebra and offers more variation in the data than would occur if only the 1990, 2000, and 2010 data points were used.

The next set of data, the Religious Congregations and Membership Study (2000) was collected by the Association of Statisticians of American Religious Bodies and distributed by the Association of Religious Data Archives. This research collected county level data on the number of religious organizations and adherents during this year. Variables used from this data include measurements such as the number of individuals who belong to specific religious institutions found in a county, as well as the number of those institutions. Unfortunately, the 2000 data was only used due to the fact that 2010 data was not yet accessible during the time the analysis took place and there were changes in the collection methodology and published variables between 1990 and 2000 that made the data from those two years difficult to compare.

Lastly, presidential election data was purchased from the Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections for the 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, and 2008 presidential elections (Leip, 2011). This data reports the proportion of individuals who voted for Republican, Democratic, and Independent candidates. Data interpolation was not used to estimate the proportion of individuals who might have voted for a specific candidate in years between presidential elections. Instead, data from years when there was no election were matched to the closest election year based on a 24-month window before and after the election. For example, if a homicide incident occurred in April 1995, it would be attached to the data associated with the 1996 presidential election, which took place nineteen 19 months after the incident. The final variable comes from Adamczyk et al's (2012) county level study examining far-right

radicalization. Whether or not a white hate group is active in a county during the same year will be used as a measurement of current far-right mobilization in the area where the far-right homicide victimization occurred.

The purpose of this data collection is to statistically examine whether there are macro-level differences in geographic regions where different types of homicides occurred. The following section details the planned analyses for examining the collected data.

3.2 Analysis Plan

3.2.1 Variation within FRI victims. The first analysis looks at the variation within the far-right ideological victims by separating them into four groups based on their characteristics and the ideological motive for which they were killed. These four groups were anti-abortion victims (n=7), anti-government victims (n=26), anti-racial/ethnic minority victims (n=75), and anti-social minority victims (n=33). Individual and situational variables, as well as their possible responses, originated from the ECDB and are listed in Table 3.3. These variables were selected for this portion of the study because they are similar to the variables from the prior homicide research reviewed in Chapter 2. After selection, they were removed from the database, cleaned, and verified as previously described. In addition to the ECDB variables, macro-level data was used to examine the similarities and differences in the counties where each type of FRI victim was killed. Every effort was made to fill in missing values for ECDB data by systematically examining the open-source documentation on each incident and conducting follow-up searches. The documents were then used to extract examples of different types of FRI victims and highlight individual and situational characteristics. This portion of the analysis collects and presents basic descriptive statistics on FRI victims, their individual characteristics, as well as

characteristics of the situations in which they are killed, and the communities where they are killed.

3.2.2 Variation between FRI, FRR & RTN victims. The second stage in the data analysis used inferential statistical techniques to determine what differences, if any, existed between far-right ideological victims and their comparison groups. Once again, data from the ECDB was utilized and cleaned, while missing values for both the FRI (N=141) and FRR (N=238) victims were filled in whenever possible. In addition, the macro-level data was also cleaned and attached to each victim based on the county and year in which the victim was killed. Table 3.4 presents a list of all variables used in this portion of the analysis. Descriptive statistics were run for FRI victims and the comparison groups, while bivariate relationships were measured using either F, t, or chi-square statistics. Variables that had significant relationships with the dependent variables at the bivariate level were used for the multivariate binary logistics or multinomial logistics. Statistical tests ran at each level of analyses, and the comparison groups used, are reported in table 3.5.

Specifically, at the individual level, bivariate analyses of the relationships between the individual level characteristics of the type of victim were conducted. Based on the levels of measurement for each variable, cross tabulations with corresponding chi-square statistic are presented. Next, a multinomial regression was conducted to determine the odds of victimization for the two comparison groups, using FRI victims as the reference category, and individual characteristics of each victim as predictors. Still using individual level characteristics, comparisons were made between the different types of victims in the county where they were killed.

Table 3.5. Analyses to compare FRI, FRR, RTN, & TV.

Level of Analysis	Groups Compared				Statistical Test	
	FRI	FRR	RTN	TV	Bivariate	Multivariate
N	141	238	705	1084		
Individual	X	X	X		chi-sq	Multinomial Logistic
	X				t-test	Binary Logistic
		X			t-test	Binary Logistic
			X		t-test	Binary Logistic
	X			X	t-test	Binary Logistic
		X		X	t-test	Binary Logistic
Situational	X	X	X		chi-sq	Multinomial Logistic
	X			X	t-test	Binary Logistic
		X		X	t-test	Binary Logistic
Macro	X	X	X		ANOVA	Multinomial Logistic
Multilevel	X	X	X			Multinomial Logistic

A progression of tests was conducted to compare FRI and FRR victims to the typical homicide victim (TV) killed in the county where they lived. Since homicide is a rare event, and some counties suffer from non-reporting during all or part of the time period under study, individual attributes of all the homicide victims killed in a county were aggregated and compared to the characteristics of FRI and FRR victims. Descriptive, bivariate, and multivariate tests were conducted to determine whether there are systematic differences between the FR victims and the TV killed in the same geographic region.

Situational characteristics were also used to determine whether there were differences between FRI victimization events and "routine" victimization events. Temporal and geographic variation between the three groups was examined at the univariate, bivariate, and multivariate levels. In addition, so were characteristics examined in prior homicide research, such as type of weapon used, whether it was inter- or intra-racial, and whether the victim and offender knew each other. As done at the individual level of analysis, FRI and FRR victims were compared to the TV in the county where they were killed using situational variables as predictors.

On the macro-level, characteristics of each county were compared across victimization type. The baseline variables, based on those recommended by Land, McCall, and Cohen (1990) were used, in addition to other variables studied in prior homicide and ideological violence research that could be important in understanding far-right ideological victimization. Also, similar to Land, McCall, and Cohen (1990), a factor analysis was conducted and eight variables were combined into two components measuring population structure and resource deprivation. Although this study is not examining homicide victimization rates, utilizing these component scores allows one to compare their influence in this research to prior research. Measurements of religious, political, social, and demographic significance were also analyzed and presented

through analysis of variance tests (ANOVA) and multinomial logistic regressions. A final multilevel model was conducted, incorporating significant individual and situational predictor variables from the earlier multivariate regressions. Through the analysis of ECDB, iSHR, and supplementary data sources, a profile of FRI victimization was developed, grounded in the comparison of FRI victims to other types of homicide victims, as well as those who lived and died in the same counties as they did.

A final, multilevel, multinomial regression was run with clustered robust standard errors. Multilevel regression models, however, have assumptions that must be taken into consideration when determining whether a statistical technique, such as hierarchal modeling, should be used. In a study focusing on the risk of violence towards women, Lauritsen and Schaum (2006) captured variables on the individual, family and community levels. However, as too few cases existed within each community to allow for accurate estimates of risk they adjusted for possible clustering by using a survey weighted logistic regression to make sure standard errors were not inflated. Similarly for this study, as most counties will have only one victim, the probability of violating the independence assumption is minimal. Arceneaux and Nickerson (2009) state "if the number of clusters is plentiful (i.e., above 20), clustered SEs, random effects, and HLM are equally adequate for precision estimates of group-level effects" (p.88). As there are more than twenty possible clusters (counties) in the data, the multilevel multinomial logistic regression was conducted in STATA using clustered robust standard errors to adjust for the possibility of underestimated standard errors that can occur when multilevel data is not properly modeled. The results of all the aforementioned statistical analyses are reported in Chapter 5.

3.3 Conclusion and a Note on Theory Building

The information collected through the aforementioned analyses was then used to build upon prior victimization theory to address ideological homicide victimization. Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo's (1978) groundbreaking work on victimization, which was built from empirical data, stated that "a grounded theoretical model-what we refer to as the lifestyle/exposure model-that we believe is compatible with the victimization survey findings (p.239)." That is to say that the theory is "grounded in the data about victims of crime (p.241)." When a theory is constructed from empirical data it is closely connected to the phenomena under study. Although it will inevitably evolve as new research is conducted, the chance that it will be rejected or replaced outright is minimal (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

This study accepts the goal of theory based in data, but does not utilize more formal sociological methods of theory building, such as Glaser and Strauss's (1967) grounded theory approach. For example, the notion of generating theoretical propositions through comparison, both between and within groups, is born out in the analysis of FRI victims, both within themselves, and between other types of homicide victims. The idea of theoretical sampling, where cases are purposefully chosen for their archetypical representation of the phenomenon being studied and analysis beginning immediately after the first case is identified, is not. As previously explained, the cases of interest, and their comparisons, either represent the population of victims, or a randomized sample of victims. Purposeful random sampling so that the selected victims are representative of the entire RTN population strays from the original purpose of theoretical sampling "to generate theory, not to establish verifications with the 'facts' (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 48)." However, the nature of the data requires, and allows for, a more systematic approach to sampling and other analysis techniques.

Through theory generation, theoretical propositions specific to far-right ideological victimization were built. The goal of the final theoretical model was to formally state the theoretical propositions in a way that they can be assessed. In fact, according to Gibbs (1972), "the purpose or function of theory need not be described in terms of causation or explanation; it can be taken as the identification or creation of order, and success can be judged by predictive power (p. 65)." It is through predictive power that the validity of a theory can be evaluated, as well as other criteria that include "internal logical consistency, scope and parsimony, testability, empirical validity, and usefulness and policy implications (Akers, 2000, p.6)."

It is also important to note that the goal of this study was to create substantive theoretical propositions, which looks specifically at victims of far-right ideological violence. Only when other substantive propositions of different types of ideological violence are generated, could all be combined to develop a formal theory of ideological violence (Glassner & Strauss, 1967). In other words, the theoretical propositions built from the empirical data examined in this study will only have the ability to offer an understanding of ideological victimization as it relates to the extreme far-right in the United States. In time, however, continued research related to ideological victimization will inform the theoretical propositions in a way that allow them to be generalizable to other types of ideologies, as well as other types of crimes. Before the theoretical propositions can be discussed, however, the results of the empirical analyses must be presented and interpreted.

Chapter 4

Variation Within Far-Right Ideological Victims

After pulling into the women's medical clinic where he worked, Dr. Joseph Brown was shot and killed, along with one of his escorts, by Peter Hilliard, an extremist associated with the pro-life movement.[11] Hilliard had spent the month prior to the murder protesting outside of the clinic. In southern California, two skinheads approached a group of teenagers and, without provocation, beat and stabbed them because they thought they were gay. By the time the altercation was finished, a high school student was dead. While Officer Reggie Miller asked to see a man's driver's license in the parking lot outside of a Wal-Mart, the anti-government extremist drew a gun on him. As he attempted to radio for back up, Officer Miller was shot multiple times and killed by a second extremist. In the Pacific Northwest, a group of skinheads set out looking for someone to attack. Running into Robert Temple, a homeless man living under a bridge, the crew beat him with a baseball bat, breaking it across the man's face, before repeatedly smashing his skull into the nearby railroad tracks. A similar fate awaited Jeremy Rhoades, a black man abducted outside of his work by a group of white supremacists. Rhoades was driven outside of town where his legs were broken with a sledgehammer and baseball bat, he was stabbed almost two dozen times, and had his throat slit.

These incidents are representative of the 141 far-right ideological (FRI) homicide victims that are coded in the Extremist Crime Database.[12] The purpose of this chapter is to present empirical information augmented by descriptive examples of far-right ideological victimizations.

[11] To comply with this research's approved Institutional Review Board protocol, all names, and some descriptive information, have been changed to protect the identities of individuals related to these incidents.
[12] The 168 victims killed in the Oklahoma City Bombing were excluded from this analysis because of the disproportionate impact their inclusion would have had on an individual level analysis.

To do this, data from the ECDB is supplemented by open-source materials to create an in-depth, empirical profile of the variation within FRI victimization events. Variables of interest, which cannot be used for a quantitative analysis because they are not systematically collected in official data, or because there are too many missing values, are presented.[13] This data is broken down into individual, situational, and macro-level characteristics.

4.1 Grouping Far-Right Ideological Victims

Variables related to victim characteristics and suspects' primary motivation are used to divide the victims into groups, allowing for an understanding of how victimizations events might vary between different types of FRI victims. Admittedly, grouping these victims into subsets is problematic and could be done in many different ways. For many scenarios, the motive is apparent, closely tied to the victim's perceived or actual identity. For example, law enforcement officers targeted by anti-government extremists because they represented what the offender believed was an oppressive and illegal government. Other times, the suspect's motive for victim selection has multiple parts, such as the murder of Damien Green, a black homeless man living in Dallas, Texas, who was killed by skinheads. In Green's case, he was targeted for both his race and his homelessness. In these instances, a primary reason for their victimization was decided upon based on the sum of all the evidence.

For this portion of the study, each FRI victim will be placed into one of the following four categories based on their characteristics and the ideological motivation and beliefs of the suspects; anti-abortion, anti-government, anti-racial/ethnic minority, and anti-social minority. The anti-abortion group (n=7) includes victims killed by anti-abortion offenders whose primary

[13] All percentages presented represent the universe of known values. In other words, the valid percent is reported unless otherwise noted. The N for each variable is presented in its related table.

motivation was to violently react to the pro-choice movement.[14] The anti-government group (n=26) includes victims targeted because they worked for law-enforcement agencies or government, or they were killed in an incident where the offender was motivated by an anti-government/law enforcement motive. The largest group of FRI victims is the anti-racial/ethnic minority group (n=75). This group includes individuals targeted primarily for their racial or ethnic background including, but not limited to blacks, Asians, Hispanics, Jews, and Arabs. For Jewish and Arab victims, specifically, their targeting appears to be a combination of ethnic and religious heritage. The final group, anti-social minorities (n=33), includes victims targeted for a particular social status not related to race or ethnicity, such as homosexuals and the homeless. Although outside the scope of this study, the suspects associated with the anti-racial/ethnic minority and anti-social minority groups appear to come from a similar pool of ideological offenders, namely white-supremacists, skinheads, and neo-Nazis. In the following sections, when appropriate, empirical data will be presented, not only on FRI victims as whole, but will also be broken down by the aforementioned groups so that variation between FRI victimization types can be examined.

4.2 Individual Characteristics of FRI Victimization

Individual characteristics, such as a victim's sex, race, religion, or sexual orientation, may be reasons for a specific person is targeted and victimized by certain offenders. It is important to state, however, that there is no implication in this research that these victims are either responsible for their victimization or should change such characteristics if possible (e.g. religion or sexual orientation). The purpose of looking at individual characteristics of far-right

[14] The percentages presented for anti-abortion group should be carefully interpreted due to the small number of victims.

ideological victims is to identify victimization patterns that can be used in the formation of a theoretical propositions, specifically modeled for victims of far-right ideologically motivated homicides. Individual level characteristics are examined and contextualized within the homicide incidents where it appears to have played a central role in the targeting behavior of each victim's killer, or increased or decreased the risk of victimization. In other words, an attempt is made to point out, based on both empirical and descriptive information, when individual characteristics appear to have played a role in a victim's murder.

Understandably, race and ethnicity appear to play a large role in FRI victimization events. As white supremacists are part of the extreme far-right, it is not surprising that their targeting behaviors often single out individuals or groups based on race and/or ethnicity. Of all FRI victims, 54.6% were white, 39% were black, and 6.4% were of another race such as Asian or Native American.[15] When examining ethnicity, 6.4% of FRI victims were of Hispanic decent. As expected, when examined across victimization groups, anti-racial/ethnic minority victims are predominantly non-white. The 25.3% in that category that are white, represent victims that are white-Hispanic, Jewish, Arab, or whites targeted for their association with a minority. The anti-abortion, anti-government, and anti-social minority groups were predominantly white (100%, 88.5%, and 84.8%, respectively). In addition, except for the anti-racial minority victims, all other victims were white more often than the TV comparison group.

Although a situational level variable, whether victims and their primary offenders were of the same race has been studied in prior victimization research and most homicides are overwhelmingly intra-racial. For FRI victims, however, the majority of victims (54.6%) are of a different race than their offender (see Table 4.2). This number is driven by the anti-minority

[15] Individual level characteristics grouped by type of FRI victim are reported in Table 4.1. In addition to the descriptive statistics of FRI victims, frequencies for the typical victims (TV) in the counties where these individuals were killed are also reported for an added level of comparison.

Table 4.1. Percent of individual characteristics within FRI victims and between and TVs.

		All Victims		Anti-Abortion		Anti-Government		Anti-Racial Minority		Anti-Social Minority	
		FRI	TV	FRI	TV	FRI	TV	FRI	TV	FRI	TV
Sex	Male	86.4	72.0	71.4	74.0	88.5	65.2	82.4	74.6	97.0	71.1
(N=140)	Female	13.6	28.0	28.6	26.0	11.5	34.8	17.6	25.4	3.0	28.9
Race	White	54.6	65.7	100.0	47.5	88.5	81.1	25.3	60.7	84.8	68.7
(N=141)	Black	39.0	31.7	0.0	49.3	11.5	15.3	62.7	37.2	15.2	28.5
	Other	6.4	2.6	0.0	3.2	0.0	3.6	12.0	2.1	0.0	2.8
Hispanic	Yes	6.4	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	8.0	--	9.1	--
(N=141)	No	93.6	--	100.0	--	100.0	--	92.0	--	90.9	--
Age	17 or less	6.4	11.6	0.0	12.7	0.0	9.0	9.3	12.1	6.1	12.3
(N=141)	18 to 24	14.2	23.7	0.0	20.7	0.0	21.7	21.3	25.0	12.1	22.9
	25 to 34	22.7	25.4	14.3	24.8	26.9	24.3	29.3	25.6	6.1	25.8
	35 to 49	37.6	23.6	42.9	23.2	50.0	22.2	29.3	23.9	45.5	24.1
	50+	19.1	15.7	42.9	18.6	23.1	22.8	10.7	13.4	30.3	14.8

victims, which were intra-racial only 25.3% of the time. Anti-abortion victims were all killed by a primary offender of the same race, and anti-government and anti-social minorities also had a large proportion of intra-racial victimizations (88.5% and 84.8%, respectively).

One example of a victimization based on race or ethnicity is the murder of Dennis Trask. While standing outside a coworker's home after the graveyard shift, Trask and his friends admired a classic sports car as it drove down the street. The vehicle slowed and the barrel of a shotgun appeared out of the front passenger's side window. The weapon discharged, shooting Trask in the head, killing him. Trask, who was black, was targeted by the skinheads in the vehicle because of his race. In situations where race played a similar role in target selection, Lee Sang-hun, an American of Asian descent, was shot and killed as he left a predominantly Korean church and Guillermo Vazquez, a Hispanic American, was shot outside of a bar. Both victims were targeted for their perceived race or ethnicity.

The sex of the victim does not appear to have a direct impact on the homicide incidents experienced by FRI victims, even anecdotally. A large majority of FRI victims were male, with only 13.6% being female. When compared to the distribution of male and female TVs, FRI victims were more likely to be male. Unlike individuals being targeted for their race by white supremacists, it does not appear that FRI victims in this sample were targeted for their sex by anti-feminists. However, if viewed through the theoretical perspective of lifestyle and routine activities, sex may have an indirect impact on victimization based on other characteristics, such as type of employment. For example, law enforcement officers are disproportionately male (Reaves 2007), therefore one would expect that police victims targeted by anti-government extremists will also be disproportionately male. Anti-abortion victims were the largest percentage of females, with 28.6% being female and anti-social minorities had the smallest

percentage of females, 3%. As the majority of the anti-social minority victims were targeted for either being gay or homeless, it appears that this number is skewed, not only by the disproportionate number of homeless males (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011), but also by the fact that far-rightists appear to disproportionately target gay males.

Of that small number of female victims, however, several were targeted not for their sex, specifically, but for inter-racial dating. Stephanie Riker, a teenage female, was on the phone talking to her boyfriend, when her assailant, a white supremacist, arrived at her house. Angry that Stephanie, who was white, had a black boyfriend; her attacker stabbed her in the heart, killing her, before raping and slashing the throat of Stephanie's younger sister. Josephine Bender, who was black, was shot in the head by a skinhead because her boyfriend was white. Her boyfriend, who was also targeted, survived the incident. Peggy Walker was targeted because she was dating a black man. Although she escaped her assailant, her son's friend was slashed to death. Also targeted because of an inter-racial relationship was Amy Michaels's father. Although the bullet fired at the house was met for him – he was in a relationship with a white woman – it killed Amy and wounded her twin sister.

For a victim, it may be the relationship between their age and other characteristics that increases the odds that they are killed during a FRI victimization incident, not their age specifically. Less than seven percent of all FRI victims were seventeen years of age or younger, almost half the proportion of TVs in the same age bracket. One of the youngest ideological victims was Amy Michaels, who was six-years old when struck by the bullet fired at her house. Victims that were between the ages of 18 and 24 when they were killed account for 14.2% of all FRI victims, 22.7% were between 25 and 34 years of age, 37.6% were between the ages of 35

and 49, and 19.1% were 50 and older. The oldest ideological victim, Raymond Degraw, a 75-year old man who used two canes to walk, was beaten to death by an offender seeking respect from the local skinhead gang. When the distribution of victim age is broken down across groups, it shows that anti-abortion and anti-government victims have no victims younger than 25 years of age, a population that makes up more than 20% of all FRI victims. Anti-minority victims have the largest percentage of victims under 25, about 30% of that population. Anti-government and anti-social minority victims have a similar percentage of older victims, 73.1% and 75.8%, respectively, of their victims are older than 35.

A victim's sexual orientation was also a reason for being targeted. Approximately 10% of all victims were killed because of their sexual orientation.[16] During one victimization incident, the offenders waited in an area of town known to be a location where gay man congregated. When a young Hispanic man approached, they greeted him, ushering him to an isolated corner of the schoolyard. Moments later, Jesus Rodriguez was beaten and stabbed to death by the three skinheads. In another incident, Donald Oberholtzer was killed while sharing a drink with friends at a local gay bar where he was shot in the chest at close range. Finally, a world-renowned scientist was found dead in his hotel room, his neck broken, strangled to death. A member of the Nazi-Low Riders was convicted of murdering the 73-year old. There were incidents, however, where victims were gay, but targeted for another reason, such as their race. In one such case, Harriet Coleman and Brendan Meyers, both gay, were killed in a fire that was set by skinheads. The pair were targeted, not for this sexual orientation, but because Coleman was black. Similarly, however, such as in the aforementioned case of Jesus Rodriguez, there are

[16] For variables such as sexual orientation, it is important to understand that the 10% should be viewed as the minimum percentage of victims who were homosexual. Additional victims may have been gay or bisexual, but their sexuality may not have been presented in the open-source documentation because it was not pertinent to the homicide, or the authors of the documents might not have been aware of the information. Other variables such as criminal history and prior victimization could also be impacted by the nature of open-source documentation.

examples where individuals who were targeted because they were gay, were also of a minority race or ethnicity.

Religion did not appear to play much of a part in victimization, except for a few cases where suspects were targeted specifically for their religion, or their perceived association with a specific religion or culture. The religion of only 10% of the victims was reported in open-sources. Of those 14 individuals, only one, Annie Glick, was specifically killed for her religion. Glick was murdered in her home by a neighbor who knew she was Jewish. That same neighbor then drove to Annie's synagogue and fired his gun at its front doors. For Dr. Benjamin Seigel, the relationship between his religion and victimization is not as apparent. On one hand, four out of the five individuals his killer attacked were Jewish. On the other hand, his killer was motivated against the pro-choice movement, focusing his attacks on doctors who performed abortions. The media argued that Jewish-Americans were more likely to be medical doctors when compared to other religions and ethnicities. This lack of Jewish victims, although counter to far-right rhetoric, is in line with prior, qualitative research. When interviewing neo-Nazis, Ezekiel (1995) found that the majority were concerned with blacks, not Jews. Similarly, Hamm (1993) reported that "The primary cause of domestic terrorism...is neo-Nazism – attitudes that are antiblack, antigay, and anti-Semitic (in that order) (p. 215)." Although far-rightist are anti-Semitic, those committing the violent acts are more likely to target individuals characteristics such as their race, their sexual orientation, and even their occupation than because they are Jewish.

Wadi Hamad and Rajiv Singh were killed by the same offender in two separate incidents because they "appeared" Arab. It is not hard, however, to imagine that their killer conflated Arab and Muslim as he sought "revenge" for the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Although Hamad was Muslim, Singh, who was from Bangladesh, was Hindu. In a similar case of religious misidentification, Matthew Stevenson was stomped to death by a neo-Nazi who thought his victim was Jewish. As previously mentioned, Lee Sang-hun was killed outside his church, a protestant denomination of Christianity, but was targeted not for his beliefs, but for his race. In one incident, a Catholic Priest was killed in prison by a white supremacist, but once again his death was not related to being Catholic, but to being a convicted sex offender. Although not resulting in fatalities, the behavior of Annie Glick's killer, who subsequently shot at her synagogue, was not an isolated incident. Four other homicide victims are connected to suspects who either prior to or after the homicide also attacked a synagogue, even though the individuals they eventually murdered were not Jewish.

In some cases, occupation and community status appear to increase ones exposure and therefore their risk of victimization. Greg McCartney and Winston Madden were active in their community. Greg had helped set up a local farmer's market. Winston spoke at the local high school about his homosexuality. Newspaper coverage reported that the couple was highly regarded for their involvement and service to their community. It was while running the market that Greg met his killers, two white supremacists connected to the Christian Identity religious movement. Soon after, both men were shot multiple times while lying in their bed, targeted for being gay. Similarly, some occupations are inherently more visible within the community. For example, five victims who were racial minorities were killed at convenience stores or restaurants where they worked or owned.

Agents of the criminal justice system also come into regular contact with the public and account for almost 15% of all victims.[17] In addition, 20.6% of victims were targeted for their job. Although all law enforcement officers were targeted because of their occupation, not

[17] This percentage includes the nearly one-third of victims whose occupation is unknown.

everyone who was targeted for their occupation, was in law enforcement. For example, seven victims who were targeted because of their occupation all worked in the medical field. Six were targeted because they worked for or with women's clinics that performed abortions and one plastic surgeon was killed because his killer believed his work was "diluting" Aryan beauty. Another victim was targeted because he was a postal worker and the offender was anti-government.

In the case of the sixteen homeless victims, they were targeted not for the occupation they had, but for the occupation they did not have. In the skinhead culture, some groups of individuals in society such as the homeless, drug users, and minorities are seen as being lesser and targeted because of a perceived low social status. For the homeless victims, their low community status and lack of occupation actually decreased their public visibility, albeit raising their victimization risk at the same time. Also, in two incidents, offenders targeted black women, one working as a prostitute and one working as a stripper. One of the women was stabbed to death in a motel room by a member of the Ku Klux Klan after she solicited him for sex. In the second incident, a stripper survived being shot at by a white supremacist, but the man driving her taxi was killed. In these situations, the women were targeted because of their race, but also because of their occupation.

Other individual level characteristics that have been studied by victimologists include repeat victimization and prior criminal histories. According to evidence found in the open-source materials, only seven victims (5.0%) were previously victimized in some form. Some of these victimizations were ideological. Several incidents were related to threats against doctors who provided abortions. Two victims had been previously harassed for their sexual orientation

and one of those, beaten up. Other victimizations were routine, for example, when a homeless man was robbed a year prior to his death, by the same offender who killed him.

Thirteen victims had been arrested prior to their murders. Of those with a criminal record, more than a third were killed while incarcerated. One victim, with a record of domestic violence, was noticed by his killers because he was engaged in a domestic dispute with his girlfriend hours before he was stabbed to death and his throat was slashed. One of the sex workers was arrested for prostitution and given a court summons a week before she was murdered. Except for those killed while incarcerated, there appears to be little or no relationship between victims' prior criminal records and their victimization. Although no ideological victims were connected to the extreme far-right, four were part of gangs. One victim was a member of the DC blacks, a prison gang, while the other three were members of SHARP, Skinheads Against Racial Prejudice. The motive for their murders, at least in part, was tied to their involvement in these groups.

Individual characteristics related to each victim add descriptive information about the persons killed by far-right extremists. To utilize both empirical data and the rich text of open-source documents, researchers can begin to develop a FRI victimization profile, identifying factors that may, or may not, alter the risk of ideological victimization. The following section continues using this analytical technique, focusing on the situational characteristics related to the incidents in which FRI victims were killed.

4.3 Situational Characteristics of FRI Victimization

The 141 ideological victims were killed in 124 incidents. Victims were attacked and killed by more than one offender 48.6% of the time, while 22.7% of victims were killed

alongside someone else.[18] As far as non-fatal victims are concerned, 28.4% of homicide victims were killed during a situation where at least one person was injured. For example, after being beaten and tied up, Earl Poehler watched as four skinheads spun the partially loaded chamber of a revolver and aimed the barrel at his head. Twice they pulled the trigger, but nothing happen. His roommate was not so lucky. The weapon discharged, shooting Mitchell Rogers in the head, killing him instantly. In another incident, Police Officer Dan Sharpe and his partner were shot during a routine traffic stop. Although Officer Sharpe succumbed to his injuries, his partner survived. The other 71.6% of victims were involved in incidents that resulted in fatalities only. The anti-abortion and anti-government victims were more often killed by only one offender, when compared to the other victimization groups. Similarly, they also were more likely to be killed alongside another homicide victim. Also, 71.4% of anti-abortion victims were killed alongside a victim who was non-fatally wounded. In comparison, anti-social minority victims were killed alongside someone who was injured only 18.2% of the time.

As far as bystanders who could potentially witness or, as suggested by routine activities theory, prevent these victimizations, 42.4% of FRI victims were killed with no one around other than co-victims or the offenders. Slightly more than 46% had one to ten people around, and 11.4% had more than ten people around who were not co-victims or offenders. Anti-government victims had the highest percentage of others around, with 75% of victims having at least one bystander observe their death. Forty-seven percent of anti-minority victims were killed with no one else around but co-victims and their offenders, the highest percentage in this category across all groups.

The relationships between FRI victims, co-victims, and offenders are also important. Even though official homicide data sources, such as the SHR, measure the relationship between

[18] Table 4.2 presents data on situational level characteristics.

Table 4.2. Situational characteristics of far-right ideological victimizations across groups.

		All Victims	Anti-Abortion	Anti-Government	Anti-Racial Minority	Anti-Social Minority
Intra-Racial (N=141)	Yes	54.6%	100.0%	88.5%	25.3%	84.8%
	No	45.4%	0.0%	11.5%	74.7%	15.2%
Multiple Suspects (N=140)	Yes	48.6%	0.0%	36.0%	50.7%	63.6%
	No	51.4%	100.0%	64.0%	49.3%	36.4%
Multiple Homicide Victims (N=141)	Yes	22.7%	28.6%	50.0%	17.3%	12.1%
	No	77.3%	71.4%	50.0%	82.7%	87.9%
Non-fatal Victim (N=141)	Yes	28.4%	71.4%	34.6%	26.7%	18.2%
	No	71.6%	28.6%	65.4%	73.3%	81.8%
Others Around (N=132)	0	42.4%	42.9%	25.0%	47.1%	45.2%
	1-10	46.2%	28.6%	50.0%	44.3%	51.6%
	>10	11.4%	28.6%	25.0%	8.6%	3.2%
Homicide Victim-Homicide Victim Relationships (N=37)	Intimate	16.2%	0.0%	0.0%	23.5%	50.0%
	Family	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	23.5%	0.0%
	Acquaintance	48.6%	100.0%	71.4%	23.5%	50.0%
	Stranger	24.3%	0.0%	28.6%	29.4%	0.0%
Homicide Victim-Injured Victim Relationships (N=39)	Intimate	5.1%	20.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%
	Family	20.5%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%
	Acquaintance	64.1%	60.0%	66.7%	60.7%	100.0%
	Stranger	10.3%	20.0%	33.3%	7.1%	0.0%
Victim-Offender Relationships (N=266)	Intimate	0.4%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	Family	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Acquaintance	27.1%	0.0%	5.4%	30.0%	34.7%
	Stranger	72.6%	100.0%	91.9%	70.0%	65.3%

		All Victims	Anti-Abortion	Anti-Government	Anti-Racial Minority	Anti-Social Minority
Level of Randomness (N=125)	Purposeful	40.0%	42.9%	22.7%	40.9%	50.0%
	Representative	59.2%	57.1%	72.7%	59.1%	50.0%
	Random	0.8%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Weapon (N=141)	Gun	54.6%	85.7%	88.5%	60.0%	9.1%
	Knife	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	22.7%	27.3%
	Blunt Object	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	33.3%
	Bodily Weapon	11.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	27.3%
	Other	6.4%	14.3%	11.5%	5.3%	3.0%
Evidence of Overkill (N=141)	Yes	19.1%	0.0%	3.8%	16.0%	42.4%
	No	80.9%	100.0%	96.2%	84.0%	57.6%
Location (N=141)	Business/Church/School	29.1%	85.7%	26.9%	29.3%	18.2%
	Prison	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	6.1%
	Private Residence	24.8%	14.3%	50.0%	21.3%	15.2%
	Remote Area/Park/Vacant Lot	20.6%	0.0%	11.5%	13.3%	48.5%
	Street	20.6%	0.0%	11.5%	29.3%	12.1%
Parking Lot/Street (140)	Yes	38.6%	42.9%	42.3%	47.3%	15.2%
	No	61.4%	57.1%	57.7%	52.7%	84.8%
Activity (N=114)	Work	35.1%	85.7%	84.6%	20.0%	0.0%
	Home	12.3%	14.3%	3.8%	15.0%	14.3%
	Leisure	52.6%	0.0%	11.5%	65.0%	85.7%

Table 4.2 Situational characteristics of far-right ideological victimizations across groups (cont.).

		All Victims	Anti-Abortion	Anti-Government	Anti-Racial Minority	Anti-Social Minority
Time of Incident (N=73)	00:00-5:59	37.0%	0.0%	15.8%	46.2%	54.5%
	06:00-11:59	16.4%	100.0%	21.1%	7.7%	9.1%
	12:00-17:59	20.5%	0.0%	26.3%	25.6%	0.0%
	18:00-23:59	26.0%	0.0%	36.8%	20.5%	36.4%
Victim Residence/Killed Same County (N=110)	Yes	83.6%	40.0%	85.0%	86.0%	85.7%
	No	16.4%	60.0%	15.0%	14.0%	14.3%
Season (N=141)	Winter	19.1%	42.9%	15.4%	17.3%	21.2%
	Spring	24.8%	14.3%	19.2%	28.0%	24.2%
	Summer	31.2%	28.6%	38.5%	30.7%	27.3%
	Fall	24.8%	14.3%	26.9%	24.0%	27.3%
Year (N=141)	1990-1994	29.8%	71.4%	7.7%	36.0%	24.2%
	1995-1999	36.9%	28.6%	46.2%	33.3%	39.4%
	2000-2004	23.4%	0.0%	38.5%	21.3%	21.2%
	2005-2007	9.9%	0.0%	7.7%	9.3%	15.2%
Region (N=141)	Northeast	15.6%	42.9%	15.4%	13.3%	15.2%
	Midwest	11.3%	0.0%	11.5%	16.0%	3.0%
	South	34.0%	57.1%	26.9%	37.3%	27.3%
	West	39.0%	0.0%	46.2%	33.3%	54.5%

the victim and the primary suspect, they do not capture the relationship between a victim and every offender, or a victim and other victims. For this study, these relationships were measured as intimate (e.g. boyfriend, wife, partner), family (e.g. cousin, mother, brother), acquaintance (e.g. friend, coworker), or stranger. When examining victim-to-victim relationships, it is important to remember that they only exist for victims who were killed in the same incident as another person who was killed or injured. That is to say those victims killed in incidents with no other fatalities or injuries are not represented in these percentages. In addition, victims with multiple relationships will have a greater impact on the data than victims with only one relationship.

For both groups, homicide victims to other homicide victims, and homicide victims to victims who were only injured, victims were more often acquaintances with co-victims than any other type of relationship (48.6% and 64.1%, respectively). For example, in two of the previously mentioned incidents, both FRI homicide victims were acquaintances with the injured victim. In the case of Poehler and Roberts, Poehler, who was only injured, was only involved in the incident because his roommate was targeted by the skinheads. A case of wrong place, wrong time. For Officer Sharpe and his partner, both were targeted for being police. An example of two acquaintances being fatally victimized would be the murders of Webster Cook and Daniel Lutz, who were beaten to death, both selected for being homeless.

For other victim-to-victim relationships, nearly 16.2% of the time, a homicide victim was in an intimate relationship with another homicide victim, yet only 5.1% of the time with a victim who was only injured. Examples of this include Greg McCartney and Winston Madden, who were killed by individuals of the Christian Identity movement because they were a gay couple, or Jillian Burk and Montgomery Jacobs, a black couple targeted by skinheads. However, homicide

victims were more often victimized with a family member who was only injured (20.5%) when compared to the percentage of family members who were killed (10.8%). Finally, homicide victims were strangers to both fatal and non-fatal co-victims 24.3% and 10.3% of the time, respectively.

Victim-offender relationships paint a different story as 72.6% of victims had no prior knowledge of their killer(s) (75.7% if brief acquaintanceships are counted as strangers[19]). Almost no intimate or family relationships existed between FRI homicide victims and the offender, while victims were an acquaintance of an offender 27.1% of the time. Ideological homicide incidents where the victims had prior knowledge of their killers deserve a closer look, as they suggest, at least some of the time, victims of ideological crimes are targeted by those who know them. The strength of a relationship between two acquaintances, however, can be fairly weak. For example, Office Brian Vance was killed by an offender whom he had interacted with years prior on a routine police call. Although the victim "knew" the offender, the strength of that relationship was extremely weak. McCartney and Madden, however, were murdered by two brothers that sold products at a local market that Matson organized. Although not friends, the four individuals interacted regularly. Similarly, Harriet Coleman and Brendan Meyers died in a fire set by neighbors living across the hall from them in the same apartment building. After shooting two police officers, anti-government spree killer Carter Dixon hunted down Vanessa Browning, a judge who ruled against the offender in a tax dispute years prior. Browning had previously been threatened by Dixon, going so far as to file for a restraining order against him. In all of these relationships, however, even though the victims and offenders had prior

[19] Brief acquaintances are individuals who met hours before the homicide occurred. Although the victim(s) and offender(s) were not technically strangers at the time of the incident, it can be argued that it is appropriate to code them as such.

knowledge of each other, it appears that these were relationships of circumstance, not strong social bonds.

When victim-offender relationships are examined across ideological groupings, it appears that both anti-minority groups had the largest percentages of their victim-offender relationships that were measured as acquaintances. The anti-abortion victims were all killed by strangers, although it is arguable that the offenders knew much about those they killed. Similarly, 91.9% of victims killed by anti-government offenders were strangers to their assailant, although, once again, it is hard to determine how much prior knowledge these individuals may or may not have known about each other. Either way, it appears that anti-racial/ethnic minority victims and anti-social minority victims are killed by someone with whom they are acquainted more often than anti-abortion and anti-government victims.

Although the majority of the time the victims and offenders were strangers, in many of these instances they were targeted, not entirely at random, but for something they represented. A unique contribution of this research data is an attempt to capture the supposed random nature of ideologically motivated violence. Recall the "randomness" hypothesis, which theorizes that victims of ideologically motivated violence, such as terrorism or domestic extremism, are representative of the populations where they are killed and no patterns can be found in the individual, situational, and macro level variation of these victimizations. The idea that there are levels of randomness has been theoretically developed, but never empirically studied. To do this, a conceptual typology to ascertain what is meant by random victimization was developed and used to examine the "randomness" of FRI victimizations.

Even for FRI victims, whose deaths were motivated by an extreme ideology, 40.0% of individuals were selected purposefully for their victimization. That is to say that their killers

knew who they were and purposefully targeted them, even though the violence was ideological in nature (this does not mean that there was a prior relationship between the victim and offender). Examples of this would include a doctor who is targeted and killed because the offender knew the doctor performed abortions, or the local mayor who is targeted by an anti-government extremist for enforcing statutes that the offender believes to be unconstitutional. These types of homicides are akin to targeted assassinations.

Of the remaining victims, 99% (or 59.2% of all victims) were killed because of something they represented, whether a specific race, religion, or even a government. In these representative victimizations, the offender had no knowledge of the victim or their personal actions, only that they represent the population the offender is targeting. Many minority killings were coded as representative in the ECDB. Only one FRI victim was randomly killed, that is to say that they did not represent the offender's primary motivation, nor did the offender know them. This victim was killed while attempting to stop a far-rightist from killing a woman being purposefully targeted. Disaggregated, the most obvious difference across the four groups is that anti-government victims were more often killed for something they represented and less often purposefully targeted, when compared to the other three groups.

The type of weapon used to kill each victim was also collected. FRI victims were killed by a gun 54.6% of the time, a knife 18.4%, a blunt object 9.2%, bodily weapons 11.3%, and another type of weapon 6.4% of the time. These percentages vary dramatically across victim groups. For example, 85.7% of anti-abortion victims were killed by a gun, compared to 9.1% of anti-social minority victims. Also, anti-abortion and anti-government victims were never killed by a knife, blunt object, or bodily weapon, even though anti-social minorities were killed by a knife 27.3% of the time or beaten to death with a blunt object or their assailant's fists or feet

33.3% and 27.3% of the time, respectively. Although not as large of a difference, anti-minority victims were also killed less often by a gun and more often by a knife, blunt object, or bodily weapon when compared to the anti-abortion and anti-government victims.

Directly related to the type of weapon, is the idea of overkill. In victimizations where overkill occurs, the physical assault to the victim goes beyond what is needed solely to end their life. Overkill has been documented in homicide events where homosexuals are targeted because of their sexual orientation (Bell & Vila, 1996). In the entire sample of FRI victims, there is evidence of overkill nearly 20% of the time. For anti-abortion and anti-government victims, however, there is almost no evidence of overkill. There is some evidence for overkill used against the anti-racial/ethnic minority groups (16.0%). In prison, black inmate Thomas Webber was stabbed 37 times in the face by a white supremacist. In a homicide that gained national notoriety for its extreme cruelty, another black victim was dragged behind a pickup truck, tearing the limbs from his body. Proportionately, however, the deaths of anti-social minority victims most often included the use of deadly force beyond that needed to kill. For example, one man who was kidnapped because he was gay, was beaten and then burned alive. Bobby Garrison, who was also gay, was beaten, his throat cut, stabbed, and then his head was split open from an ax handle before his body was burned over a pile of old tires. One homeless man, Albert Wick, was beaten on his upper body and head before he was stabbed in the eye with a tire iron. Even without attempting to study overkill specifically, violence perpetrated by the racist right has empirically been shown to be more intimate and more violent than other types of homicide (Gruenewald, 2011).

Temporal and geographic variation between FRI victimization groups also has the potential to inform theoretical propositions of ideologically motivated victimization. For this

study, the location of victimization was aggregated into six categories: business/church/school (29.1%), prison (5.0%), private residence (24.8%), remote area/park/vacant lot (20.6%), or street (20.6%). The street category was only used if the victim was actually on the street, either walking or driving, not if they were standing outside of a business or a private residence that they were visiting. To capture those killed on the street or in a parking lot at one of the aforementioned locations, this characteristic was also coded. For example, a victim might be killed in the parking lot of a bar. In this instance, the location would be the bar (a business) and they would also be coded as being a parking lot.

Anti-abortion victims were most often killed at a business, specifically the health clinics where they worked. One victim was killed at home, shot through their kitchen window. In addition, 42.9% of the anti-abortion victims (or 50% of those killed at clinics) were murdered on the sidewalk or in the parking lot of the building. Anti-government victims were most often killed at a private residence. Officers Bryce Hubert and Lester Evans were found dead inside their killer's cabin after responding to a complaint that the man had possession of stolen weapons. While trying to serve a warrant, Sheriff's Deputy Kenneth Johnson and his civilian ride along, retired office Gary Baxter, were killed in their assailant's driveway, shot before they could even exit the police cruiser. When looking at only parking lots or streets, anti-government victims were killed in these locations 42.9% of the time, regardless of the specific location. For example, Office Reggie Miller was outside of a business when a concerned citizen pointed out that a child in a nearby vehicle in the parking lot appeared to be in danger. Upon approaching, Miller was shot by one of the adult passengers in the car.

Anti-social minority victims were less often killed in the street or a parking lot, but were disproportionately killed in remote areas, parks, or vacant lots. These three types of locations

were grouped together because they represent isolation and intent by the suspect to either take to or find a victim in an area that is not well traveled. In the case of most homeless victims, they were killed in remote areas, under bridges, or in isolated parks. John Carlisle, a homeless veteran was stabbed by a skinhead while he slept in a sleeping bag on a dry riverbed. Norman Chappell and Daniel Long were beaten to death with baseball bats and mutilated while sleeping in shelters on the outskirts of a city park. Finally, almost 30% of anti-racial/ethnic minority victims were killed while walking or driving on the street. Two of these victims, Jillian Burk and Montgomery Jacobs, were shot while walking down the street, targeted by racist skinheads because they were black. Similarly, Private Terry Dietz, who was also black, was killed while walking back to his parents' house from a party, celebrating his return from Operation Desert Storm.

Why, however, were victims at these locations when killed? At least 35% of FRI victims were killed at a location that was connected to their line of work. This number includes law enforcement victims that were killed in the line of duty or medical personnel working at clinics targeted by anti-abortion extremists. Almost 53% of victims were at the location where they were killed engaging in a leisure activity. For example, Terrance Mann and Jason Linn were both killed at house parties. While getting back into her car, Cynthia Kyle was shot in the head after buying movie tickets for a show later that evening. Lastly, FRI victims were killed at home 12.3% of the time. These variables, however, do not account for the activities of those in prison or the homeless (as well as other missing variables), because unless specifically stated, it is difficult to know the activity in which they were engaged in at the time they were killed and assign any significant meaning to it. For those whose activities we do know, it is not surprising that the vast majority of anti-abortion and anti-government victims were killed during work

related activities as most were targeted for their occupation. The vast majority of anti-minority victims from both groups were engaged in leisure activities when killed. These activities remove them from the safety of their homes and the protection of others, where their minority status could increase their risk of ideological victimization.

The temporal distribution of FRI victimizations shows that the greatest percentage occurs between midnight and 5:59 a.m. (37.0%) and the fewest occur between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m (16.4%). Although almost half of the data is missing for this variable, there does appear some relationship between time and type of victimization. Anti-racial/ethnic minority and anti-social minority victims have the greatest victimizations in the late night/early morning hours (midnight to 5:59 a.m.), a possible artifact of the lifestyles of both victims and offenders. All of the known times of anti-abortion victimizations were between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m., a period when the clinics were opening and medical staff were entering the facilities.

Other geographic and temporal variables were more macro in nature. Most victims were killed in the same county where they resided (83.6%), with only the anti-abortion victims killed more often in a county where they did not live (60% of FRI victims)[20]. Once again, however, this inconsistency with the rest of the groups could be connected to the relative low number of victims. Alice Hawthorne, who was killed by shrapnel during the Olympic Park bombing, had traveled three hours with her daughter to be a part of the international celebration. Joe Dempsey, a federal law enforcement officer, traveled nationally based on his job requirements. Similarly, Juan Garcia, who was of Cuban descent, was targeted and killed while traveling for work. There is no evidence that any of these victims were specifically targeted because they did not live in the county where they were killed.

[20] Tita & Griffiths (2005) found that 48.8% of homicide victims in their sample lived in the same Census tract where they were killed.

Seasonal variation shows a relatively equal distribution of events across the year, with slightly less victimizations occurring in winter (19.1%) and slightly more occurring in the summer (31.2%). Across groups, this pattern appears stable, except with the anti-abortion victims, who were more often killed in the winter. No apparent rationale appears in the open-source documents, however, that shows an intentional act on behalf of the offenders to target their victims during a specific season. Routine activities theory predicts, and this data supports, the idea that seasonal distribution of crime events should be moderated by the fact that during certain seasons suitable victims will have more or less interaction with motivated offenders without the presence of a capable guardian.

The last temporal characteristic examined was the year in which the victimization occurred. Broken into four groups, the greatest number of victimizations occurred between 1995 and 1999, with the fewest, understandably, occurring during the three-year period between 2005 and 2007. If victimizations were equally distributed, one would expect that approximately 27.8% would occur in each of the first three time periods, and 16.7% in the last period. However, all anti-abortion victims were killed prior to 2000 and the largest number of anti-government victims were killed between 1995 and 2000, a year significant to factions of the far-right who saw ideological significance in the coming of a new millennium. In addition, the period after the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 ushered in an era of government interest in the activities of militias, constitutionalists, and anti-government extremists. Related to anti-government victims, the death of a U.S. Marshal at Ruby Ridge was the first identified killing of a law enforcement officer in the 1990s by the far-right. Between Ruby Ridge and the Oklahoma City bombing, federal agents also infamously raided the Branch Davidian compound in Waco,

Texas in 1993, killing six civilians in the process. All events were rallying calls for anti-government far-rightists to defend themselves against government officials.

The final variable, which helps to bridge the analysis between situational and macro level characteristics of the FRI victimizations, is the region in the country where the victim was killed. Spatially, 39.0% of victims were killed in Western states, 34.0% in Southern states, 15.6% in Northeastern states, and 11.3% in Midwestern states. Once again, the anti-abortion victims varied the most between the distribution of all FRI victims and the other groups, as 42.9% were killed in the Northeast and 57.1% were killed in the South (57.1%). The other groups, however, seemed to follow the overall trend with the most victims being killed in the West and South and the fewest in the Midwest. Arguably, the geographic variation between FRI victims deserves a closer look and should be further explored to fully understand its impact on a theoretical understanding of FRI victimization.

4.4 Macro Characteristics of Victimization

Moving away from the individual and situational characteristics of FRI victimizations, the study briefly focuses on the differences and similarities in macro-level characteristics. These characteristics, as described in the methods section, represent data collected from multiple sources, measured at the county level. As these variables are far removed from the rich, textual open-source data used to illustrate and code the individual and situational variables presented, they will only be briefly discussed in this section. The primary purpose of this final section is to offer the reader a glimpse of the variation between the counties where different types of FRI victims were killed, before moving onto statistical analyses that examine the variation between different types of homicide victims, FRI and routine.

Table 4.3 presents the averages for all FRI victims of each variable, before breaking them down into the four subgroups. Counties where anti-government victims were killed had lower populations, smaller population densities, and were more rural, when compared to the other groups. The two anti-minority groups had the largest populations and densities, but the anti-abortion victims were killed in counties that had the highest percent living in an urban area.

Turning to demographic variables, the average percentage of the population that was male for all FRI victims was 49.2%, with the variation from this average being relatively minimal across all groups. More interesting, both empirically and theoretically, is the variation across these counties related to race and ethnicity. The counties where anti-government victims were killed had, on average, the largest percentage of whites, followed by anti-abortion counties, anti-social minority counties, and finally anti-racial minority counties, which had the smallest percentage of whites. The counties where anti-racial/ethnic minority victims were killed, also had, on average, the largest percent Hispanic, and the second largest percent black and Other, which include Asian/Native American/Pacific Islander populations. Anti-social minority victims were also killed in counties that had the greatest percentage of the population that were something other than black or white. Most importantly, it appears that the counties where the anti-minority victims were killed had the greatest diversity in the racial and ethnic makeup of their populations, while anti-government counties had the least. Similarly, the anti-minority counties also had the largest percent of the population that were not native born.

Although there is some variation in the percentage of the county population that falls into each age group across FRI victimization groups, it is difficult to theorize as to what this means. A greater proportion of the population in anti-racial/ethnic minority counties is between the ages of 18 and 34, as were the victims themselves, when compared to the other groups. Education

Table 4.3. Averages of county characteristics of far-right ideological victimizations across groups (N=141).

		All Victims	Anti-Abortion	Anti-Government	Anti-Racial Minority	Anti-Social Minority
Population	In Thousands	1009.9	489.6	164.6	1283.7	1163.8
	Per Square Mile	1047.2	784.7	216.7	1239.0	1321.4
Urban/Rural	% Urban	80.6%	90.1%	56.4%	85.6%	86.5%
	% Rural	19.4%	9.9%	43.6%	14.4%	13.5%
Sex	% Male	49.2%	47.9%	49.3%	49.1%	49.6%
	% Female	50.8%	52.1%	50.7%	50.9%	50.4%
Race/Ethnicity	% White	77.4%	81.2%	84.0%	74.7%	77.4%
	% Black	11.2%	14.8%	8.0%	13.0%	8.9%
	% Other	11.5%	4.0%	8.0%	12.4%	13.7%
	% Hispanic	12.9%	2.4%	8.5%	15.1%	13.7%
Native Population	% Native Born	90.0%	94.9%	94.3%	89.1%	87.8%
Age	% Under 18	25.3%	22.9%	25.2%	25.9%	24.6%
	% 18 to 24	10.1%	9.3%	9.5%	10.5%	10.0%
	% 25 to 34	14.9%	14.6%	13.1%	15.6%	14.9%
	% 35 to 49	21.9%	21.4%	22.3%	21.8%	21.9%
	% 50 and over	27.7%	31.7%	29.9%	26.2%	28.5%
Education (Highest Level Attained)	% No HS Degree	20.3%	17.9%	20.0%	21.1%	19.4%
	% HS Degree	28.4%	28.3%	31.6%	28.1%	26.8%
	% Some College	28.5%	28.0%	28.6%	27.8%	29.8%
	% College or more	22.8%	25.8%	19.7%	23.0%	24.0%

Table 4.3. Averages of county characteristic of far-right ideological victimizations across groups (cont.).

		All Victims	Anti-Abortion	Anti-Government	Anti-Racial Minority	Anti-Social Minority
Resource Deprivation	% Unemployed	6.1%	5.9%	6.3%	6.0%	5.9%
	% Living in Poverty	15.2%	15.5%	15.5%	15.2%	15.1%
	% Female Headed Households	8.0%	8.7%	7.2%	8.2%	7.8%
	Median family income in 1000s	45.6	45.0	43.0	45.7	47.6
	GINI Index	44.5	45.4	43.6	44.6	44.6
Religion	Evangelical adherents/1000	140.9	194.3	159.2	146.1	103.4
	Jewish adherents/1000	18.8	21.7	7.4	20.4	23.6
	Muslim adherents/1000	4.6	3.8	2.5	5.6	4.1
Presidential Election	% Voting Democrat	45.0%	40.7%	41.5%	45.3%	48.2%
	% Voting Republican	45.4%	42.4%	49.9%	45.2%	43.1%
	% Voting Independent	9.6%	16.9%	8.6%	9.6%	8.7%
Hate Group	% Counties w/ White Hate	50%	43%	23%	61%	45%

also varies, but once again it is difficult to interpret what, if any impact, this should have on the theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization. Counties where anti-government victimizations occurred had the smallest percentage of the population whose highest level of educational attainment was college or higher, while anti-abortion victims were killed in counties with the highest average percent of the population having a college education or higher.

The variables related to Land, McCall, and Cohen's (1990) resource deprivation construct included percent unemployed, percent living in poverty, percent of households with children led by women, median family income, and the GINI index which measures income disparity. There was little variation in the percent unemployed in a county, or the percent living in poverty. Counties where anti-government victims were killed and the lowest percentage of household headed by women (7.2%), while the anti-abortion counties had the highest average percentage (8.7%). However, median family incomes were also lowest in anti-government counties, yet they had higher levels of income equality when compared to the other groups.

When examining religion, counties where anti-social minorities were killed had, on average, the lowest number of Evangelical adherents, but the highest number of Jewish adherents. The anti-government counties only had the second most Evangelical adherents, but the least Jewish and Muslim adherents. Politically, anti-abortion and anti-government counties had the lowest average percentages of individuals voting for the Democratic presidential candidate. Interestingly, counties where anti-abortion victims were killed had the largest percentage of voters casting ballots for the Independent candidate. Finally, 50% of the FRI counties had at least one hate group active in the county at the time of the homicide victimization. Only 23% of the anti-government counties had a hate group, while 61% of the anti-racial/ethnic minority counties had a hate group active in the region during the same year as

the homicide. These macro level characteristics display some interesting differences between the different FRI victimization groups. Counties where anti-government victims are killed appear more rural and less diverse racially, ethnically, religiously, and politically. On the other hand, counties where anti-minority victims are killed are more urban and have, on average, much larger and much more diverse populations.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter presented empirical and textual descriptions of the different FRI homicide victims. Although similar in the respect that each victim was killed by an extreme far-rightist who was ideologically motivated, variation in the individual, situational, and macro characteristics were apparent. Anti-abortionist victims, for example, were all white, and had the highest percentage of females compared to the other four groups of FRI victims. Overall, they were also oldest. When examining the situations in which they were killed, all were intra-racial and all were killed by offenders with whom they had no previous relationship. Almost all died while at work or were targeted for their occupation. The communities where the attacks occurred had large populations that were more dense and urban than anti-government counties.

Next to anti-abortion victims, anti-government victims were white most often and the same race of their killer. Compared to anti-minority victims, anti-government victims where less often killed by multiple-suspect, yet more often killed by a stranger and alongside another homicide victim or a victim who was non-fatally injured. Similar to anti-abortion victims, very little or no evidence of overkill is apparent in the anti-government victimizations and most were killed while on the job. This empirical data paints a portrait of occupation based victimization,

where law enforcement and government officials are targeted either purposefully, or because of what they represent, while in the process of fulfilling the duties of their job.

When compared to the homicide victims from prior research, anti-race/ethnicity victims were much more often black, but only male slightly more often. Seventy-five percent of anti-race victims were killed by someone of a different race and 70% of the time by a stranger, findings contrary to typical homicide trends. Compared to anti-government victims, they were killed by guns less often, yet more often with knives and other means. The counties where these victims were killed were more populated and dense compared to the anti-government and anti-abortion victims. They also had the lowest percentage of white populations and the highest percentage of Hispanics. These counties were similar to the anti-social minority counties, with lower proportions of the population who were unemployed and living in poverty when compared to anti-government counties. The most notable macro attribute for anti-race/ethnicity counties was that 61% had evidence of a white hate group being active in the county during the same year as the FRI victimization, the highest percentage across all groups.

Anti-social minority victims were mostly white, had the greatest percent of Hispanics, and almost exclusively male. This group of victims also tended to be older than the typical homicide victim, as 75% were over the age of 35. More similar to anti-government and anti-abortion victims, they were more often intra-racial. These victims had the most violent deaths. Often excessive force was used to beat them to death with blunt objects and bodily weapons. Mutilation and overkill were not uncommon. County level characteristics were similar to anti-racial/ethnic minority counties, although they were slightly more homogeneous.

The four types of FRI victims vary in many respects on their individual, situational, and macro-level characteristics. Anti-abortion and anti-government victims are overwhelmingly

killed at work in what appear to be assassination like incidents. Murdered sometimes for what they represent, other times for things they have done. Anti-minority victims, especially anti-social minorities, are attacked by groups in isolated areas, their deaths violent and intimate. As the study shifts from examining the variation within FRI victims, to the variation between ideological and "routine" homicide victims, it is important to keep in mind the individual, situational, and macro level characteristics already discussed, how they compare to far-right and non-far-right "routine" homicide victimization events, and how each piece of information can assist in developing theoretical propositions.

Chapter 5

Variation Between FRI, FRR & RTN Victims

The purpose of this chapter is to collect empirical evidence through statistical analyses. Between 1990 and 2007, 141 people were killed during 124 ideologically motivated homicide incidents committed by members of the far-right, an average of 1.14 victims per incident. As stated before, this does not include the 168 victims killed in Oklahoma City in 1995 when the Alfred P Murrah Federal Building was destroyed by a truck bomb. These 141 far-right ideological (FRI) victims are the primary focus of the study, although for this chapter far-right "routine" (FRR) and "routine" (RTN) homicide victims are discussed and used for purposes of comparison. This chapter examines the relationships of FRI victims with FRR victims, RTN victims, and the typical homicide victim (TV) in the counties where they were killed through the presentation of univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistics.

5.1 Individual Characteristics of Victimization

First, basic demographic characteristics of the three types of victims are discussed. Table 5.1 details the results of three separate cross tabulations that measured sex as a dichotomous variable, broken age into five categories (so that FRI and FRR victims could be compared to RTN victims from the iSHR file[21]), and coded race as white, black, or other. [22] The chi-square statistic for all three cross-tabulations was significant. For sex, 86.4% of FRI victims were male,

[21] RTN victims (n=705) represent a random sample of five RTN victims reported in the SHR between 1990 and 2007 for every one FRI victim. Although the police often report victim characteristics, there is a small amount of missing data. In the RTN sample, for example, age was missing 1.4% of the time, sex .4%, and race, 1.3%. Missing values were imputed by Fox and Swatt (2009) for missing victim, offender, and incident data.

[22] Percentages may vary slightly between tables because of differences in the N, which could change based on the characteristics under examination.

Table 5.1. Cross tabulations of victimization groups by demographic characteristics.

		FRI (N=141)	FRR (N=238)	RTN (N=705)
Sex**	Female	13.6%	27.3%	24.7%
	Male	86.4%	72.7%	75.3%
Race***	White	54.6%	85.3%	46.8%
	Black	39.0%	9.7%	50.8%
	Other	6.4%	5.0%	2.4%
Age***	<18	6.4%	14.3%	10.8%
	18-24	14.2%	18.5%	25.0%
	25-34	22.7%	22.7%	27.9%
	35-49	37.6%	26.9%	24.0%
	50+	19.1%	17.6%	12.3%

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

compared to 72.7% of FRR victims and 75.3% of RTN victims. FRI victims appear to be older than FRR and RTN victims, as 56.7% were 35 years of age or older and only 44.5% of FRR victims and 36.3% RTN victims were 35 or older. There were also significant differences in race between the three types of victims. Only 46.8% of RTN victims were white, compared to the 54.6% and 85.3% of FRI and FRR victims, respectively. Slightly under half of RTN victims were black (50.8%), while only 9.7% of FRR victims were black. It is important to note that Hispanic victims are not accounted for in this comparison because the SHR does not collect data on ethnicity and Hispanic victims could be represented in any of the race categories.

A multinomial logistic regression was run to determine whether these three sets of individual characteristics could significantly determine the odds at which a person would be a FRI, FRR, or RTN victim. These results are reported in Table 5.2. The model was significant (X^2=156.8, df=12, p<.001), yet weak (Nagelkerke R-sq= .163). As FRI victims are the subjects of interest for this study, they were used as the reference group and the presented results

Table 5.2. Multinomial logistic regression of individual characteristics with FRI comparison (N=1083).

		B	Std. Error	Wald	Exp (B)	
FRR	Male	-0.814	0.293	7.718	0.443	**
	White	1.620	0.253	41.110	5.053	***
	Age (50 and over)					
	<18	1.050	0.475	4.895	2.858	*
	18-24	0.520	0.374	1.930	1.682	
	25-34	0.199	0.341	0.342	1.221	
	35-49	-0.249	0.316	0.617	0.780	
RTN	Male	-0.804	0.265	9.213	0.447	**
	White	-0.245	0.190	1.675	0.782	
	Age (50 and over)					
	<18	0.985	0.435	5.133	2.678	*
	18-24	1.024	0.325	9.927	2.785	**
	25-34	0.624	0.294	4.517	1.866	*
	35-49	-0.050	0.273	0.034	0.951	

X^2=156.8, df=12, p<.001

Nagelkerke R-sq= .163

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

demonstrate the relative odds of victimization risk for FRR and RTN victims when compared to FRI victims. When controlling for the other individual level variables, males were .44 times as likely to be a FRR victim, when compared to the odds of being a FRI victim. Conversely, individuals who were white were five times more likely to be FRR victims, when compared to the race of FRI victims. For age, the only category that could significantly predict the odds of FRR victimization when compared to the reference category was for victims less than 18 years of age. Specifically, individuals who were under 18 were almost three times more likely to be a FRR victim. When comparing individual characteristics between RTN victims and FRI victims, sex and age were significant predictors. The odds of being a RTN victim were 55.3% lower for males, when compared to FRI victims. Also, being in any age category under the age of 34 increased the odds of being a RTN victim. Based on the results of the multivariate analysis, it appears that, at least when only controlling for individual level characteristics, the odds of FRI

victimization are greater for older, non-white males when compared to FRR victimization risk. When compared to RTN victims, however, older males are again at higher risk, where race has no significant ability to predict between the two victimization groups.

In addition to determining whether individual level characteristics could be used to predict the type of victimization, data was collected to compare victims to the typical homicide victim (TV) in the geographic region in which they were killed.[23] Imputed individual characteristics of all homicide victims in the iSHR were aggregated to the county level. FRI and FRR victims were then matched to the TV from the county and state where they were killed. This aggregation averaged the characteristics of every homicide victim who was killed and subsequently reported to the FBI over the time period under study, 1990-2007.[24] Table 5.3 presents the results of multiple t-tests which compare the characteristic of each type of victim to the TV in the geographic region where killed. FRI victims were more often male, less often white, less often under 24, and more often between 35 and 49, when compared to the typical homicide victim. There was no significant difference between the typical victim and FRI victims based on an individual's race of black or other. Victims of FRR homicide events were more often white and less often black when compared to the typical homicide victim. There was no significant difference between FRR victims and typical victims based on gender, the race other, or age. That is to say, that based on those individual characteristics, FRR victims were representative of the typical homicide victim.

Tables 5.4 and 5.5 present the results of two binary logistic regressions comparing FRI and FRR victims to that of the typical victim in the counties where the homicide events occurred.

[23] RTN homicide victims were also compared to the TV, although the results are not presented. As one would expect, there is no significant difference between the RTN victims and the TV as both are representative of the same population.

[24] Homicide data was aggregated across the entire time period under study as aggregation to the county-year level resulted in too few victims, potentially even zero, depending on reporting patterns of the jurisdictions within those counties.

Once again, all models were significant. When compared to the typical victim, the odds of being a FRI victim were significantly greater for males at the county level. Being white decreased one's odds of FRI victimization when compared to the typical victim. Individuals who were less than 24 years of age were significantly less likely to be a FRI victim when compared to the typical victim. Specific to FRR victimization, the odds of FRR victimization significantly

Table 5.3. T-tests comparing average percentages of individual characteristics of victims.

		FRI (N=282)			FRR (468)		
		Victim	TV		Victim	TV	
Sex	Male	86.4%	72.0%	***	73.1%	72.1%	
Race	White	54.6%	65.7%	*	85.0%	71.8%	***
	Black	38.3%	31.7%		9.8%	23.4%	***
	Other	6.3%	2.6%	+	5.1%	4.7%	
Age	Under 18	6.3%	11.6%	*	14.5%	11.7%	
	18 to 24	14.2%	23.7%	**	18.4%	22.9%	+
	25 to 34	22.7%	25.4%		22.2%	23.9%	
	35 to 49	37.6%	23.6%	**	26.9%	25.0%	
	50 and over	19.1%	15.7%		17.9%	16.5%	

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

Table 5.4. Binary logistic regression comparing FRI & typical victims (N=280).

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)	
Male	2.142	0.572	14.046	8.517	***
White	-1.142	0.369	9.580	0.319	**
Age					
Under 18	-2.410	0.968	6.199	0.090	*
18 to 24	-1.788	0.664	7.253	0.167	**
25 to 34	-0.632	0.586	1.163	0.532	
35 to 49	0.333	0.541	0.379	1.396	

X^2 = 50.57, df=6, p<.001

Nagelkerke R-sq = .220

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

Table 5.5. Binary logistic regression comparing FRR & typical victims (N=468).

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)	
Male	0.116	0.301	0.149	1.123	
White	1.626	0.342	22.664	5.084	***
Age					
Under 18	0.177	0.480	0.137	1.194	
18 to 24	-0.795	0.443	3.216	0.452	+
25 to 34	-0.453	0.423	1.145	0.636	
35 to 49	-0.102	0.414	0.061	0.903	

X^2 = 29.6, df=6, p<.001

Nagelkerke R-sq = .082

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

increased only for individuals who were white. Based on these multivariate regressions, it appears that FRI victims are not representative of the typical homicide victim in the counties where they were killed, as being Male, white, and under 24 altered the odds of being a FRI victim when compared to being a TV. On the other hand, being white significantly increased the odds of being a FRR victim when compared to the TV in the same county.

5.2 Situational Characteristics of Victimization

The situational characteristics related to FRI victimization events were also examined. Temporally and geographic characteristics are presented in Table 5.6. The greatest number of victimizations occurred in 1999, a year significant to far-rightists because it was immediately prior to the turn of the millennium, although at least one FRI victimization did occur every year between 1990 and 2007. Due to several incidents with multiple victims, the greatest number of FRR victims was killed between 2005 and 2007 (30.7%), followed by the time period between 1995 and 1999 (28.2%). Following national patterns of decreasing crime rates, the plurality of RTN victims were killed between 1990 and 1994 (32.6%), with the percentages dropping for

each subsequent time period. For FRI victims, the seasonal distribution included 19.1% of victimizations occurring during the winter, 24.8% occurring in the spring, 31.2% in the summer, and the remaining 22.8% occurring the fall. Comparatively, 10.9% of FRR victims were killed in the winter, 42.0% in the spring, 24.4% in the summer, and 22.7% in the fall. For RTN victims, 16.3% were killed during the winter, 30.9% in the spring, 26.8% in the summer, and 26.0% in the fall.

Geographically, FRI victims were killed in 30 of the 48 contiguous states and in 90 unique counties. When aggregated to larger geographic areas, 15.6% of FRI victims were killed

Table 5.6. Cross tabulations of victimization groups by temporal & geographic characteristics (N=1084).

		FRI	FRR	RTN
Years***	1990-1994	29.8%	16.4%	32.6%
	1995-1999	36.9%	28.2%	27.4%
	2000-2004	23.4%	24.8%	24.1%
	2005-2007	9.9%	30.7%	15.9%
Season*	Winter	19.1%	10.9%	16.3%
	Spring	24.8%	42.0%	30.9%
	Summer	31.2%	24.4%	26.8%
	Fall	24.8%	22.7%	26.0%
Region***	Northeast	15.6%	7.6%	16.2%
	Midwest	11.3%	13.9%	21.6%
	South	34.0%	33.6%	42.0%
	West	39.0%	45.0%	20.3%

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

Table 5.7. Cross tabulations of victimization groups by situational characteristics (N=1084).

	FRI	FRR	RTN
Intra-racial***	54.6%	88.2%	85.4%
Multiple Victims***	22.7%	36.1%	9.4%
Known***	23.7%	70.8%	72.9%
Relationship***			
Intimate	0.7%	1.7%	14.3%
Family	0.0%	4.2%	10.8%
Acquaintance	23.0%	64.8%	47.8%
Stranger	76.3%	29.2%	27.1%
Weapon+			
Gun	54.6%	64.4%	66.0%
Knife	18.4%	17.8%	14.3%
Other	27.0%	17.8%	19.7%

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

in the Northeast, 11.3% in the Midwest, 34.0% in the South, and 39.0% in the West. FRR victimizations, however, occurred in 33 states and 122 counties, with 7.6% of occurring in the Northeast, 13.9% in the Midwest, 33.6% in the South, and 45.0% in the West. The largest number of RTN homicide victims were killed in the South (42.0%), followed the Midwest (21.6%), the West (20.3%), and the Northeast (16.2%).

Bivariate analyses were conducted in an attempt to determine whether differences between FRI, FRR, and RTN victims for the above variables are statistically significant. Temporal and geographically, it appears that victimization is not randomly distributed. As noted, FRI and FRR victims cluster around the year 1999. Also, FRI and FRR victims appear to be disproportionally killed in western states (39.0% and 45.0%, respectively), when compared to the sample of RTN victims randomly selected from the iSHR (20.3%). Seasonal distributions show that although the greatest percentage of FRR and RTN victims are killed in the spring (42.0% and 30.9%, respectively), the largest number of FRI victims (31.2%) are killed in the summer.

More interesting are the variables related to the situation itself (Table 5.7). For victim-offender relationships, the majority of FRI victims were killed by strangers (76.3%), followed by acquaintances (23.0%). Less than 2% of FRR victims were killed by a person with whom they were intimately involved, 4.2% were killed by a family member other than a spouse, 64.8% were killed by an acquaintance, and 29.2% were killed by a stranger, percentages more comparable with RTN victims than were FRI victims. For RTN victims, they were most often killed by an acquaintance (47.8%), followed by a stranger (27.1%). When the victim's relationship with the primary offender is dichotomized into known/unknown, 70.8% of FRR and 72.9% of RTN victims had a prior relationship with their killer, compared to only 23.7% of FRI victims.

Another situational variable of interest is whether the victim and the primary offender were of the same race, which significantly differed across type of victimization. FRI victims were killed during an intra-racial incident 54.6% of the time, a rate much lower than FRR and RTN intra-racial victimization (82.2% and 85.4%, respectively). Also significant was the type of weapon used to kill the homicide victims. Guns were used slightly less often to kill FRI victims (54.6%) when compared to FRR victims (64.4%) and RTN victims (66.0%). Conversely, the weapon of "other" was used more often against FRI victims (27.0%) than FRR victims (17.8%) and RTN victims (19.7%). This difference can most likely be accounted for by the increased use of blunt objects and bodily weapons used by far-rightists, specifically against anti-minority victims. The final situational variable examined at the bivariate level was whether or not a victim was killed in an incident with at least one other victim. The association between multiple victims and the type of victim was significant, where 22.7% of FRI victims were killed with at least one other victim, compared to 36.1% of FRR victims and only 9.4% of RTN victims.

Two multinomial logistic regressions were run to examine whether situational characteristics could significantly predict to which group a victim should belong. Tables 5.8 and 5.9 present the results of these multivariate tests. The first regression examines the relationship between the three victimization groups and the temporal and geographic variables. Although the model is significant (X^2=130.3, df=18, p<.001), it is weak (Nagelkerke R-sq = .137). Once

Table 5.8. Multinomial logistic regression of temporal & geographic characteristics with FRI comparison (N=1084).

		B	Std. Error	Wald	Exp (B)	
FRR	Years (2005-2007 reference)					
	1990-1994	-1.717	0.371	21.440	0.180	***
	1995-1999	-1.446	0.350	17.036	0.235	***
	2000-2004	-1.079	0.369	8.560	0.340	**
	Season (Fall reference)					
	Winter	-0.418	0.357	1.367	0.658	
	Summer	0.582	0.298	3.820	1.789	+
	Spring	-0.169	0.301	0.318	0.844	
	Region (West reference)					
	Northeast	-0.865	0.368	5.535	0.421	*
	Midwest	-0.025	0.354	0.005	0.975	
	South	-0.272	0.255	1.143	0.762	
RTN	Years (2005-207 reference)					
	1990-1994	-0.309	0.333	0.861	0.734	
	1995-1999	-0.658	0.327	4.039	0.518	*
	2000-2004	-0.331	0.345	0.921	0.718	
	Season (Fall reference)					
	Winter	-0.218	0.268	0.573	0.804	
	Summer	0.187	0.263	0.503	1.205	
	Spring	-0.158	0.253	0.391	0.854	
	Region (West reference)					
	Northeast	0.675	0.285	5.623	1.964	*
	Midwest	1.259	0.308	16.673	3.523	***
	South	0.829	0.224	13.676	2.291	***

X^2=130.3, df=18, p<.001

Nagelkerke R-sq = .137

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

Table 5.9. Multinomial logistic regression of situational characteristics with FRI comparison (N=1078).

		B	Std. Error	Wald	Exp (B)	
FRR	Multiple Victims	0.267	0.279	0.911	1.306	
	Known Offender	2.006	0.261	59.153	7.434	***
	Intra-racial	1.593	0.280	32.450	4.918	***
	Weapon (Other reference)					
	Gun	0.810	0.300	7.265	2.248	**
	Knife	0.313	0.374	0.702	1.367	
RTN	Multiple Victims	-1.560	0.277	31.795	0.210	***
	Known Offender	2.265	0.236	92.191	9.627	***
	Intra-racial	1.261	0.222	32.152	3.529	***
	Weapon (Other reference)					
	Gun	1.079	0.262	16.966	2.942	***
	Knife	-0.034	0.330	0.011	0.966	

X^2=278.2, df=10, p<.001

Nagelkerke R-sq = .275

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

again, FRI victims were used as the reference category. The temporal distribution of FRR incidents shows that the odds of victimization decreased for the years prior to 2005 when compared to FRI victimizations. The geographic distribution of FRR victims shows that the odds of an individual being killed in the Northeast significantly decreases by 57.9% when compared to the odds of a victimization occurring in the West and the distribution of FRI victims. For RTN victims, only one temporal variable has the ability to significantly predict the risk of RTN victimization when compared to FRI victimization. Specifically, the odds of RTN victimization were lower for the time period between 1995 and 1999. For geographic variables, RTN victimizations were more likely to occur in the Northeast, Midwest, and South, when compared to the West and FRI victims. Although the ability of this analysis to inform theoretical propositions seems limited, it does show that aspects of the geographic and temporal distribution of FRI victims appears to significantly differ from that of FRR and RTN victims.

The second model, which looks at the remaining situational characteristics that can be compared across all three victimization groups, was also significant, yet somewhat stronger (X^2=278.2, df=10, p<.001; Nagelkerke R-sq=.275). When compared to FRI victims, the odds of FRR victimization significantly increased if the victim and offender knew each other, were of the same race, and a gun was used to kill the victim. Specifically, the odds of a victim belonging to the FRR group were 7.4 times greater if the victim and offender had a prior relationship, 4.9 times higher if the victim and the primary offender were of the same race, and more than two times higher if a gun was used. When the situational characteristics of RTN victimization events were compared to FRI victimization events, the likelihood of a victim being classified into the RTN group significantly decreased by 79.0% if there were multiple victims. When compared to FRI victims, the odds of an individual being a RTN victim were more than nine times greater if the offender and victim knew each other, three and half times greater if the incident was intra-racial, and almost three times greater if the victim was killed with a gun. It appears, based on the multivariate model examining situational characteristics, that FRI victims are more likely to be killed by an offender they do not know, who is of a different race, and who does not use a gun, when compared to FRR and RTN victims. In addition, FRI victims are more likely to be killed along side of another homicide victim than RTN victims.

As done at the individual level, the situational characteristics specific to the death of each FRI and FRR were also compared to the situational characteristics of the typical homicide victim in the county where they were killed. On the bivariate level (Table 5.10), FRI victims were less often the same race as their offender or knew their offender than the TV. When victim-offender relationships were broken down, FRI victims less often had intimate relationships with their offender, less often were related, less often were acquaintances, and much more often were

strangers. Also, they were less often killed by guns when compared to the TV. Finally, FRI victims were more often killed along with another victim. FRR victims, however, had similar rates of being the same race as their offender when compared to the TV, as well as when compared to the type of weapon used to kill them. Less frequently, FRR victims were known to their offenders before their victimization. Similar to FRI victims, FRR victims also were more often killed along with another person.

Two binary logistic regressions were conducted to determine whether situational characteristics could act as significant predictors when comparing the odds of FRI or FRR victimization to the TVs in the county where they were killed. Victim-offender relationships were collapsed into one category for this analysis, whether the victim and primary offender knew each other or not prior to the victimization. Also, the multiple victims variable was dropped because of the disproportionate impact it had on the regression models. Tables 5.11 and 5.12 present the results of these tests. When compared to the TV, the odds of being a FRI victim significantly decreased if the victim and offender were of the same race, had a prior relationship, or the weapon used in the incident was a gun. On the other hand, the only situational variable that was significant for the FRR to TV analysis was whether the victim and offender had a prior relationship. Specifically, when compared to the typical victim, individuals were 58.7% less likely to be FRR victims if they knew their offender.

Situational characteristics appear to differ between FRI victims and FRR, RTN, and typical victims. Specifically, FRI victims are less likely to be of the same race of their offender, are more likely to be strangers, and are less likely to be killed with a gun as they are more often stabbed or beaten to death. Not surprisingly, when FRI victims do know their offenders, the vast majority of the time it is as an acquaintance, never as a family member, and only rarely as

Table 5.10. T-tests comparing situational characteristics of FRI & FRR victims to typical victim.

		FRI			FRR		
		Victim	TV		Victim	TV	
Situational	Intra-racial	54.6%	87.3%	***	88.0%	87.9%	
	Relationship						
	Stranger	76.3%	21.2%	***	29.3%	20.5%	**
	Known	23.7%	78.8%	***	70.7%	79.5%	**
	Intimate	0.7%	15.3%	***	1.7%	16.2%	***
	Family	0.0%	13.8%	***	4.3%	14.2%	***
	Acquaintance	23.0%	49.7%	***	64.7%	49.1%	***
	Weapon						
	Gun	54.6%	60.6%		64.4%	62.5%	
	Knife	18.4%	16.0%		18.0%	15.7%	
	Other	27.0%	23.4%		17.6%	21.8%	
	Multiple Victims	21.7%	8.93%	***	36.8%	9.8%	***

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

Table 5.11. Binary logistic regression comparing situational characteristics between FRI & typical victims (N=280).

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)	
Intra-racial	-2.025	0.760	7.096	0.132	**
Known	-6.519	0.901	52.296	0.001	***
Weapon					
Gun	-3.511	1.104	10.113	0.030	**
Knife	1.395	0.90.	2.388	4.035	

X^2 = 193.3, df=4, p<.001

Nagelkerke R-sq = .665

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

Table 5.12. Binary logistic regression comparing situational characteristics between FRR & typical victims (N=464).

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)	
Intra-racial	0.248	0.414	0.358	1.281	
Known	-0.866	0.298	8.435	0.421	**
Weapon					
Gun	0.372	0.355	1.101	1.451	
Knife	0.782	0.449	3.040	2.187	+

$X^2 = 11.7$, $p<.05$

Nagelkerke R-sq = .033

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

someone with whom they had an intimate relationship. Although not as often as FRR victims, FRI victims are more likely to be killed in incidents that contain multiple victims when compared to the typical homicide victim in the area where they were killed and also when compared to the national sample of RTN homicide victims. On the other hand, FRR victims seem to share similar situational characteristics with typical and RTN victims. In fact, the multivariate analysis shows that only victim-offender relationship has the ability to significantly predict the type of victimization when comparing FRR victims to the TV killed in the same geographic location.

5.3 Macro Characteristics of Victimization

In addition to individual and situational victimization characteristics, this study examines the macro-level characteristics of the counties where the victims were killed. Comparisons are made between the geographic regions where FRI, FRR, and RTN victims died. Although these analyses are based on where each victimization occurred, they do not control for victim level characteristics. Therefore, these results should be viewed as a preliminary attempt to understand the differences between the counties where the different types of victims were killed before

running the multilevel model. Initially, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted for each variable to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in at least two of the group averages between the FRI, FRR, and RTN victim's macro-level characteristics. The purpose of the ANOVA is to assist in determining which variables should be included in the multivariate analysis. Group means, as well as whether there was a significant difference, are reported in Table 5.13.

To start, population, population density, and the percent of that population that lives in a rural area was compared across the three groups. It appears, at least on the bivariate level, that FRI victims were killed in counties that are less rural than the areas where FRR victims are killed, but more rural than the areas where RTN victims are killed. Not only are FRR victims killed in counties with significantly smaller populations but, on average, almost 25% of that population lives in a rural area compared to 19.4% of FRI counties, and 16.1% of RTN counties. The difference between the average population density for counties where RTN victims are killed compared to FRI victims is much larger than the difference between FRI and FRR counties. This is similar for the raw population numbers also. Finally, similar to that of Land, McCall and Cohen (1990), the natural log of population and population density, as well as percent rural, were used in a factor analysis to determine whether they loaded as the factor, population structure.[25] This standardized score shows that RTN victims are killed in counties with population structures greater than the counties where FRI and FRR victims are killed. This

[25] Based on the research by Land, McCall & Cohen (1990), eight variables loaded into two components, which were used to control for macro-level variation related to population structure and resource deprivation. The natural log of county population and population density, and percent rural, loaded together to create the population structure component. After varimax rotation, the loading scores were .936, .917, and -.921, respectively. The second component, resource deprivation, included percent unemployed (.846), percent living in poverty (.889), the natural log of median income (-.777), percent of households headed by females with children (.810), and the county GINI index score (.744). The standardized regression coefficient of each component was included in the macro-level models.

Table 5.13. Analysis of variance between victimization groups & macro characteristics.

	FRI (N=141)	FRR (N=236)	RTN (N=705)
Population/1000***	1,009.8	789.2	1,906.5
Population Density***	1,047.2	976.7	3,387.1
% Population Rural***	19.4	24.5	16.1
Population Structure***	-0.182	-0.353	0.155
% Male***	49.2	49.7	48.6
% White***	77.4	77.7	66.1
% Black***	11.2	8.5	21.1
% Other***	11.4	13.8	12.8
% Hispanic	12.9	15.1	14.4
% Native Born***	90.0	90.7	88.0
% Under 18+	25.3	25.9	25.6
% 18 to 24	10.1	10.2	10.4
% 25 to 34***	14.9	14.6	15.9
% 35 to 49*	21.9	21.9	21.5
% 50 and up*	27.7	27.4	26.6
% No High School Degree***	20.3	19.5	24.0
% High School Degree	28.4	27.9	28.0
% Some College***	25.5	29.4	25.7
% College Degree or More	22.8	23.1	22.4
% Population unemployed***	6.1	6.2	6.8
% Population below poverty level***	15.2	16.0	17.5
Median family income***	45,607.2	49,310.8	44,762.8
% Female headed households***	8.0	7.4	9.5
GINI Index***	44.5	44.0	46.0
Resource Deprivation***	-0.262	-0.362	0.174
Evangelical Adherence rate/1000+	140.9	169.3	151.7
Jewish Adherence rate/1000***	18.8	10.3	27.8
Muslim Adherence rate/1000***	4.6	3.5	8.2
% Voting Democrat***	45.0	43.6	52.7
% Voting Republican***	45.4	50.2	40.0
% Voting Independent	9.6	6.2	7.3
White Hate Groups*	59.6	54.2	60.6
South*	34.0	33.9	42.0

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

is expected based on the variation reported by the three variables that hang together to create the factor.

The difference in the average percent of the population that is male is also significant between at least two of the groups. These differences, however, are not large. The RTN victims were killed in counties that had, on average, lesser proportions of males in their population when compared to the FRI and FRR. On the other hand, RTN counties had a significantly smaller population of whites than FRI and FRR counties. The proportion of the black population in FRI geographic regions is larger than that of FRR geographic regions, yet smaller than that of RTN geographic regions. Both FRI and FRR victims were killed in areas with a significantly smaller population of race of other when compared to RTN geographic regions. The differences in the percentage of the populations that were Hispanic, were not significant at the bivariate level. There is, however, a significant difference in the native born populations, as FRI and FRR victimization regions have a larger proportion of their population that is native born (90.0% and 90.7%, respectively) when compared to RTN victimizations counties (88.0%).

When examining the age distribution across the three groups, the only difference in the percentage of the populations that fell into each age category that was significant was for the age group fifty and over. Specifically, FRI and FRR counties had slightly larger proportions of their population that were fifty or older, when compared to counties where RTN victims were killed. For the four categories used to measure educational attainment, only the average percentages of the county populations that had no high school degree or had some college were significantly different between the groups. Approximately 24.0% of the population in the counties where the RTN homicides occurred had no high school degree, compared to 20.3% of FRI counties and 19.5% of FRR counties. Where the highest level of education was some college, the average

percentage of the population who fit this category in FRI counties was 25.5%, 29.4% in FRR counties, and 25.7% in RTN counties.

Other variables related to economic and structural measures included those examining unemployment, poverty, income and income inequality, and household composition. There was a significant difference between at least two of the groups for all of these variables. Counties where RTN victims were killed had higher unemployment and poverty rates, while the median family income was lower, when compared to FRI and FRR counties. It is not surprising then, that income inequality, measured though the GINI index, was greater in RTN counties.[26] Finally, the percentage of households with children that were headed by females was also examined. Similar to the other patterns, FRI counties had higher rates of female-headed households when compared to FRR counties, but rates lower than RTN counties. These variables were used to create the second factor, described by Land, McCall & Cohen (1990) as a measure of resource deprivation. The variation in the standardized factor scores was similar to that of the individual variables. Counties where RTN victims were killed had the greatest levels of resource deprivation, followed by FRI counties, and finally FRR counties.

County level differences were also found for macro-level variables measuring religion and the percent of individuals voting for either the Republican or Democratic candidate in the Presidential election closest to the year when the victimization occurred. Specific to religion, adherence rates for Evangelical Christians were, on average, 140.9 per 1000 in counties where FRI victims were killed, 169.3 for FRR counties, and 151.7 for RTN counties, although these differences only approached significance. Jewish and Muslim adherent rates were significantly different, with similar patterns. The highest rates of adherents were in counties where RTN

[26] The GINI index measures income inequality from 0 to 100, where 0 means there is no income inequality, and 100 means one individual would make all the income in that county. Simply put, the higher the index number, the greater the inequality.

homicides occurred, the second highest rates were in FRI counties, while the lowest rates were in FRR counties. The final set of variables examined at the macro-level were those attempting to capture the percent of the population in each county that was either Democrat or Republican. As stated, the averages of these variables were significantly different across the three groups. Higher percentages of individuals who voted in presidential elections voted Democratic in RTN counties (52.7%) when compared to FRI and FRR counties (45.0% and 43.6%, respectively), while the inverse was true for Republican voters (FRR=50.2%, FRI=45.4%, and RTN=40.0%). Notably, voters in FRI counties voted for Independent candidates most often.

Using the chi-square statistic, the bivariate relationship was examined between macro characteristics and the dummy variables for white hate groups and the South. To measure some form of existing mobilization, the measure of whether or not a county had a white hate group in it during the same time period as the victimization was used. Although the relationship was significant, it was weak. In addition, a larger percentage of RTN counties had at least one white hate group during the year the victim was killed (60.6%), when compared to FRI counties (59.6%) and FRR counties (54.2). Similarly, more RTN counties were in the South, when compared to FRI and FRR counties.

At first glance, it appears that counties that housed RTN homicides were more urban and heterogeneous. Patterns discovered through bivariate analysis, however, do not always hold up when multivariate analyses are conducted to control for the impact of all variables. To test these relationships, a multinomial logistic model was conducted using FRI counties as the reference category. The model reveals which variables can significantly predict the group that victims are more likely to fall into based on the macro-level characteristics of the counties where killed, when controlling for other variables (Table 5.14). Not all variables examined in the bivariate

analysis were used in this model and the predictor variables were partially chosen based on the magnitude and significance of their association at the bivariate level, their potential contributions to theoretical development, and whether regression diagnostic results indicated issues of multicollinearity.

Table 5.14. Multinomial logistic regression with macro characteristics with FRI comparison (N=1082).

		B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)	
FRR	% Male	0.095	0.095	1.011	1.100	
	% White	-0.005	0.015	0.132	0.995	
	% Native	-0.018	0.023	0.663	0.982	
	% 25 to 34	0.055	0.075	0.528	1.056	
	% No High School Degree	-0.013	0.027	0.226	0.987	
	Jewish Rate	-0.021	0.008	7.204	0.979	**
	Muslim Rate	-0.023	0.030	0.591	0.977	
	% Democrat	0.062	0.020	9.735	1.064	**
	% Republican	0.057	0.018	10.461	1.059	**
	White Hate Group	-0.514	0.277	3.426	0.598	+
	Resource Deprivation	-0.038	0.222	0.030	0.962	
	Population Structure	-0.283	0.253	1.256	0.753	
	South	0.282	0.295	0.912	1.325	
RTN	% Male	-0.109	0.097	1.266	0.897	
	% White	-0.043	0.013	11.018	0.958	**
	% Native	0.061	0.020	9.752	1.063	**
	% 25 to 34	0.180	0.068	7.055	1.197	**
	% No High School Degree	0.118	0.025	21.776	1.126	***
	Jewish Rate	-0.006	0.005	1.097	0.995	
	Muslim Rate	0.006	0.025	0.060	1.006	
	% Democrat	0.053	0.017	9.245	1.054	**
	% Republican	0.023	0.016	2.153	1.023	
	White Hate Group	0.142	0.243	0.342	1.153	
	Resource Deprivation	-0.736	0.206	12.751	0.479	***
	Population Structure	0.171	0.236	0.523	1.186	
	South	0.164	0.261	0.394	1.178	

X^2 =303.9, df=26 p<.001

Nagelkerke R-sq = .296

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

The regression was significant (X^2=297.0, df=28, p<.001) and moderate in strength (Nagelkerke R-sq = .290). When compared to FRI counties and controlling for the other variables, the odds of being a FRR victim decreased as the percentage of whites and blacks increased. In addition, the odds significantly increased as the percent of individuals voting for either the Democratic or Republican candidate for president increased. To be specific, for every unit increase in the percent of a county's population that was white, the odds of an individual being a FRR victim decreased by 6.3%, and for every percent increase in the black population, the odds decreased by 7.7% (in relation to the odds of FRI victimization). Also, for every percent increase in individuals who voted for either the Democratic or Republican candidate, there was a 6.2% and 5.3% increase in the likelihood of the individual being a FRR victim, respectively.

When controlling for all other variable, the macro level characteristics that could significantly predict the odds of being a RTN victim, when compared to a FRI victim, were percent native, percentage of the population between 25 and 34 years old, percentage of the population with no high school degree, percent Democrat, and the resource deprivation factor. For every percent increase in the native population, the odds of a victim being RTN, when compared to the odds of being a FRI victim, increased by seven percent. Similarly, for every unit increase in percent 25 to 34 and percent of the population that had no high school degree, the likelihood of a victim being RTN increased by 19.2% and 12.5%, respectively. For every percent increase in Democratic voters in the presidential elections, the odds of victim coming from a RTN county increased by 5.5%. Conversely, as resource deprivation increased, the odds of a county being RTN decreased.

Based on the multinomial logistic regression, it seems that, when controlling for all macro-level variables used in the analysis, there is similar variation between the counties where FRR victims and RTN victims were killed, when both are compared to FRI victims. FRR victims are killed in counties where increases in the percent white and black, decreases the odds of the a victim being FRR, while increases in the percentage of Republican and Democratic voters increase the likelihood of a victim being FRR instead of FRI. At first, these patterns in race and political ideology might seem confusing. However, when one considers that these variables are not inclusive of all possible responses, the results make more sense. In counties where FRR victims are killed, it appears that the percentage of individuals who are of a race other than white or black, or voted for a candidate that was not running on the Democratic or Republican ticket, have some impact on the model. Also, increases in percent native, percent between 25 and 34, percent with no high school degree, and percent Democrat, appear to significantly increase the odds of a victim being killed in a RTN county, when compared to FRI counties.

5.4 Multi-Level Characteristics of Victimization

The final test in the quantitative portion of the data analysis consists of running a multinomial logistic model where variables from all three levels of analysis are utilized. Unlike the prior analyses, which were run in SPSS 20, the final model was run in STATA 12 so that clustered robust standard errors could account for the fact that victim and situational characteristics could potentially cluster based on the counties and years where the victimization occurred. There were 1,076 victims clustered within 790 unique county-years. The individual and situational characteristics were treated as being on the same level in the analysis as

situational characteristics could vary between victims killed within the same situation. Table 5.15 presents the model using variables from each level of analysis. The multilevel model was significant (X^2=347.75, p<.001), and moderate in strength (McFadden R-sq=.315).

First, examining characteristics of FRR victims compared to FRI victims, only one individual level variable can significantly predict between the two groups when controlling for all other variables, compared to three in the model with only individual level variables.

Table 5.15. Multinomial logistic regression with clustered robust standard errors with FRI comparison.

		FRR			RTN		
Individual &	Male	0.562	(0.179)	+	0.470	(0.143)	*
Situational	White	4.576	(1.434)	***	0.912	(0.234)	
	Age (Over 50)						
	Under 18	1.456	(0.800)		1.805	(0.923)	
	18-24	1.009	(0.476)		1.290	(0.542)	
	25-34	0.699	(0.288)		0.959	(0.348)	
	35-49	0.638	(0.251)		0.598	(0.220)	
	VO Known	8.454	(2.781)	***	11.584	(3.216)	***
	Intra-Racial	3.400	(1.123)	***	4.192	(1.095)	***
	Multiple Victims	1.112	(0.467)		0.254	(0.095)	***
	Weapon (Other)						
	Gun	2.652	(0.962)	**	2.419	(0.752)	**
	Knife	1.760	(0.762)		0.789	(0.313)	
Macro	% White	0.992	(0.020)		0.960	(0.017)	*
	% Native	0.997	(0.026)		1.072	(0.024)	**
	% 25 to 34	1.014	(0.079)		1.215	(0.082)	**
	% No High School Degree	0.986	(0.036)		1.143	(0.036)	***
	Jewish Rate	0.975	(0.010)	*	0.996	(0.007)	
	% Democrat	1.086	(0.028)	**	1.090	(0.024)	***
	% Republican	1.055	(0.023)	*	1.031	(0.019)	
	Resource Deprivation	1.192	(0.373)		0.468	(0.132)	**
	White Hate Group	0.503	(0.181)	+	0.710	(0.216)	

***p<.001;**p<.01;*p<.05;+p<.1

Exp(B) & Clustered Robust Std Error Reported

X^2=347.75***

McFadden R-sq=.315

Specifically, the likelihood of a victim being FRR is more than four times greater if they are white. Approaching significance, individuals were less likely to be FRR if they were male, when compared to FRI.

At the situational level, when controlling for all other variables, and compared to FRI victims, the odds of an individual being a FRR victim were more than eight times greater if the victim and offender knew each other, 3.4 times greater if the victim and offender were of the same race, and 2.65 times greater if the victim was killed with a gun. Finally, for FRR victims, the odds of a victim being FRR, when compared to FRI victims, decreased as the number of Jewish adherents increased. Also, increases in the percentage of voters who voted for either the Republican and Democratic candidate increased the odds of a FRR victimization occurring within a county. Although only approaching significance, the presence of a white hate group increased the odds of a county having a FRI victimization, when compared to FRR counties.

Examining the differences between RTN victims to FRI victims found only one variable that was significant at the individual level. If the victim was male, this decreased the likelihood of an individual being a RTN victim. For situational variables, the likelihood of the individual being a RTN victim significantly increased if the victim and offender knew each, the victim and offender were of the same race, and a gun was used to kill the victim. If the victim was killed in an incident that involved multiple deaths, the odds of them being a RTN victim decreased by 74.6%. Finally, five macro-level variables were significant in their ability to predict whether a victim was RTN, when compared to FRI victims. For every percent increase in the native population, the odds of a victimization being RTN increased by 7%. Similarly, increases in the percentage of the population that was between 25 and 34 years of age, those without a high school degree, and those voting Democrat, increased the probability of a victimization being

RTN. Finally, as was shown in the macro model, increases in resource deprivation increased the likelihood that a victim was FRI.

5.5 Conclusion

There are several patterns of FRI victimization that emerge from this data. On the individual level, FRI victims were less often female and more often older when compared to other victims. Although ideological victims were more often minorities when compared to other non-ideological far-right victims, there were no significant differences based on the race of ideological victims when compared to "routine" homicide victims. FRI victimization risk was greater for males, but lower for whites, Hispanics and those under 18, when compared to the typical victims.

For situational variables, ideological victimization risk increased when the victim and offender had no prior relationship, were of different races, the incident included multiple homicide victims, and a weapon other than a firearm was used. Similarly, the typical victims in the counties where FRI victims were murdered were less likely to be killed in inter-racial incidents by strangers and more likely to know the offender and be shot, when compared to FRI victims. This relationship of intimate, stranger, inter-racial homicide appears to hold even when controlling for other variables and varying the comparison groups.

Many macro characteristics reveal that the counties where FRI victims are killed are a hybrid of RTN and FRR counties. For example, RTN counties are most populous and dense, FRR are least populous and dense, while FRI fall somewhere in between. This is also true for percent black, percent native, and even the resource deprivation factor. When controlling for other variables, FRI victimization risk in these counties, when compared to FRR victimization

risk, is greater in areas with decreases in non-white and non-black populations, as well as increases in Independent voters. When compared to RTN homicides, FRI risk is higher where levels of resource deprivation increase.

When all levels of analysis are introduced into the model, the odds of a victim being killed in a far-right ideologically motivated attack increase, when compared to RTN homicide risk, if the victim is male, killed by a weapon other than a gun, by someone they do not know, and who is of a different race. The risk of FRI victimization also increases if the county in which they are killed has lower native populations, individuals between 25 and 34, and lower proportions of the population with no high school degree. Increases in resource deprivation at the county level increase the risk of FRI victimization when compared to RTN victimization.

The purpose of this chapter was to use quantitative data to examine patterns in FRI victimization at the individual, situational, and macro-levels of analysis. The results of these tests have shown that there are significant differences in FRI victims when compared to FRR and RTN victims, as well as the typical victims in the counties where FRI victims are killed. All of these results, along with those presented in the within FRI victims analysis, will be used to inform theoretical propositions, which are presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 6

Differential Identity:

Developing Theoretical Propositions of Far-Right Ideological Victimization

A theory is an attempt to understand and predict the occurrence of a phenomenon (Dubin, 1969; Gibbs, 1972). There are several reasons to develop theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization through inductive reasoning. First, no prior victimization theories address terroristic or extremist violence. Second, no data or research has been published on the victims of extremist crimes or the situations in which they are killed, therefore collecting and analyzing data prior to theoretical proposition building allows for more informed propositions. Developing the propositions without data increases the chance that significant, explanatory variables are never identified or tested. Finally, there is a precedent for sociological theory, generally, and victimization theory, specifically, to be developed through inductive reasoning (e.g. Hindelang, Gottfredson, & Garafalo, 1978).

When positing theoretical propositions, born of empiricism, it is important to ask what is it about a person, a situation, or a community that increases or decreases the risk of ideological victimization. An attempt at theory building, whether for understanding or prediction, should address these inquiries, putting forth propositions that have the ability to explain why a specific person was killed in a specific interaction in a specific community, when so many people are not killed during their daily routines in the majority of communities in the United States. This chapter outlines three theoretical propositions, one each at the individual, situational, and macro-levels of analysis, as well as advice on how to operationalize and test the propositions for future research.

Based on the results of the empirical analyses, however, it is important to first discuss the idea of the "randomness hypothesis." The risk of far-right ideological victimization is not equally distributed across American society. A 97 year old, white woman living in Perkins County, South Dakota does not share the same amount of ideological victimization risk, no matter how small, as the 28 year old black male living in San Bernardino County, California. In fact, the ideological victimization risk of a 28 year old black male in San Bernardino County is not the same as a 28 year old black male living in Perkins county, either. It appears that variation exists between situations in which ideologically motivated offenders victimize individuals are not the same as those situations in which routine homicide victims are killed.

In addition to the empirical differences between homicide victims, the finding that only approximately one percent of FRI victimizations were random, in its truest sense at least, also supports the idea that patterns of ideological violence do exist. On the opposite end of the spectrum, 40% of ideological homicides were actually targeted assassinations. The middle portion of the stratified concept of randomness, representative targeting, accounts for the remaining 59% of the victims. Depending on how randomness is measured, it appears that far-right ideological victims are targeted for an identifiable reason by an offender between 40% and 99% of the time. Whether researchers agree with the lower or higher end of that range, the results underline the complicated nature of the idea of randomness. They also demonstrate the importance of researchers examining randomness as a stratified construct, with pure, random victimization on one end, targeted assassinations on the other, and degrees of representative targeting in the middle. No matter how one operationalizes randomness, however, there does appear to be variation in victimization types that deserve an attempt at a theoretical explanation.

As stated, the purpose of this chapter is to present testable, theoretical propositions that assist in explaining and predicting variation in ideological victimization risk. To do this, the construct of differential identity is presented and its hypothesized influence on the individual, situational, and macro levels of analysis are discussed. It is important to formally posit operationalizable theoretical propositions because it provides a pathway for future studies to test and further develop the propositions.

6.1 Differential Identity

Turner (2010) defines social identification as "the process of locating oneself, or another person, within a system of social categorizations" and "the sum total of the social identifications used by a person to define him- or herself" as their identity (p. 17-18). Much research has been done on the idea of identity, some focusing on individual identity and its relationship to collective and national identities (e.g. McDermott & Samson, 2005; Smith, 1991; Taifeel, 2010), others focusing on how identity can motivate individuals to commit acts of political, ethnic, and terroristic violence (e.g. Arena & Arrigo, 2005; Byman, 1998; Fearon & Laitin, 2000; Schlesinger, 1991; Schwartz, Dunkel, & Waterman, 2009; Sen, 2006). For the purpose of these propositions, however, it is only important that one accepts that some individuals assume identities grounded in extremist ideologies and that they view others as having identities, whether real or perceived, which are congruous, neutral, or antithetical to their ideological identity. Based on this, ideological victimization risk increases for potential victims based on whether, and how much, their identity differs from an ideologically motivated offender. In some ways, this is similar to Kimmel and Ferber's (2000) discussion of the far-right's concept of "others." Through the process of identifying "others," "rural white militia members seek to

restore their own masculinity by framing state policies as emasculating and by problematizing the masculinity of these various 'others' (p. 594)." With differential identity, the far-right seeks to assert and reaffirm their ideology through the ideological victimization of those who differ from them.

From the concept of differential identity come two attributes that are important to the proposed theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization - the presence and magnitude of differential identity. Specific to ideologically motivated violence, one or more aspects of an individual's identity allows them to determine who should, or should not be, victimized. It is the concept of differential identity-the differences in ones ideological identity in juxtaposition to another-that can be used to explain ideological victimization risk. Ideological victimization can be predicted through the operationalization and modeling of the differences in the identity of possible victims based on the ideology of their offenders. The magnitude of differential identities is important as it represents the idea that specific actions or environments can increase the social and psychological distance between an offender's ideological identity and a pool of potential victims who represent the antithesis of that identity. The construct of differential identity offers researchers the ability to isolate and operationalize variables that can help one understand and predict ideological victimization.

The theoretical propositions based around differential identity are probabilistic in nature, not deterministic. That is to say that the characteristics identified as having relationships with ideological victimization do not guarantee that the victim was killed, or will be killed, in an ideologically motivated event. Instead, the manifestation of these attributes on the individual, situational and macro-levels increases the likelihood of ideological victimization. Although this study has attempted to be victim-centric, the very universe of victims examined is based on the

ideological motivation of the offender. This consideration of the offender will continue to the minimal amount necessary to discuss and develop the theoretical propositions. In fact, similar to the offender's involvement in the delineation of the universe of victims that were selected for the study, the very core of the propositions, differential identity, depends on the juxtaposition of specific characteristics of the victim at the individual level to the ideological goals of the offender.

Although the term differential identity has been used in other areas of research (e.g. Bauman, 1971), as well as identity as a theoretical construct and its relationship to ideologically motivated violence (e.g. Schwartz, Dunkel, & Waterman, 2009), the idea of differential identity as a mechanism to explain ideological victimization risk is unique. For the purposes of this study, differential identity exists when an attribute of an individual, whether physical or ideological, real or perceived, is in direct contrast to the extremist ideology of another. For example, a biracial couple's relationship, and its subsequent impact on how others perceive them, would be in opposition with a white supremacist's belief that inter-racial dating is immoral and has severe consequences for the Aryan race. It is this basic idea, that victimization risk can be measured using the components of a victim's identity, and how that identity differs from an extremists belief system, that is one of the building blocks of the proposed theoretical propositions. The second building block, which is integrally tied to the first, is the magnitude of the distance between the two identities. A skinhead who savagely beats a homosexual male or a Ku Klux Klan member who attacks a stranger are actions that can be interpreted as manifestations of distancing ones identity from their victims or byproducts of identity distancing having already occurred.

On all levels of analysis, it is argued that the identity of a victim, whether that identity differs from their offender's ideological motivation, and how wide the social and psychological distance of those two identities is, can be measured, both directly and indirectly, and subsequently used to predict how homicide risk varies between far-right ideological victims and routine homicide victims. On the individual level, differential identity is measured directly and individuals whose identities are antithetical to the far-right are at a higher risk of ideological victimization than those whose are not. At the situational level, certain variables show that identity distancing has already occurred and to what degree. For example, when compared to non-ideological homicide events, differential identity allows for ideological homicides to be between strangers, to be more violent, and that violence will be more intimate. At the macro level, characteristics of the environment have the potential to make differential identity more salient, increasing victimization risk for specific populations. In addition, although it will be argued that homicide risk varies across populations based on how their identity differs from an offender, and to what degree, other variables related to lifestyle and routine activities moderate that risk. The following sections formally state each theoretical proposition, while offering supporting evidence and advice for how to operationalize the constructs and test the propositions.

6.2 Differential Identity on the Individual Level

The presence of differential identity: An individual level proposition of ideological victimization. *On the individual level, ideological victimization risk varies based on the relationship between a victim's identity and how it differs from their killer's ideological identity. Specifically, risk of ideological victimization increases with the presence and magnitude of this difference. Beyond this differential identity, risk is moderated through individual characteristics*

such as age, sex, occupation, and criminal history, which have the ability to increase or decrease the likelihood of interacting with an offender or having an identity antithetical to an offender's ideological identity.

Based on the empirical data, we have the ability to begin to determine what it is about the individual characteristics of FRI victims, and how they differ from the ideology that motivated their deaths, that increases their victimization risk. FRI victims are more often male when compared to the typical victim in the counties where they are killed, as well as the samples of "routine" victims. Being male increases an individual's risk of FRI victimization when compared to the risk of "routine" victimization. Disaggregated, anti-social minorities are males most often out of all FRI victimization groups, followed by anti-racial/ethnic minorities, anti-government, and anti-abortion. In the instance of anti-abortion victims, the doctors targeted were male while support staff were female. For anti-government victims, the distribution in sex, like anti-abortion victims, appears to be based on the distribution of sex in law enforcement. That is to say that for those anti-abortion and anti-government victims, sex varies in FRI victims because sex varies for those occupations that were targeted by FRI offenders. Victims were targeted for their identity as government employees or abortion-providers, not their sex. However, because of their sex, the likelihood of them being employed in one occupation over another varied.

For the anti-minority victims, however, this question seems somewhat more complicated. In anti-race/ethnic minority killings, female victims included those targeted for being a minority, or dating a minority, or being of a different religion. Men, however, were targeted for those exact same reasons. For this category, there appears to be nothing at all specific to sex that caused one victim to be at a higher risk than another, even anecdotally, because of their identity. Comparatively, for anti-social minorities, there are very few females. An argument can be made

that differences can partially be explained by the fact that men are more often homeless (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development), a large subset of the anti-minority victims. The anti-homosexual homicides, however, were exclusively male. It is this subgroup that appears to have the only theory informing variation in sex, when compared to the others. FRI offenders target male homosexuals more often than female homosexuals. The one known lesbian killed in the ECDB was attacked and killed, not because she was a lesbian, but because she was black. It is not unreasonable to believe that this variation in sex, or lack there of, related to homosexual men is based in the idea that heterosexual males attack gay men in an effort to reinforce their own sexual orientation (Harry, 1992). If that is the case, then one could argue that sexual orientation, not sex, was the primary motivation for the offender targeting their victim.

The second demographic characteristic that could be compared within and between victim types was race. As with victim sex, there is empirical data about victim similarities and differences based on their race and ethnicity. FRI victims were less often white, but much more often black when compared to the typical victim in the county where they were killed. When FRI victims are disaggregated by the ideological motivation of their offender, it can be seen that these differences in race and ethnicity are driven by the victims in the anti-racial/ethnic minority category, which makes up more than half of the FRI victims. In fact, anti-abortion, anti-government, and anti-social minority victims are white more often, and black and other less often, than the typical victim.

Although racial differences appear to be very important for explaining individual level victimization risk in some respects, this impact is not uniform across types of FRI victims. In fact, it is worthwhile to reiterate that FRI victims who are not targeted for their race or ethnicity, are white more often than the TV killed in that county. When compared to other types of

homicide victims, we find that although FRI victims are white more often than RTN victims, they are white far less often than FRR victims. Therefore, unsurprisingly, it appears that the differences in race are driven primarily by the anti-racial minority victims, who are targeted specifically for being a race different than that of the offender. Although being white decreases one's risk of FRI victimization when compared to RTN victims, whites are disproportionately killed in non-anti-racial minority incidents. Once again, these differences most likely can be explained not directly because of race, but because of the impact race has on other individual characteristics, such as occupation.

The final individual level characteristic examined for theoretical implications is age. Does a person's age increase or decrease their FRI victimization risk, and if so, why? When compared to the TV, FRI victims were less often under 35, and more often older than 35. In multivariate analyses, these patterns held and often significantly increased the risk of FRI victimization, when compared to the TV. For FRI victims compared to FRR and RTN victims, not all differences in age significantly altered the risk of victimization. For example, when compared to FRR victims, the odds of ideological victimization only significantly decreased if the victim was less than 18 years of age. When compared to RTN victims, however, the odds of ideological victimization significantly decreased for any victim under the age of 35.

Like sex and race, it appears that age could have a moderating effect on FRI victimization risk at the individual level. For anti-abortion and anti-government victims, individuals must be old enough to work either in government or medical facilities as a doctor or support staff. For anti-race victims, whose age distribution is most similar to the typical victim killed in their area, it seems that age probably does little to explain differences in homicide victimization, although FRI victims do appear to group in the age categories between 18 and 49. Viewed from a

lifestyle, or routine activities perspective, this makes sense as these ages probably encompass the most number of individuals who are out in public on a regular basis. In fact, anti-racial minority victims were engaged in a leisure activity outside of the home 65% of the time when they were killed. Also, recall that there is little evidence that victim precipitation, victim criminal involvement, or victim involvement in the movement has much of a relationship with ideological victimization.

Across all individual level characteristics, which could be compared within FRI victims and between all homicide victims, there is clear evidence of patterns of FRI victimization. It does not appear, however, that any of these individual characteristics, except for race, is the direct reason for victimization. Instead, these variables moderate victimization risk by affecting the lifestyles in which these individuals engage. The real difference in ideological victimization risk is not based on these attributes discussed, however, but on how these attributes are linked to a victim's identity, and how that identity differs from the ideological identity of their killer. How, though, does differential identity explain the fact that not everyone who is black has an equal chance of being killed by a white supremacist, or that everyone who is Jewish does not have an equal chance of being killed by a neo-Nazi? Although part of this can be explained through statistical terms such as measurement error and lack of model specificity, part of it can also be explained as a variation at other levels of analysis, such as the situations in which potential victims engage and the communities in which they live. Incorporating aspects of other victimization theories, this proposition predicts that in addition to the presence of differential identity, risk can be moderated by individual attributes of the potential victim and their lifestyle. Related to the moderating variables, such as age and sex (and race for non-anti-racial/ethnic minority victims), these characteristics will vary the likelihood of a person being a police officer,

or a member of city counsel, or a medical doctor. As variation in these attributes increase the likelihood of an individual assuming an identity different than an offender's, so increases the probability of ideological victimization.

In order for theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization to have the ability to predict when victimization will occur, the main components of the propositions must be operationalized. At the individual level, this means determining what aspect of a potential victim's identity to measure. This decision should be based directly on the ideological motivation of the offenders whose victims are being studied. For example, research on victims of white supremacists would operationalize possible victims as individuals who are non-white, as this is the attribute on which a victim and offender's identity would differ. For skinheads, race, religion, sexual orientation, and homelessness are possible individual level measurements. For anti-government extremists, occupation, specifically whether an individual is employed by a branch of government, such as a law enforcement agency, would be appropriate.

In some ways, this seems tautological, as the presence of a differential identity between the victim and offender could be used to determine which victims are killed in ideologically motivated incidents. This is to say that, at the individual level at least, an ideologically violent offender predicts ideological victimization and differential identity is simply a measure of ideology. Hirschi & Gottfredson (2000) argue against those who critique theory based on tautology, stating "It has apparently escaped the attention of these critiques that what they consider egregiously atheoretical or pointless and trivial tautologies are also known in the psychometric literature as tests of construct validity. The critics of such tests again appear to assume that they must be successful because tautologies cannot be falsified. But in fact these tests are often unsuccessful (p. 58)." Applying this argument to the individual level proposition

of ideological victimization, it is important to acknowledge the potential tautological relationship between the offender's ideology and the victim's identity at the individual level, but also to acknowledge that an appropriate measure increases the validity of the ideological measurement while still allowing for the possibility that differential identity does not have the ability to predict or explain ideological victimization.

When operationalizing these concepts it is important to make sure *ex post facto* identity construction does not impact how victims are chosen. That is to say that the operationalization of differential identity on the individual level should be determined prior to coding and analysis and should be based on the expressed motive of the offender, not the identity of the victim. For example, if a researcher wishes to examine the validity of the propositions for victims killed during ideologically motivated incidents committed by anti-abortionists, they should identify offenders who either explicitly state, or evidence implies, that their actions were ideologically motivated. Then, information on all of their victims should be collected and coded. In this instance, a variable that captures a victim's support of the right to choose would be appropriate, either through their occupation or involvement in the pro-choice ideological movement. Therefore, when the analysis takes place, the impact of differential identity on victimization risk can be examined so as to support or refute the proposition. As one might expect, there will most likely be cases where a victim's identity is not antithetical to that of their killer (e.g. a victim killed during an ideologically motivated bombing at an abortion clinic as they walked by and whose identity did not differ from the ideology of the offender). Determining how to operationalize individual level attributes related to differential identity prior to data collection, coding, and analysis, allows for the inclusion of these types of victims, whose deaths have the ability to falsify the propositions, as they cannot be explained through differential identity.

To reiterate, on the individual level, to the degree that a victim's identity differs from the ideological identity of an offender, so will the risk of ideological victimization. The concept of differential identity should be based on attributes of a victim's identity in juxtaposition to an offender's ideology, based on the extremist ideology under study, and operationalized through theoretically based hypotheses prior to data collection and analysis. In addition, non-identity based individual level variables should be included as they will control for levels of risk. However, individual level characteristics alone cannot predict risk of ideological victimization, and situational and macro-level variables should also be included in any model hoping to explain or predict ideological victimization.

6.3 Differential Identity on the Situational Level

The magnitude of differential identity: A situational level proposition of ideological victimization. *On the situational level, ideological victimization risk increases based on evidence that identity distancing has occurred between the victim's identity and the offender's ideological identity. Beyond these constructs, risk is moderated through situational characteristics such as location or time of day, which have the ability to increase or decrease the likelihood of interacting with an offender.*

Routine activities theory posits that certain situations in which suitable victims place themselves can increase risk because of decreased guardianship and greater exposure to motivated offenders. Similarly, lifestyle theory argues that aspects of a victim's life increases and decreases risk based on the situations in which their lifestyle places them. Despite the theoretical and methodological difficulties of testing these theories, there is evidence that lifestyle and routine activities may cause variation in victimization risk, especially for very

specific types of homicide. In this regard, the variation in risk across populations can, to some degree, be explained by victimization theories, but the same variables probably cannot universally predict homicide risk across all populations and all types of homicide. What, however, can be said about ideological victimization risk based on how situational characteristics, especially those related to differential identity, vary within and between victim types?

FRI victimization situations are more often inter-racial when compared to FRR and RTN situations, a distribution driven by the incidents in which anti-racial minority victims are killed. They also disproportionately involve victims and offenders who are strangers prior to the incident. Lastly, they less often involve a gun. These differences are significant on the bivariate and multivariate levels. In addition, when compared to RTN situations, FRI situations are more likely to involve multiple homicide victims. These differences hold when FRI victims are compared to the TV in the county where they died. To be succinct, FRI victims are more likely to be killed by strangers of a different race, with a weapon other than a gun, when compared to FRR, RTN, and typical victims.

Although in their entirety, FRI victims are killed by guns less often than other types of victims, this difference is only 10% to 12% higher for FRR and RTN victimizations, respectively, and only 6% higher when compared to the TV in the county where they lived. This can be interpreted as there being county level variation in weapon type that decreases the differences in FRI and typical victims. That is to say that TVs killed in the same county as a FRI victim were more likely to be killed with a weapon similar to that used against a FRI victim anyway, when compared to the TVs in non-FRI counties. However, anti-abortion and anti-government victims are killed with a gun much more frequently than RTN victims and anti-

minority FRI victims. From a situational perspective, this makes sense, as an offender who attacks an armed law enforcement officer with a knife or a blunt object probably has little chance of killing that officer. Similarly, anti-abortion extremists know that clinics hire security guards to protect the patients and staff. In fact, one anti-abortion victim was an off-duty police officer working as a security guard and another was a volunteer escort who would pick up doctors from their home and drive them to the clinic. For anti-racial minority victims, the rates of gun related killings are similar to the raw percentages of TVs and RTN victims, approximately 60% and 66%, respectively. Once again, the anti-social minorities find themselves to be different than the other groups.

Variation within FRI situations shows that anti-abortion and anti-government victimizations more often have multiple victims, but less often have multiple suspects. In fact, the anti-social minority homicide incidents have the lowest percentage of multiple victims, but the highest percentage of multiple offenders. These incidents also have the highest percentage of overkills. Anti-social minority victims are more likely to be singled out and attacked by a group of offenders who kill, either because of lack of access to guns or by choice, using knifes, blunt objects and their fists and feet to stab and beat their victims. This type of violence is expressive and intimate in the sense that the offenders choose to engage in an act of violence so brutal it sends a message. As at the individual level, there are patterns of victimization at the situational level that are distinct between FRI victimizations and "routine" victimization incidents. Can these differences, however, be theoretically explained or predicted through theoretical propositions?

It is hypothesized that situational characteristics can also assist in predicting ideological victimization risk, when compared to "routine" victimization risk, as they can be interpreted as

further differentiating, or distancing, the victim's identity from the offender's based on variables such as the relationship between the victim and the offender. Other characteristics, such as the weapon type or the number of offenders, are influenced by a combination of the magnitude of differential identity and practicality. For example, guns are more often used in anti-government victimizations, but this is based on characteristics of both the offender and the victim, as one would not expect to attack a man armed with a gun with a knife or a blunt object. If they did, the probability that the act would result in a homicide is low. One could also argue that anti-government extremists, who are reverent of their individual liberties, including the right to bear arms, are more likely to own and carry a weapon. Why, however, do ideological victimizations, especially those including racial and social minorities, include more intimate forms of violence, such as stabbings and beatings? The proposed theoretical propositions predict that as the magnitude between the differing identities increases so will the probability that more extreme forms of violence will be used. Similarly, the more distant the relationship between a victim and their offender(s), the greater the chance the incident was ideologically motivated.

Although the magnitude of the differential identities can be measured through social distance and the level of violence, other situational variables might have the ability to measure the same construct. For example, anti-government victims were the most likely to be killed during incidents with multiple victims and also had the highest percentages of others around. The very fact that an offender was motivated to attack an armed individual, with little regard for the presence of others or their own safety, demonstrates both a commitment to their extremist ideology and the potential byproduct of a large distance between the opposite identities. It is hard to imagine a willingness to risk ones life during an act of ideologically motivated violence if the perception of differential identity is not present and of a high magnitude. In a comparable

way, anti-minority victims, who are more likely to attack in groups and target only one individual, may compensate for this perceived lack of ideological commitment through the aforementioned presence of overkill.

In addition, the increase in the magnitude of differential identity through inter-racial and stranger homicides should allow for more brutal violence as increased distance devalues the worth of the individual being attacked. If this is true, we should expect that the situations where the victim and the offender have the greatest distance in identity would be the most brutal and intimate. When examining the situational characteristics of RTN and FRR homicides, when compared to FRI victims, we find that increases in distance in identity, measured as inter-racial and stranger homicides, significantly increase the risk of a victimization being ideological. This is also the same when FRI victims are compared to the typical victim.

As discussed above, the variation of social distance within FRI victims, and its impact on the type of weapon seems to be impacted by the type of victim. Guns are used in 85.7% of anti-abortion cases and 88.5% of anti-government FRI victimizations, even though social distance measured through the victim-offender relationship are greatest with nearly all of the victims being strangers. Out of the two anti-minority groups, the anti-racial minority victims were of a different race and strangers with their offender more often than the anti-social minority victims. Even with this, only 16% of the anti-race victims had evidence of overkill, and 60% were killed with guns. Comparatively, only 15.2% of anti-minority victims were killed by someone of a different race and 65.3% had no prior relationship with their killers, yet only 9.1% were killed by a gun, the rest were beaten or stabbed to death. Although differences across the anti-abortion and the anti-government make theoretical sense, especially if one thinks about the role of capable guardians, the differences between the two anti-minority groups are harder to explain. On one

hand, although offender characteristics are outside the scope of this study, their killers come from a similar pool of white supremacists, skinheads, and neo-Nazis. On the other hand, the model does not measure the presence and magnitude of differential identity related to the differences in sexual orientation and homelessness. Perhaps these two attributes increase the social distance between the victims and their offenders to such a degree that acts of violence such as stabbing, curbing, and beating are more appropriate, because of their symbolic nature, than simply shooting the victim, as is more common in not only other types of homicides, but also other types of FRI victimizations.

It appears that situational characteristics offer a unique predictive value to determine what types of situations may or may not be ideologically motivated, although have limited ability in deterring such events. This is apparent in their consistent statistical significance across several bivariate and multivariate analyses using varying comparison groups. In this respect, the operationalization of the presence and magnitude of differential identity on the situational level should focus on characteristics that can be reasonably interpreted as manifestations of increased social and psychological distance between the ideological identities of the victims and the offenders. For example, all things being equal, a victim killed by a stranger is more likely to be FRI than a victim killed by a romantic partner. Similarly, a victim killed by someone of a different race is more likely to be FRI because of the inherent social distances between individuals of different races. This measurement, however, is based in the unequal number of anti-race victims and theoretically we would not expect the same results if examining only anti-government victims. As stated before, this is not to say that these situational characteristics are deterministic, but instead are probabilistic.

Once again, situational characteristics demonstrate that as identity distancing increases, so does the probability that a victim will be ideological. Similarly, the magnitude of differential identity appears to mediate, to some degree, the type of violence used to kill a FRI victim. The greater the social distance, the more aggressive, violent, or intimate the act. Admittedly, this data set does not have the ability to measure all ways in which a far-rightists might psychologically and ideologically distance themselves from their victim, but for the variables that it does measure, there appears to be a consistently significant ability to predict whether a victim will be killed during an ideological or "routine" homicide incident.

6.4 Differential Identity on the Macro Level

Contextualized presence and magnitude: A macro-level proposition of ideological victimization: *Risk of ideological victimization is not constant across geographic and temporal locations; instead it varies based on the populations of possible ideological victims and offenders, differentiated through their identities. In addition, fluctuations in other macro-level variables can influence ideological victim risk as the magnitude and salience of differential identity can be further increased through the collective struggle for political and economic resources, creating an environment in which ideological violence can occur.*

The macro-level analysis includes variables whose relationship with ideological victimization is most abstract and furthest removed from the victim and the incident in which they were killed. Victimization theories have been critiqued for violating the ecological fallacy, the idea that researchers assume that variation in macro-level characteristics say something specific about the individuals, both potential victims and offenders, who live in those areas. For example, high poverty rates in FRI counties do not mean that the victims in FRI counties live in

poverty. Whether a victim lives in poverty, and whether that increases their risk of victimization, is a question to be answered on the individual level. An attempt to interpret the variation in macro-level characteristics across counties should focus on how fluctuations in these measurements might change the environments in which the victims are killed, not as direct measures related to the situations or the individuals.

In the single level models, which were used to explore the differences in the macro-level characteristics without controlling for individual characteristics, significant differences exist between counties where FRI victims are killed and counties where "routine" victims are killed. FRI counties are smaller, less dense, and more rural when compared to RTN counties, but larger, denser, and more urban when compared to FRR counties. In a similar pattern, FRI counties have a lower percentage of the population that is white, other, Hispanic, and native when compared to FRR counties, but have larger black populations. When compared to RTN counties, the counties where FRI victims were killed are more white and native, but less black, other, and Hispanic. Basically, if one thinks about FRR counties as more rural and white and RTN counties as more urban and non-white, FRI counties fall somewhere in between.

This pattern partially holds for economic variables. FRI counties have a higher median income than RTN counties and a lower median income than FRR counties. When examining the number of households headed by a single female, FRI counties once again are between the two comparisons, with FRR having less, and RTN having more. Similarly, RTN counties have the highest income inequality as measured using the GINI index, FRR have the lowest, and FRI are in the middle. It is not surprising then, that the resource deprivation factor that was created, shows RTN counties have the highest levels of resource deprivation, FRR having the lowest, and once again, FRI counties are in between. What is surprising, is that when compared to RTN

counties, and controlling for multiple multilevel variables, increases in resource deprivation at the county level actually increase the probability that a victim is FRI. This finding, however, is contradictory to other research examining similar types of ideologically motivated crimes (e.g. Green, Glaser, & Rich, 1998; Green, Strolovitch, & Wong, 1998) and should be examined further in future research.

For variables measuring religion, counties where FRI victims were killed had lower Evangelical, Jewish, and Muslim adherent rates when compared to RTN victims. When compared to FRR counties, however, FRI counties had more Jewish and Muslim adherents, but less Evangelical. Related to political ideology, FRI counties had more Independent voters than both comparison groups, and not surprisingly, once again had percentages of Democratic and Republican voters between FRR and RTN counties. RTN counties had, on average, higher percentages of their populations voting for the Democratic candidate, and FRR counties had higher percentages of their populations voting for the Republican candidate. Somewhat unexpected is the finding that RTN counties more often had the presence of a white hate group being active in the county during the same year the homicide victim was killed, while FRR counties had the lowest percentage of counties with white hate groups.

As presented in Chapter 5, however, the relationship between victimization type and some of the macro-level characteristics disappears once a multivariate analysis is conducted. When controlling for all of the variables that were significant at the bivariate level, the risk of a victim being killed in a FRI county, compared to the risk of being killed in a FRR county, increases as the percent of the population that is white or black increases. The risk decreases as the percent of the population that voted for either a Republican or Democrat in a presidential election increases. In the multilevel model, increases in percent white and percent black

continued to increase FRI risk, while increases in the native population, percent voting Democrat and percent voting Republican decreased FRI risk. When compared to RTN counties, a victim was more likely to be killed in a FRI counties with increased levels of resource deprivation, native populations, and Democrats. These relationships were also significant in the multilevel model.

For the variation within the FRI groups on the macro-level, there are also some interesting results. Economically, anti-government counties have the highest levels of unemployment and poverty rates, but the lowest median incomes and lowest levels of income inequality. Ideologically, anti-government counties have the smallest number of Jewish and Muslim adherents, the highest percentage of individuals voting Republican, and the lowest proportion of Independent voters. Across all groups, anti-government counties also have the lowest rates of white hate groups. When compared to FRR counties, anti-government counties have more independent voters, less Republican and Democratic voters, less adherents across all religions, and lower levels of poverty, although higher unemployment rates. On the macro-level at least, certain characteristics place anti-government counties to the lower bounds of all counties analyzed, even FRR counties, as they are more rural, less populated, and less heterogeneous in many respects.

If anti-government counties are more like FRR counties, anti-minority counties are more like RTN counties. For example, both anti-race and anti-social minority counties have lower levels of native populations when compared to the other FRI groups, levels comparable to RTN counties. Similarly, anti-race counties have the smallest white populations, highest Hispanic, and second highest black and other, when compared to the other FRI groups. Anti-minority counties also have the highest populations of all FRI groups, but still are not as populous, dense,

or urban as RTN counties. In terms of ideological differences, the anti-minority counties have the highest rates of Muslim and Jewish adherents. For political ideology, all FRI counties have, on average, greater percentages of Independent voters when compared to FRR and RTN counties. Not surprisingly, the anti-race counties have the most number of counties with a white hate group identified as active in that county during the year of the victimization, although it is only slightly more than the percentage of RTN counties. This variation in macro-level characteristics, both within FRI groups and between FRI, FRR, and RTN groups, begins to delineate counties where different types of homicides occur. For example, FRI counties are not similar, but appear to vary based on the ideological motivation of the incident.

The first concepts that should be operationalized on the macro-level are characteristics based partially on prior victimization theory and involve the number of motivated offenders and suitable victims (Cohen & Felon, 1979). All things being equal, greater numbers of suitable victims and motivated offenders, differentiated from the rest of the population by their ideological identities, should increase the risk of an ideological victimization occurring in a county when compared to counties with less numbers of suitable victims and motivated offenders. Once again, how these are operationalized and measured is based on the ideology being studied. For example, if researching white supremacists, macro-level characteristics that measure both motivated offenders (e.g. percent white, percent male, and ideological mobilization) and suitable victims (e.g. percent black, Jewish adherence rates) would be appropriate. Based on what is known about differences in routine and ideological homicides from this study, however, it can be argued that it is not only motivated offenders (as far-right routine homicides occur in different types of counties) and suitable victims (as routine homicides occur disproportionately in counties with more minorities) that are needed, but a precise mixture

of both. Counties with more minorities actually have less risk of ideological homicide, when compared to routine homicide. From this it can be inferred that although too much heterogeneity increases the likelihood that individuals of different identities will interact, it also decreases the social, psychological, and physical distance between possible victims and offenders, and in some ways limits ideological extremism. In the same way, counties that are homogenous, that is there are large pools of possible far-right extremists and few minorities, may increase the distance between differential identities, but the potential interactions between possible victims and offenders is greatly limited. Therefore, when compared to routine homicides, ideologically motivated homicides will occur in counties with populations of possible offenders and victims that will maximize both the magnitude of differential identities and the amount of possible interactions between them.

Other measures that need to be operationalized are those that indicate a struggle for economic and political resources, such as high unemployment or large percentages of Independent voters, and have the ability to facilitate identity distancing. In these locations where resources are scarce, it is hypothesized that differences in identity become more salient. Similarly, increases in ideological activities, such as the organization of white hate groups, demonstrate that a community has been polarized through further identity distancing. For example, in the far-right data, although the pool of motivated offenders cannot predict victimization based on race, that is the percent white is similar between FRR and FRI counties, the existence of white hate groups does. One can argue that this not only measures macro-level increases in the motivations of offenders, but also demonstrates increases in that community's attachment to a far-right identity, which could further distance the identity between FRI victims

and offenders.[27] Also, as shown in the analyses, increases in the Jewish adherence rates increased the likelihood that a victim would be killed in a FRI county. Although this could be interpreted as an increase in the pool of suitable victims, based on the very limited number of Jewish victims, it more likely measures an environment of increased distances between differential identities.

Finally, to measure local competition of political resources, voting behaviors could be utilized. In the data, FRI risk increased for counties as the percentage of the Democratic and Republican voters decreased, which means increases in Independent voters increased FRI victimization risk. This could be interpreted as greater instability in political ideology, as both Democrats and Republicans will feel as if they have to fight for third party support, another sign that not only is identity polarized, but there is an ongoing struggle for dominance. Such a struggle has the potential to create an environment where differences in identity are salient to the pool of possible offenders. It is the variation in these macro-level characteristics, as well as those found at the individual and situational levels, which can be utilized to test theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization.

6.5 Conclusion

To reiterate, these theoretical propositions focus on operationalizing the presence and magnitude of differential identity on three levels of analysis. The presence of differential identity is concerned with measuring a victim's identity and how it differs from an offender's ideological identity. In addition, the propositions are concerned with the magnitude of the

[27] On a related note, these theoretical differences found between the FRI and FRR victims illustrate the importance of analyzing FRR victims separately from the RTN victims. If FRR victims had been grouped in with the FRI or RTN victims, these differences, which highlight the variation in types of crimes committed by the same pool of motivated offenders, would have never been identified.

differences between the competing identities. On the individual level, it is hypothesized that ideological victimization risk varies based on a victim's identity and whether it is antithetical to their offender's ideological identity. In addition to the theoretical variables, individual risk is moderated through other characteristics, which have the ability to vary the likelihood of interacting with an ideologically motivated offender and/or the chance of a victim assuming an identity that differs from an offender's. On the situational level, ideological victimization risk varies based on the magnitude of the differential identity, which is manifested through characteristics of the homicide incident. Risk is also moderated through non-theoretical situational characteristics, which have the ability to increase or decrease the likelihood of interacting with an offender. On the macro-level, the proposition hypothesizes that the risk of ideological victimization is not constant across geographic and temporal locations, but varies based on the populations of possible ideological victims and offenders, differentiated through their identities. In addition, fluctuations in other macro-level variables can influence ideological victimization risk as the struggle for political and economic resources can create an atmosphere that increases the magnitude of differential identity.

When testing the propositions, it is important for researchers to understand that the variables used to measure each construct will potentially change between each campaign of ideological violence being examined (e.g. anti-government versus anti-race). Although the constructs are purposefully broad, so as to have the ability to explain and predict varying types of ideological violence, the logic behind any research that attempts to operationalize them should be clear. For the campaign of ideological violence being studied, individual attributes of each victim that are arguably counter to that of the extremist ideology, such as a victim's race, religion, nationality, politics or sexual orientation, will increase their risk of ideological

victimization. Similarly, when compared to non-ideological violence, any characteristics of the situation that can be interpreted as a manifestation of increasing the distance between the two identities, such as evidence of overkill, more personal forms of violence, or no prior relationship between the victim and offender, should also increase ideological victimization risk. Finally, on the macro-level, variables related to measuring the potential pool of victims and offenders are important, as the more victims and more offenders that live in a geographic region should increase the likelihood that they will interact. Also, macro characteristics that can arguably create an atmosphere in the community that further distances the differential identities and make those differences more salient are also important. A hypothesis of the theoretical propositions might predict that when compared to characteristics of non-ideological homicide victims, the probability that an individual would be killed in an anti-racial/ethnic homicide incident would be highest for minority males between the ages of 25 and 49, who are viciously stabbed or beaten to death by a group of strangers, in a community with relatively large populations of white and black males and increased competition for political and economic resources.

In this chapter, inductive reasoning was used to develop theoretical propositions through the interpretation of a multilevel analysis of far-right homicide data. These theoretical propositions, which focuses on the presence and magnitude of differential identity, combine new ideas about ideological victimization with components of prior research on victimization and ideological violence. Through the unique construct of differential identity and three propositions that can be tested at multiple levels of analysis, the tools for testing these propositions are laid out. In the final chapter, the research concludes through the discussion of limitations and contributions of the study, potential policy implications, and ideas for future research.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

This research concludes with a brief discussion of the potential methodological and theoretical limitations and contributions of the study. Next, possible policy implications related to the reduction of ideological victimization risk are discussed. Finally, the chapter concludes with suggestions for future research looking to formally test the proposed theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization.

7.1 Limitations & Contributions

As with any research, there are both limitations to the study, as well as contributions to the broader body of research. The discussion of the limitations and contributions of this research focuses on the data, analyses, and theoretical interpretation. As stated in Chapter 3, the population of far-right ideological victims, although extracted from one of the most reliable terrorism or extremism datasets available, has potential weaknesses. The main weakness is the possibility of missing ideological victims. The number of FRI victims is relatively small, so even a few missing ideological victims could have an impact on the outcome of the analysis, especially if they are missing for some systematic reason, such as lack of open-source coverage in areas of the country or time periods under study. That being said, the SHR, which has been used in countless homicide studies over the last several decades, has many missing victims and values and the weaknesses of the ECDB data seems minute in comparison. However, as this research also utilizes SHR data, the comparison group of RTN victims incurs the same critiques

of other research using SHR data. Importantly, although statistical methods have been used to impute missing values, missing cases might still be an issue.

Conversely, however, this study contributes methodologically to research related to ideological violence and homicide victimization. The ECDB is the only database that has a validated universe of extremist violence in the United States, systematically collects information on ideological and non-ideological crimes committed by extremists, and has victim level data. In addition, unique methods were utilized to validate and augment the data from the ECDB. Through the utilization of open-source information such as genealogical, court, corrections, and public databases, the number of missing values for the FRI and FRR victims was limited. In addition, official data sources, such as the SHR, were used to validate and fill in missing values in the ECDB data. This exhaustive use of freely available information demonstrates that when examining a small, specific phenomenon, researchers have the ability to develop and analyze their own databases even when official government data is inaccessible or non-existent.

The data analysis portion of the research also had several unique methodological contributions. The first is the comparison of homicide victims to the typical victim killed in the same location. Although a random sample of RTN homicide victims across the entire geographic and temporal area of study was used for the main comparison group, the separate analyses comparing FRI and FRR victims to the TV in the county where they were killed controlled for regional variation in individual and situational homicide characteristics. To the knowledge of the author, this type of comparisons is unique to this research and offers a pathway for future researchers who do not have the ability to conduct case-control studies, but want to control for geographic and temporal variation, as well as compare the victims of interest to representative victims.

The most apparent limitation to the data analysis is not using a statistical technique constructed specifically for modeling multilevel data. Additionally, the analyses made no effort to control for temporal and geographic clustering in the multivariate analyses. Specific to the propositions that formed out of the analysis, one of the major limitations of the study is that these propositions were not tested. Without testing the propositions, even though they were induced from multiple empirical data points, there is no ability to determine whether the propositions can predict far-right ideological violence outside of the time range and geography studied. This lack of deductive reasoning, although understandable based on the scope of the research, still limits its validity until further studies are conducted.

There are, however, potential theoretical contributions to the criminological fields of victimology and ideological violence research. For one, this is one of very few studies that posit theoretical propositions of victimization. It is also one of very few studies of ideological violence that is based on actual data and the only one that is victim-centric. Typically, terrorism and extremism researchers develop theories without utilizing empirical data. Finally, the proposed theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization contribute to the broader literature on victimization and ideological violence by incorporating the same theoretical construct – differential identity – across the individual, situational, and macro-levels of analysis. Just as none of the limitations should invalidate the study, none of the contributions are conceptually or methodologically groundbreaking. Together, however, they add to the incremental progress of social science research.

7.2 Policy Implications

One can argue that the primary purpose of studying, understanding, and predicting ideological victimization should be to reduce future acts of violence. In order for this to occur, the theoretical propositions must have the ability to inform policy. The practical implications of victim-centric research, however, can be difficult to discover. At the individual level, characteristics that increase ideological victimization risk either cannot be changed (e.g. race or age) or should not be changed (e.g. religion, sexual orientation) because of the threat of ideological violence. Therefore, unlike some criminological research that attempts to affect policy by identifying attributes of individuals and communities that increase the chance of a crime occurring so that policy can be enacted to address these criminogenic characteristics, the policy implications of this research are grounded in the propositions' ability to predict individuals, situations, and geographies that are at a higher risk of ideological victimization. This knowledge can then be utilized to target very specific parts of the country where ideological victimization has already occurred and where it is likely to occur. In these instances, probable victims, such as government employees, or minority racial and religious groups, can be educated in the elevated risk and the situations in which that risk is greatest. Law enforcement officers and others can increase guardianship over vulnerable populations. Attempts could even be made to alter the atmosphere of the communities where these victimizations are likely to occur in an effort to decrease the magnitude of differential identities. For example, recall that the presence of white hate groups could not significantly predict between FRI counties and RTN counties, as both had similar percentages of these groups, but ideological victimization risk was increased in FRI counties, when compared to FRR counties. Perhaps targeting counties similar to those FRI counties which had white hate groups, and ignoring those counties similar to RTN counties with

white hate groups, law enforcement can focus on programs meant to help offenders desist from extremist behaviors and subsequently lower the ideological victimization risk. For the proposed propositions to have the ability to impact policy or lower victimization risk, however, evidence must be accumulated through additional research that either supports or falsifies the theoretical propositions.

7.3 Future Research

As stated, additional research needs to be conducted to validate and refine the proposed theoretical propositions. This can be done by (1) expanding outside of fatal acts of violence, (2) focusing on highly specific extremist ideologies, (3) using more appropriate geographic units at the macro-level, (4) identifying non-event based comparison groups, and (5) utilizing advanced statistical techniques. To begin, even though the propositions focused on fatal violence for methodological reasons, they should also be able to predict other types of non-fatal, ideologically motivated criminal acts and future research should investigate this possibility. Next, although using data on ideological victims for all far-right extremists was useful for research whose main goal was inductive theory development, the broad scope of the data, which allowed for the important within FRI group comparisons, also made it difficult to create a strong predictive model. For example, although race was an important individual level characteristic that increased the risk of anti-racial/ethnic minority victimizations, as it was a measure of differential identity, for almost 20% of the victims it was occupation that acted as a measure of differential identity. Similarly, recall that macro-level characteristics demonstrated that the environments in which anti-government victims were killed were similar to FRR counties, while anti-minority

counties were similar to RTN counties. Focusing on a specific portion of the broader far-right extremist movement should allow for the creation of a much stronger predictive model.

Also, decreasing the size of the geographic units when possible should improve the validity of any test. Although county level data is better than state level data, census tract or census block data should be better than both for capturing the true environment where ideological victimizations are occurring. Counties can be large areas with much variance within their boundaries. Even though only 25% of a county's population might live in an urban area, the victimization might have occurred within that 25%. Using smaller geographic units should increase a researcher's ability to better test the impact of macro-level variables on ideological victimization risk.

Some thought should be given to testing the propositions against non-victimization events, not non-ideological victimization events. In many ways, understanding the differences between the individuals, situations, and communities where ideological victimizations occur compared to where they do not occur, is more information and beneficial than understanding the differences between ideological victimizations and other types of victimization. On the individual level, this study did not compare victimization situations to non-victimization situations, nor counties where ideological victimizations occurred to counties where ideological victimizations did not occur. The ability to predict events from non-events is important and is more valid and useful test of a theory than predicting ideological homicide to non-ideological homicide.

Finally, advanced statistical techniques should be utilized, when appropriate, to test the theory. For example, to some degree it has been shown that geographic and temporal variation in ideological victimizations was not random and longitudinal or spatial analyses should be

employed to determine whether events cluster across time and space. Additionally, as the propositions are multiple levels of analysis, statistical techniques such as HLM might be appropriate to account for multiple victims nested within an incident and multiple incidents nested within a geographic region. Any future research should consider one, or all of these suggestions for testing the theoretical propositions.

Conclusion

Through inductive reasoning, this study utilized a unique data source, the Extremist Crime Database, to develop theoretical propositions of far-right ideological victimization. The theoretical contribution spanned both victimology and the study of ideological forms of fatal violence. Methodologically, the study demonstrated how open-source materials can be used to validate and augment official forms of crime data, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Supplementary Homicide Report, and vice versa. Additionally, multilevel analyses showed the importance of controlling for individual, situational, and macro-level variation when studying specific forms of ideological violence. Finally, the proposed theory enables policymakers, future researchers, and law enforcement to identify individuals who are at greater risk of ideological victimization because of how, and how much, their identity differs from that of possible ideologically motivated offenders.

The theoretical propositions related to differential identity and ideological victimization identify one central construct that can be operationalized at the individual, situational, and macro-levels of analysis in order to isolate attributes that increase the risk of ideological victimization. As these propositions were developed through inductive reasoning, only deductive reasoning can validate or invalidate it through formal theory testing, which it has been

suggested, should focus on more specific forms of violence and extremist ideologies. Further development of the propositions is important as not only will it allow for a better understanding of the people who are victims of terroristic and extremist violence, but also the situations and communities in which they are victimized. Through this understanding, it is the hope that the targeted implementation of educational and law enforcement policies can reduce ideological victimization risk and in doing so, prevent further acts of fatal violence.

Bibliography

Adamczyk, A., Chermak, S.M., Freilich, J.D., & Parkin, W.S. (2012). Examining the relationship between the presence of hate groups and the presence of violent far-right extremists at the county level. Report to the *United States Department of Homeland Security.*

Addington, L. A. (2004). The effects of NIBRS reporting on item missing data in murder cases. *Homicide Studies, 8*(3), 193-213.

Akers, R.L. (2000). *Criminological theories: Introduction, evaluation, and application,* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Arceneaux, K. & Nickerson, D.W. (2009). Modeling certainty with clustered data: A comparison of methods. *Political Analysis, 17*(2), 177-190.

Arena, M.P. & Arrigo, B.A. (2005). Social psychology, terrorism, and identity: A preliminary re-examination of theory, culture, self, and society. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 23,* 485-506.

Association of Statisticians of American Religious Bodies. (2002). *Religious congregations and membership study, 2000 (Counties)* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://www.thearda.com/

Avakame, E. (1999). Sex rations, female labor force participation, and lethal violence against women: Extending Guttentag and Secord's thesis. *Violence Against Women, 5*(11), 1321-1341.

Barber, C.W., Azreal, D.H., Olson, L.M., Nie, C., Schnaechter, J., & Walsh, S. (2008). Suicide and suicide attempts following homicide: Victim-suspect relationship, weapon type, and presence of antidepressants, *Homicide Studies, 12*(3), 385-297.

Barkun, M. (1996). Religion, militias and Oklahoma City: The mind of conspiratorialists. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 8*(1), 50–64.

Barkun, M. (1997). *Religion and the racist right: The origins of the Christian Identity movement.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Barnett-Ryan, C. (2007). Introduction to the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. In J.P. Lynch & L.A. Addington (Eds.), *Understanding Crime Statistics: Revisiting the Divergence of the NCVS and the UCR,* (55-90). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, R. (1971). Differential identity and the social base of folklore. *The Journal of American Folklore, 84*(331), 31-41.

Baumer, E.P. & Lauritsen, J.L. (2010). Reporting crime to the police, 1972-2005: A multivariate analysis of long-term trends in the National Crime Survey (NCS) and National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). *Criminology, 48*(1), 131-185.

Beam, L. (1992). Leaderless resistance. *The Seditionist, 12.*

Beirich, H., Bramblett, M., Freeman, A., Griggs, A., Smith, J., & Wood, L. (2007). The year in hate. *Southern Poverty Law Center Intelligence Report, Spring.*

Bell, M. & Vila, R. (1996). Homicide in homosexual victims: A case study of 67 cases from the Broward County, Florida, medical examiner's office (1982-1993), with emphasis on "Overkill". *American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology, 17*(1), 65-69.

Berk, R. (2010). What you can and can't properly do with regression. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 26*, 481-487.

Berlet, C., & Vysotsky, S. (2006). Overview of U. S. white supremacist groups. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 34*, 11-48.

Berrebi, C. & Lakdawalla, D. (2007). How does terrorism risk vary across space and time? An analysis based on the Israeli experience. *Defence and Peace Economics, 18,* 113-131.

Blazak, R. (2001). White boys to terrorist men: Target recruitment of Nazi skinheads. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*(6), 982-1000.

Block, C.R. (1985). Race/ethnicity and patterns of Chicago Homicide 1965-1981. *Crime & Delinquency, 31*(1), 104-116.

Braga, A. A., Piehl, A. M., & Kennedy, D. M. (1999). Youth homicide in Boston: An assessment of Supplementary Homicide Report data. *Homicide Studies, 3*(4), 277-299.

Breault, K.D. & Kposowa, A.J. (1997). The effects of marital status on adult female homicides in the United States. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 13*(2), 217-230.

Bridges, E.S. & Tankersley, W.B. (2010). Mean ages of homicide victims and victims of homicide-suicide. *Psychological Reports, 106*(1), 163-169.

Broidey, L.M., Daday, J.K., Crandall, C.S., Sklar, D.P. & Jost, P.F. (2006). Exploring demographic, structural, and behavioral overlap among homicide offenders and victims. *Homicide Studies, 10*(3), 155-180.

Burton, C.E. (2005). Segregation and Latino homicide victimization. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 29*(1), 21-36.

Byman, D. (1998). The logic of ethnic terrorism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 21*, 149-169.

Canetti-Nisim, D., Mesch, G., & Pedahzur, A. (2006). Victimization from terrorist attacks: Randomness or routine activities? *Terrorism and Political Violence, 18,* 485-501.

Caywood, T. (1998). Routine activities and urban homicide: A tale of two cities. *Homicide Studies, 2*, 64-82.

Chermak, S. M., Freilich, J. D., Parkin, W. S., & Lynch, J. P. (2012). American terrorism and extremist crime data sources and selectivity bias: An investigation focusing on homicide events committed by far-right extremists. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 28*(1), 191-218.

Chermak, S.M., Freilich, J.D., & Simone, J. (2010). Surveying American state police agencies about lone wolves, far-right criminality, and far-right and Islamic jihadist criminal collaboration. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 33*, 1019–1041.

Cohen, L.E. & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*, 588-608.

Cohen, L.E., Kluegel, J.R., & Land, K.C. (1981). Social inequality and predatory criminal victimization: An exposition and test of a formal theory. *American Sociological Review, 46*, 505-524.

Cook, P.J. (1987). Robbery violence. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 78*(2), 357-376.

Crothers, L. (2002). The cultural foundations of the modern militia movement. *New Political Science, 24*(2), 221-234.

Dahlberg, L.L. (1998). Youth violence in the United States: Major trends, risk factos, and prevention approaches. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 14*(4), 259-272.

D'alessio, S.J. & Stolzenbeg, L. (2009). Racial animosity and interracial crime. *Criminology, 47*(1), 269-296.

Damphousse, K., Smith, B., & Sellers, A. (2003). The targets and intended victims of terrorist activities in the United States. In D. Das & P. Kratocski (Eds.), *Meeting the Challenges of Global Terrorism: Prevention, Control, and Recovery* (171-188). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Dejong, C., Pizarro, J.M., & McGarrell, E.F. (2011). Can situational and structural factors differentiate between intimate partner and "other" homicide? *Journal of Family Violence, 26*, 365-376.

Dobrin, A. (2001). The risk of offending on homicide victimization: A case control study. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 38*(2), 154-173.

Dobrin, A., Lee, D., & Price, J. (2005). Neighborhood structure differences between homicide victims and non-victims. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33,* 137-143.

Dubin, R. (1969). *Theory building.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Dugan, L. & Apel, R. (2003). An exploratory study of the violent victimization of women: Race/ethnicity and situational context. *Criminology, 41*(3), 959-980.

Durham, M. (1996). Preparing for Armageddon: Citizen militias, the patriot movement, and the Oklahoma City bombing. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 8*(1), 70.

Eckberg, D.L. (1995). Estimates of early twentieth-century U.S. homicide rates: An econometric forecasting approach. *Demography, 32*(1), 1-16.

Ellen, I.G. & O'Regan, K. (2010). Crime and urban flight revisited: The effect of the 1990s drop in crime on cities. *Journal of Urban Economics, 68,* 247-259.

Englebrecht, C.M. & Reyns, B.W. (2011). Gender differences in acknowledgment of stalking victimization: Results from the NCVS stalking supplement. *Violence and Victims, 26*(5), 560-579.

Ezekiel, R.S. (1995). *The Racist Mind: Portraits of American Neo-Nazis and Klansmen.* New York: Viking Penguin.

Ezell, M.E. & Tanner-Smith, E.E. (2009). Examining the role of lifestyle and criminal history variables on the risk of homicide victimization. *Homicide Studies, 13*(2), 144-173.

Fattah, E.A. (2000). Victimology: Past, present and future. *Criminologie, 33*(1), 17-46.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2010, March 29). Uniform crime reporting statistics. Retrieved from http://www.ucrdatatool.gov/

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2011, January 12). Supplementary Homicide Report. Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/reporting-forms/supplementary-homicide-report-pdf

Felson, R.B. & Messner, S.F. (1996). To kill or not to kill? Lethal outcomes in injurious attacks. *Criminology, 34*(4), 519-545.

Felson, R.B., Savolainen, J., Berg, M.T., & Ellonen, N. (2012). Does spending time in public settings contribute to the adolescent risk of violent victimization? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology.* Published online July 12, 2012. DOI 10.1007/s10940-012-9179-5.

Flewelling, R.L. (2004). A nonparametric imputation approach for dealing with missing variables in SHR data. *Homicide Studies, 8*(3), 255-266.

Fox, J. A. (2004). Missing data problems in the SHR: Imputing offender and relationship characteristics. *Homicide Studies, 8*(3), 214-254.

Fox, J.A. & Swatt, M.L. (2009). *Uniform crime reports [United States]: Supplementary homicide reports with multiple imputation, cumulative file 1976-2007* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/

Fox, J.A. & Zawitz, M.W. (2007). *Homicide trends in the United States.* Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Corrections.

Freilich, J.D., Chermak, S.M., & Caspi, D. (2009). Critical events in the life trajectories of domestic extremist white supremacist groups: A case study analysis of four violent organizations. *Criminology & Public Policy, 8*(3), 497-530.

Freilich, J.D., Chermak, S.M., & Simone, J. (2009). Surveying American state police agencies about terrorism threats, terrorism sources, and terrorism definitions. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 21,* 450- 475.

Freilich, J.D., Chermak, S.M., Belli, R., Gruenewald, J.A., & Parkin, W.S. (Under review). Introducing the Extremist Crime Database.

Freilich, J.D. & Chermak, S.M. (2010). *The Extremist Crime Database Codebook.*

Freilich, J.D. & Pridemore, W.A. (2007). Politics, culture and political crime: Covariates of abortion clinic attacks in the United States. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35*(3), 323-336.

Gartner, R. (1990). The victims of homicide: A temporal and cross-national comparison. *American Sociological Review, 55*(1), 92-106.

Gibbs, J. B. (1972). *Sociological theory construction.* Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.

Gibson, C.L. (2012). An investigation of neighborhood disadvantage, low self-control, and violent victimization among youth. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 10*(1), 41-63.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Goodwin, J. (2006). A theory of categorical terrorism. *Social Forces, 84,* 2027-2046.

Green, D.P., Glaser, J., & Rich, A. (1998). From lynching to gay bashing: The elusive connection between economic conditions and hate crime. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(1), 82-92.

Gruenewald, J.A. (2011). A comparative examination of far-right extremist homicide events. *Homicide Studies, 15*, 177-203.

Gruenewald, J.A. (Under review). Comparing homicides against sexual orientation minorities and common homicides in the United States.

Gruenewald, J.A., Chermak, S.M. & Freilich, J.D. (Under review). Comparing the nature of lone wolf and group-based terrorism in the United States.

Gruenewald, J.A. & Pridemore, W.A. (2009). Stability and change in homicide victim, offender, and event characteristics in Chicago, 1900 and 2000. *Homicide Studies, 13*(4), 355-384.

Gruenewald, J.A. & Pridemore, W.A. (2012). A comparison of ideologically –motivated homicides from the new Extremist Crime Database and homicides from the Supplementary Homicide Reports using multiple imputation by chained equations to handle missing values. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 28*, 141-162.

Hamm, M.S. (1993). *American Skinheads: The Criminology and Control of Hate Crime.* Westport. CT: Praeger Publishers.

Harry, J. (1992). Conceptualizing anti-gay violence. In G.M. Herek & K.T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men* (113-122). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hewitt, C. (2005). *Political violence and terrorism in modern America: A chronology.* Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.

Hiede, K.M., Roe-Sepowitz, D., Solomon, E.P., & Chan, H.C. (2007) 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.

Hindelang, M., Gottfredson, M., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization.* Ballinger: Cambridge.

Hipp, J.R. (2011). Violent crime, mobility density, and neighborhood racial/ethnic transition. *Social Problems, 58*(3), 410-432.

Hirschi, T. & Gottfredson, M. (2000). In defense of self-control. *Theoretical Criminology, 4*(1), 55-69.

Jacobs, D. & Wood, K. (1999). Interracial conflict and interracial homicide: Do political and economic rivalries explain white killings of blacks or black killings of whites? *American Journal of Sociology, 105*(1), 157-190.

Jaishankar, K. (2008). What ails victimology? *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 3*(1), 1-7.

Jiao, A.Y. (2007). Explaining homicide clearance: An analysis of Chicago homicide data 1965-1995. *Criminal Justice Studies, 20*(1), 3-14.

Kaminski, R.J. (2008). Assessing the county-level structural covariates of police homicides. *Homicide Studies, 12*(4), 350-280.

Kaplan, J. (1997). Leaderless resistance. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 9*(3), 80-96.

Karch, D. & Nunn, K.C. (2010). Characteristics of elderly and other vulnerable adult victims of homicide by a caregiver: National violent death reporting system-17 U.S. States, 2003-2007. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(1), 137-157.

Kazerouni, N.N., Shah, N., Lathrop, S., & Landen, M.G. (2009). Non-firearm-related homicide, New Mexico, 2001-3. *Injury Prevention, 15,* 317-321.

Kellerman, A.L., et al. (1993). Gun ownership as a risk factor for homicide in the home. *The New England Journal of Medicine, 329,* 1084-1091.

Kennedy, L.W. & Silverman, R.A. (1990). The elderly victim of homicide: An application of the routine activities approach. *The Sociological Quarterly, 31,* 307-319.

Kimmel, M. & Ferber, A.L. (2000). "White men are this nation:" Right-wing militias and the restoration of rural American masculinity. *Rural Sociology, 65*(4), 582-604.

Kposowa, A.J. & Breault, K.D. (1998). Temporal factors and homicide in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*(5), 590-604.

Kposowa, A.J., Tsunokai, G.T., & McElvain, J.P. (2006). Race and homicide in the U.S. national longitudinal mortality study. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 4*(1/2), 1-27.

Kposowa, A.J. (1999). The effects of occupation and industry on the risk of homicide victimization in the United States. *Homicide Studies, 3*(1), 47-77.

Kreinert, J.L. & Walsh, J.A. (2009). Eldercide: A gendered examination of elderly homicide in the Unites States, 2000-2005. *Homicide Studies, 14*(2), 52-71.

Kuhns, J.B., Wilson, D.B., Clodfelter, T.A., Maguire, E.R., & Ainsworth, S.A. (2011). A meta-analysis of alcohol toxicology study findings among homicide victims. *Addiction, 106,* 62-72.

Kuhns, J.B., Wilson, D.B., Maguire, E.R., Ainsworth, S.A., & Clodfelter, T.A. (2009). A meta-analysis of marijuana, cocaine, and opiate toxicology study findings among homicide victims. *Addiction, 104,* 1122-1131.

LaFree, G. (2005). Evidence for elite convergence in cross-national homicide victimization trends, 1956-2000. *The Sociological Quarterly, 46*(1), 191-211.

Land, K.C., McCall, P.S. and Cohen, L.E. (1990). Structural covariates of homicide rates: Are there any invariances across time and social space? *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(4), 922-963.

Langford, L., Isaac, N., & Kabat, S. (1998). Homicides related to intimate partner violence in Massachusetts: Examining case ascertainment and validity of the SHR. *Homicide Studies, 2*(4), 353-377.

Lanier, D.N., & Dietz, T.L. (2012). Time dynamics of elder victimization: Evidence from the NCVS, 1992 to 2005. *Social Science Research, 41*(2), 444-463.

Last, S.K. & Frizon, K. (2005). Investigating the nature of expressiveness in stranger, acquaintance and intrafamilial homicides. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 2,* 179-193.

Lauritsen, J.L. (2001). The social ecology of violent victimization: Individual and contextual effects in the NCVS. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 17*(1), 3-32.

Lauritsen, J.L. (2010). Advances and challenges in empirical studies of victimization. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 26,* 501-508. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 78,* 259-271.

Lauritsen, J.L. & Carbone-Lopez, K. (2011). Gender differences in risk factors for violent victimization: An examination of individual-, family, and community-level predictors. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 48*(4), 538-565.

Lauritsen, J.L. & Heimer, K. (2008). The gender gap in violent victimization, 1973-2004. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 24,* 125-147.

Lauritsen, J.L. & Heimer, K. (2010). Violent victimization among males and economic conditions: The vulnerability of race and ethnic minorities. *Criminology & Public Policy, 9*(4), 655-692.

Lauritsen, J.L. & Laub, J.H. (2007). Understanding the link between victimization and offending: New reflections on an old idea. In M. Hough & M. Maxfield (Eds). *Surveying Crime in the 21st Century*, (55-75). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Lauritsen, J.L. & Schaum, R.J. (2004). The social ecology of violence against women. *Criminology, 42*, 323-357.

Leip, D. (2011). *Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://uselectionatlas.org/

Loftin, C., McDowall, D., & Fetzer, M. D. (2008). A comparison of SHR and Vital Statistics homicide estimates for U.S. Cities. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 24*(1), 4-17.

Marvell, T.B. & Moody, C.E. (2009). Female and male homicide victimization rates: Comparing trends and regressors. *Criminology, 37*(4), 879-902.

Maxfield, M. G. (1989). Circumstances in supplementary homicide reports: Variety and validity. *Criminology, 27*(4), 671-695.

McCall, P.L., Land, K.C., & Parker, K.F. (2010). An empirical assessment of what we know about structural covariates of homicide rates: A return to a classic 20 years later. *Homicide Studies, 14*(3), 219-243.

McDermott, M. & Samson, F.L. (2005). White racial and ethnic identity in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology, 31*, 245-261.

Meier, R.F., & Miethe, T. (1993). Understanding theories of criminal victimization. *Crime and Justice, 17*, 459-499.

Messner , S.F. (1983). Regional differences in the economic correlates of the urban homicide rate. *Criminology, 21*(4), 477-488.

Messner, S.F. & Blau, J.R. (1987). Routine leisure activities and rates of crime: A macro-level analysis. *Social Forces, 65*(4), 1035-1052.

Messner, S.F. & South, S.J. (1992). Interracial homicide: A macrostructural-opportunity perspective. *Sociological Forum, 7*(3), 517-536.

Messner, S.F. & Tardiff, K. (1985). The social ecology of urban homicide: An application of the "routine activities" approach. *Criminology, 23*, 241-267.

Michael, G. (2006). RAHOWA! A history of the World Church of the Creator. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 18*(4), 561-583.

Mize, K.D. & Shackelford, T.K. (2008). Intimate partner homicide methods in heterosexual, gay, and lesbian relationships. *Violence and Victims, 23*(1), 98-114.

Mize, K.D., Shackelford, T.K., & Shackelford, V.A. (2009). Hands-on killing of intimate partners as a function of sex and relationship status/state. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 463-470.

Moracco, K.E., Runyan, C.W., & Butts, J.D. (1998). Femicide in North Carolina, 1991-1993: A statewide study of patterns and precursors. *Homicide Studies, 2*(4), 422-446.

Mustaine, E.E. & Tewksbury, R. (2006). Predicting risks of larceny theft victimization: A routine activity analysis using refined lifestyle measures. *Criminology, 36*, 829-858.

National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START). (2011). Global Terrorism Database [Data file]. Retrieved from http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd

Nelson, C. & Huff-Corzine, L. (1998). Strangers in the night: An application of the lifestyle-routine activities approach to elderly homicide victimization. *Homicide Studies, 2*, 130-159

O'Brien, S.P. & Haider-Markel, D.P. (1998). Fueling the fire: Social and political correlates of citizen militia activity. *Social Science Quarterly, 79*(2), 456-465.

Ousey, G.C. & Lee, M.R. (2007). Homicide trends and illicit drug markets: Exploring differences across time. *Justice Quarterly, 24*(1), 48-79.

Ousey, G.C. & Lee, M.R. (2010). The southern culture of violence and homicide-type differentiation: An analysis across cities and time points. *Homicide Studies, 14*(2), 268-295.

Palmiotto, M.J. & Janeksela, G.M. (1999). An analysis of weapons used in homicides in the state of Kansas from 1980-1992. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 22*(1), 95-112.

Peterson, D., Taylor, T.J. & Esbensen, F. (2004). Gang membership and violent victimization. *Justice Quarterly, 21*(4), 793-815.

Phillips, J.A. (1997). Variation in African-American homicide rates: An assessment of potential explanations. *Criminology, 35*(4), 527-559.

Pizarro, J.M., Dejong, C., & McGarrell, E.F. (2010). An examination of the covariates of female homicide victimization and offending. *Feminist Criminology, 5*(1), 51-72.

Pizarro, J.M., Zgoba, K.M., & Jennings, W.G. (2011). Assessing the interaction between offender and victim criminal lifestyles & homicide type. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39,* 367-377.

Preeti, C., Magdalena, C., Messner, S.F., Tracy, M., Tardiff, K., & Galea, S. (2011). Race/ethnic-specific homicide rates in New York City: Evaluating the impact of broken windows policing and crack cocaine markets. *Homicide Studies, 15*(3), 268-290.

Pridemore, W. A. (2005). A cautionary note on using county-level crime and homicide data. *Homicide Studies, 9*(3), 256-268.

Pridemore, W.A. and Freilich, J.D. (2005). Gender equity, traditional masculine culture, and female homicide victimization. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33,* 213-223.

Radelet, M. L. & Pierce, G. L. (1985). Race and prosecutorial discretion in homicide cases. *Law & Society Review, 19*(4), 587-622.

Reaves, B. (2010). *Local Police Departments, 2007.* Bureau of Justice Statistics: U.S. Department of Justice.

Ren, L., Zhao, J., & Lovrich, N.P. (2011). Local political structures and violent crime in U.S. cities: Patterns of association in a longitudinal panel study. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 22*(4), 448-470.

Rennison, V.M. & Rand, M. (2007). Introduction to the National Crime Victimization Survey. In J.P. Lynch & L.A. Addington (Eds.), *Understanding Crime Statistics: Revisiting the Divergence of the NCVS and the UCR,* (17-54). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Roncek, D. & Maier, P. (1991). Bars, blocks, and crimes revisited: Linking the theory of routine activities to the empiricism of "hot spots." *Criminology, 29,* 725-753.

Safarik, M.E., Jarvis, J.P., & Nussbaum, K.E. (2002). Sexual homicide of elderly females: Linking offending characteristics to victim and crime scene attributes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(5), 500-525.

Schlesinger, P. (1991). *Media, State and Nation: Political Violence and Collective Identities.* London: Sage Publications.

Schmid, A. and Jongman, A. (2005). *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, & Literature.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Schwartz, J., Steffensmeir, D., Zhong, H., & Ackerman, J. (2009). Trends in the gender gap in violence: Reevaluating NVCS and other evidence. *Criminology, 47*(2), 401-425.

Schwartz, S.J., Dunkel, C.S. & Waterman, A.S. (2009). Terrorism: An identity theory perspective. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 32*, 537-559.

Sen, A. (2006). *Identity & Violence: The Illusion of Violence.* London: Penguin Books.

Shackleford, T.K. (2001). Cohabitation, marriage, and murder: Woman-killing by male romantic partners. *Aggressive Behavior, 27*, 284-291.

Sharpe, T. T. (2000). The identity Christian movement: Ideology of domestic terrorism. *Journal of Black Studies, 30*(4), 604-623.

Shihadeh, E.S. & Barranco, R.E. (2010). Latino immigration, economic deprivation, and violence: Regional differences in the effect of linguistic isolation. *Homicide Studies, 14*(3), 336-355.

Shreck, C.J., Wright, R.A., & Miller, J.M. (2002). A study of individual and situational antecedents of violent victimization. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(1), 159-180.

Silverman, R.A. & Kennedy, L.W. (1987). Relational distance and homicide: The role of the stranger. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 78*(2), 272-308.

Smith, A.D. (1991). *National Identity.* London: Penguin Books.

Smith, B.L. (1994). *Terrorism in America: Pipe Bombs and Pipe Dreams.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Smith, B.L., & Damphousse, K.R. (2007). *American Terrorism Study, 1980-2002* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/

Sobol, J.J. (1997). Behavioral characteristics and level of involvement for victims of homicide. *Homicide Studies, 1*(4), 359-376.

Sorenson, S.B. & Lew, V. (2000). Homicide and nativity: A look at victimization and offending Los Angeles County. *Homicide Studies, 4*(2), 162-184.

Taifeel, H. (Ed.). (2010). *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, T.J., Peterson, D., Eberson, F., & Freng, A. (2007). Gang membership as a risk factor for adolescent violent victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 44*(4), 351-380.

Tennenbaum, A., & Fink, E. (1994). Temporal regularities in homicide: Cycles, seasons, and autoregression. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 10*(4), 317-342.

Tita, G., & Griffiths, E. (2005). Traveling to violence: The case for a mobility-based spatial typology of homicide. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 42*, 275-308.

Titterington, V.B. & Reyes, N.C. (2010). Elder homicide in urban America: An exploratory analysis of Chicago, Houston, and Miami. *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice, 6*(3), 228-249.

Turner, J.C. (2010). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Taifeel (Ed.), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations* (15-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Dyke, N. & Soule, S.A. (2002). Structural social change and the mobilizing effect of threat: Explaining levels of patriot and militia organizing in the United States. *Social Problems, 49*(4), 497-520.

von Hentig, H. (1948). *The Criminal and His Victim.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. (1992). *1990 biennial census* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/

U.S. Census Bureau. (2002). *2000 biennial census* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/

U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). *2010 biennial census* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2011). *The 2010 annual homeless assessment report to Congress.* Retrieved from http://www.hudhre.info/documents/2010HomelessAssessmentReport.pdf

Van Patten, I.T. & Delahuer, P.Q. (2007). Sexual homicide: A spatial analysis of 25 years of deaths in Los Angeles. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 52*(5), 1129-1141.

Vieraitis, L.M. & Williams, M.R. (2002). Assessing the impact of gender inequality on female homicide victimization across U.S. cities: A racially disaggregated analysis. *Violence Against Women, 8*(1), 35-63.

Wadsworth, T. & Roberts, J.M. (2008). When missing data are not missing: A new approach to evaluating supplemental homicide report imputation strategies. *Criminology, 46*(4), 841-870.

Weaver, G.S., Martin, C.D., & Petee, T.A. (2004). Culture, context, and homicide of the elderly. *Sociological Inquiry, 74*(1), 2-19.

Williams, K. R. & Flewelling, R. L. (1987). Family, acquaintance, and stranger homicide: Alternative procedures for rate calculations. *Criminology, 25*(3), 543-560.

Wu, B. (2008). Homicide victimization in California: An Asian and non-Asian comparison. *Violence and Victims, 23*(6), 743-757.