

# Crime & Delinquency

<http://cad.sagepub.com/>

---

## **Multiple Homicide as a Function of Prisonization and Concurrent Instrumental Violence: Testing an Interactive Model —A Research Note**

Matt DeLisi and Glenn D. Walters

*Crime & Delinquency* 2011 57: 147 originally published online 27 January 2009

DOI: 10.1177/0011128708327034

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://cad.sagepub.com/content/57/1/147>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *Crime & Delinquency* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://cad.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://cad.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations:** <http://cad.sagepub.com/content/57/1/147.refs.html>

# Multiple Homicide as a Function of Prisonization and Concurrent Instrumental Violence: Testing an Interactive Model—A Research Note

Crime & Delinquency  
57(1) 147–161  
© 2011 SAGE Publications  
DOI: 10.1177/001128708327034  
<http://cad.sagepub.com>



Matt DeLisi<sup>1</sup> and  
Glenn D. Walters<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

Prisonization (as measured by number of prior incarcerations) and concurrent instrumental offending (as measured by contemporaneous kidnapping, rape, robbery, and burglary offenses) were found to interact in 160 multiple-homicide offenders and 494 single-homicide offenders. Controlling for age, gender, race, criminal history, prior incarcerations, and instrumental contemporaneous offending, the interaction between prior incarceration and instrumental contemporaneous offending was a significant predictor of multiple homicide. These results constitute exploratory evidence suggesting that multiple homicide has a greater likelihood of occurring when prisonization and concurrent instrumental criminal offending are present. The theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed.

---

<sup>1</sup>Iowa State University

<sup>2</sup>Federal Correctional Institution, Schuylkill, Pennsylvania

## Corresponding Author:

Matt DeLisi, PhD, Iowa State University, 203A East Hall, Ames, IA 50011-1070

Email: [delisi@iastate.edu](mailto:delisi@iastate.edu)

**Keywords**

prisonization, instrumental criminal offending, multiple homicide, prison inmates, murder

Highly prolific serial killers may capture the headlines and dominate the television news, but they are not the most common forms of multiple homicide present in society. Domestic murders, such as familicides, murder–suicide, multiple murders committed within the context of a robbery or other crimes, and murder for hire, are more common than serial homicide (Copes, Kerley, & Carroll, 2002; Duwe, 2000, 2004; Fox & Levin, 1998; Hickey, 2006). Regardless of what form multiple homicide may take, there is little in the way of empirical evidence upon which to base firm conclusions about this crime.

In fact, the bulk of prior research has focused on definitional issues surrounding various typologies of homicide offenders. Multiple-homicide offenders have been categorized into one of three groups: serial killers, mass killers, and spree killers. The essential difference between these classifications pertains to the temporal nature of the killing and the time lag, or “cooling-off” period, between killings. Serial homicide offenders kill their victims over an extended period, spanning years or even decades, and take at times significant breaks between killings. This form of multiple-homicide offending is intermittent and prolonged. Although unanimity does not exist, many experts have defined serial-homicide offenders as persons who murder at least three victims (Douglas, Burgess, Burgess, & Ressler, 1992; Ferguson, White, Cherry, Lorenz, & Bhimani, 2003; Hickey, 2002; Keeney & Heide, 1994). Spree killers murder their victims over a truncated period of time, hours or days, often in concert with other criminal activity. According to Rush (2003), spree killers murder victims at two or more locations, with little or no intervening time and as a result of a single event. Mass killers murder victims at a discrete time and place. Mass killing occurs instantaneously and often yields the most victims. Those who murdered at least four victims at one location and place have been characterized as mass killers (Chaiken, Chaiken, & Rhodes, 1994; Fox & Levin, 2003; Rush, 2003).

Most of what is known about multiple homicide comes from news stories, case studies, and secondhand accounts of true-crime authors (Dowden, 2005; Fox & Levin, 1994). Indeed, Fox and Levin (2003) noted that typical approaches to studying multiple-homicide offenders “generally lack any measure of reliability and predictive accuracy. Often they are constructed with items that have no empirical foundation, but merely reflect the characteristics of a troubled individual” (pp. 61–62). One notable exception is a recently published study by DeLisi and Scherer (2006) in which 160 multiple-homicide offenders were

compared to 494 single-homicide offenders on a number of concurrent offense and criminal-history variables. The results of this study indicate that multiple homicide was associated with prior rape convictions, prior incarceration, and greater concurrent involvement in rape and burglary. Despite providing support for a criminal-careers perspective on multiple homicide, the DeLisi and Scherer study did not consider other possible theoretical explanations for multiple homicide, including prisonization and instrumental violence. These topics are examined next.

## Conceptual Background

*Prisonization* is a term coined by Donald Clemmer (1940) to describe the process by which prisoners adopt the customs, mores, and values of the prison culture in which they live. The prisonization thesis provides an explanation for the empirical regularity with which chronic offenders cycle in and out of prison to resume offending upon release. Prisonization also provides a criminological theory that articulates how and why prisons can serve as schools of crime (Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958; Wheeler, 1961). As Norman Hayner and Ellis Ash (1940) observed, “a clear realization of the degenerating influence of our present prison system should encourage more experiments aiming to devise a community for offenders that will actually rehabilitate” (p. 583). Prisonization is not limited to prison settings in the United States. For instance, Akers, Hayner, and Gruninger (1977) examined the effects of prisonization among inmates in five Western nations: England, Mexico, Spain, United States, and West Germany. They found evidence of a normative orientation among inmates directed against prison staff and prison regulations; furthermore, the criminogenic effects of prison were significant even while controlling for individual antisocial characteristics of inmates. Reisig and Lee (2000) reported evidence of prisonization among inmates in Korean prisons. When compared to prisoners who were supervised in more flexible administrative environments, inmates who were housed in the most rigid institutional settings displayed the greatest amount of antisocial attitudes.

Whereas some originally believed that prisonization operated on the basis of deprivation (Sykes, 1958), others have argued that prisonization is largely a consequence of offenders’ importing their values and beliefs into the prison from their criminal lifestyles in the community (Irwin & Cressey, 1962). Research generally supports both models (Hochstetler & DeLisi, 2005; Paterline & Petersen, 1999; Sorensen, Wrinkle, & Gutierrez, 1998; Zaitzow, 1999). Recently, Walters (2003a) explored the prisonization process in some detail and determined that changes in both identity and thinking were critical in

promoting prisonization. In this study, 55 male federal prison inmates with no prior prison experience (novice inmates) and 93 male federal prison inmates with at least one prior incarceration and at least five years of prison experience (experienced inmates) were administered the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (Walters, 1995) and Social Identity as a Criminal (Cameron, 1999) on two occasions, 6 months apart. Whereas the scores of experienced inmates remained reasonably stable over time, novice inmates showed signs of increased criminal identity and proactive/instrumental criminal thinking.

Whether increased instrumentality is a cause, consequence, or correlate of prisonization is currently unknown, but it may well have value in differentiating between single- and multiple-homicide offending. Although myriad typologies of multiple-homicide offenders (e.g., serial, spree, and mass murders) have been advanced (Hickey, 2006), the place of instrumental violence has been latent and at times manifest among them. Across behavioral, affective, and cognitive dimensions, instrumentally violent offenders are noteworthy for their premeditation, scheming, calculation, anticipation of positive crime outcomes, control, and attitudes of privilege (Godwin, 2008; Walters, 2008). For instance, single homicides are often situational or reactive, with the two most common categories of single homicide being an emotionally charged situation involving family members, intimates, or acquaintances and a criminal offense, such as a robbery or burglary gone awry (Smith & Zahn, 2004). Consequently, single homicides are frequently reactive or expressive (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Santtila, Canter, Elfgrén, & Häkkänen, 2001). Compared to the hot-blooded, impulsive, and reactive/ situational character of most single homicides, multiple homicides are generally cold-blooded, purposeful, and proactive/instrumental. For instance, Kraemer, Lord, and Heilbrun (2004) compared single- and serial-homicide offenders and found that the former tended to kill people (via firearm) whom they knew, usually out of anger, but the latter tended to kill strangers (via manual strangulation) for sexual reasons. The intent behind single and serial homicide also supports an instrumental/reactive classification. Kraemer et al. (2004) found that whereas serial-homicide offenders murdered for sexual purposes, single-homicide offenders murdered for emotional reasons.

Reviewing the records of 125 offenders serving time in Canadian prisons for criminal homicide, Woodworth and Porter (2002) uncovered a relationship between psychopathy and the rated instrumentality of the homicide. Approximately 90% of the psychopathic murderers in the Woodworth and Porter study committed instrumental homicides, whereas slightly more than half of the nonpsychopathic murderers committed reactive homicides. In a study of subtypes of criminal psychopaths, Swogger and Kosson (2007) found that primary psychopaths had significantly higher arrest histories for serious violent crimes,

as compared to other offender groups. Based on the Supplementary Homicide Reports and newspaper archives, the work of Petee, Padgett, and York (1997) examined 139 mass killers from 1965 to 1995 and found that the modal group committed felony murder; in other words, their killing rampage occurred along with other criminal activity. To the extent that a link exists between psychopathy and serial murder (Porter & Woodworth, 2006), instrumentality may play an important role in serial murder and other forms of multiple homicide.

The instrumentality of homicide offending is largely contingent on the presence of other criminal behaviors. Offenders must gain access to potential victims to ultimately murder them, and this frequently involves other serious crimes, such as kidnapping, rape, robbery, and burglary. There is precedence in the literature that these four offenses are instrumental vis-à-vis homicide offenders, particularly, those who murder multiple victims over time (Hazelwood & Warren, 2000; Knight, 1999; McCabe & Wauchope, 2005; Miethe & Drass, 1999; Vaughn, DeLisi, Beaver, & Howard, 2008). In their study of serial sexual homicide, Myers, Husted, Safarik, and O'Toole (2006) asserted that serial killers should be considered a type of sex offender because sexual sadism is the prevailing motivating factor behind their murders, which explicitly connotes the association between instrumental violence and multiple homicide. In their analyses of 456 career criminals with a minimum criterion of 30 arrests, Vaughn et al. (2008) used latent profile analysis to document a small subgroup of burglars (6% of the total sample) who were classified as sexual predators. This group had the most severe criminal history, the earliest onset of arrest, and greater involvement in offenses, such as murder, aggravated assault, and sexual assault. To the modal criminal offender, burglary is the pathway to access property; to others, it is the gateway to the goals of kidnapping, rape, and murder.

## Current Focus

Prisonization and nonhomicidal instrumental criminal offending may be insufficient to increase a person's propensity for multiple homicide in isolation. However, combining these two factors, as represented by an interaction in which prisonization and nonhomicidal instrumental criminal offending are high, may significantly enhance the probability of multiple homicide. To test this possibility, the number of prior incarcerations served as a proxy for prisonization, and the number of contemporaneous rapes, robberies, kidnappings, and burglaries served as proxies for concurrent nonhomicidal instrumental criminal offending. Number of prior incarcerations has been employed in several prior studies as a measure of prisonization (Dhami, Ayton, & Loewenstein, 2007; McCorkle,

Miethe, & Drass, 1995), and these crimes have been coded as being primarily instrumental in prior research (Cornell et al., 1996; Miethe & Drass, 1999; also see Kerley, Copes, Hochstetler, & Carroll, 2002). The hypothesis tested in this study held that the interaction between prisonization (prior incarceration) and nonhomicidal instrumental criminal offending (offenses for rape, robbery, kidnapping, or burglary) will successfully discriminate between multiple-homicide offenders and single-homicide offenders after controlling for basic demographics (age, gender, race), criminal history (prior community corrections sentences, prior arrests, age at first arrest), prior incarcerations, and the non-homicidal instrumental offenses being evaluated.

## Method

### *Participants*

Homicide offenders are relatively rare in number and are scarcely found in conventional probability samples, conditions that necessitate accessing correctional samples through official records. The current study uses DeLisi and Scherer's (2006) data from a stratified convenience sample of 654 convicted and incarcerated homicide offenders selected in 2003 from eight states (Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Texas) spanning the Midwestern, Southern, and Atlantic coast areas of the United States. These states were selected because they provided biographical information on homicide offenders (e.g., name, sex, race, and date of birth), which could be used to locate their publicly available criminal records. Criminal records contained arrest, judicial, and correctional information and were produced by a clearinghouse with access to criminal justice information in 45 states and Washington, DC. The records clearinghouse service updated its database every month, producing criminal records that, though not as exhaustive as National Crime Information Center rap sheets, were valid measures of offenders' official criminal history (Farrington et al., 2003; Geerken, 1994), particularly, those of homicide offenders (DeLisi, Hochstetler, Scherer, Purhmann, & Berg, 2008; DeLisi & Scherer, 2006; K. A. Wright, Pratt, & DeLisi, 2008).

### *Procedure*

Three demographic measures were included as control variables in this study: chronological age, race, and gender. Chronological age ( $M = 39.12$ ,  $SD = 10.77$ , range = 18–82) was the offender's age at the time of their arrest for the instant homicide offense. Race was dichotomized into White and non-White, with White

participants being coded 0 ( $n = 264$ ) and non-White participants being coded 1 ( $n = 390$ ). Gender was coded 0 for males ( $n = 618$ ) and 1 for females ( $n = 36$ ).

Four measures of criminal history were included as control variables. Prior community corrections sentences ( $M = 2.09$ ,  $SD = 2.77$ , range = 0–21) included prior sentences to deferred judgments, probation, parole, or any other community-based sanction. Prior arrests ( $M = 3.69$ ,  $SD = 4.97$ , range = 0–36) was a summary measure of career arrests, and age at first arrest ( $M = 21.71$ ,  $SD = 7.53$ , range = 13–73) was the official onset of the criminal career. Prior prison included all prior incarcerations to state and federal prison ( $M = 1.43$ ,  $SD = 1.82$ , range = 0–11).

A composite instrumental offending variable ( $M = 1.63$ ,  $SD = 2.99$ , range = 0–32) was created to test the hypothesis that the interaction between prisonization (prior incarcerations) and nonhomicidal instrumental criminal offending (offenses for rape, robbery, kidnapping, or burglary that were contemporaneous to the instant homicides) would discriminate between multiple-homicide offenders and single-homicide offenders. The original prior incarcerations to state and federal prison and the concurrent offense variables (kidnapping, rape, robbery, and burglary) were included in the models, along with their interactive term, to provide a more conservative test of the hypothesized linkage between prisonization and nonhomicidal instrumental criminal offending. Descriptive statistics for all study variables appear in Table 1.

Two-block binomial logistic regression analyses were conducted, with demographic variables, criminal history variables, prior incarcerations, and concurrent offenses entered as independent variables in the first block and with prior incarcerations by instrumental contemporaneous offenses interaction entered as an independent variable in the second block of a stepwise binomial logistic regression analysis. Multiple-homicide offending ( $no = 0$ ,  $yes = 1$ ) served as the dichotomous dependent variable.

## Results

Table 2 contains binomial logistic regression results for the composite measure of instrumental offenses. Two significant effects emerged. Those serving community corrections sentences were significantly less likely ( $B = -.157$ , Wald = 4.316,  $p < .05$ ) to commit multiple homicide. This makes intuitive sense given that less dangerous offenders are generally more likely to receive community corrections sentences as opposed to prison. Offenders with a prior prison history and concurrent involvement in kidnapping were at elevated risk for committing multiple homicide ( $B = .064$ , Wald = 9.408,  $p < .01$ ). In addition, the omnibus tests of model coefficients show that the contemporaneous

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range
Chronological age	39.12	10.77	18–82
Prior community corrections sentences	2.09	2.77	0–21
Prior arrests	3.69	4.97	0–36
Age at first arrest	21.71	7.53	13–73
Prior prison sentences	1.43	1.82	0–11
Instrumental contemporaneous offenses	1.63	2.99	0–32
	<i>n</i>	%	
Multiple-homicide offending			
Yes	160	24.5	
No	494	75.5	
Gender			
Male	618	94.5	
Female	36	4.5	
Race			
White	264	40.4	
Non-White	390	59.6	

**Table 2.** Binomial Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Composite Instrumental Offenses

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald	Exp ( $\beta$ )	95% CI
Chronological age	-.002	.012	0.035	0.998	0.975–1.021
Gender (male versus female)	.749	.506	2.190	2.114	0.784–5.696
Race (White versus non-White)	.008	.195	0.002	1.009	0.688–1.478
Age at first arrest	.012	.017	0.519	1.012	0.979–1.046
Prior community corrections sentences	-.157	.075	4.316*	0.855	0.738–0.991
Prior arrests	.050	.042	1.448	1.051	0.969–1.141
Prior incarcerations	-.058	.097	0.361	0.943	0.779–1.141
Instrumental contemporaneous offenses	.016	.040	0.166	1.017	0.939–1.100
Incarceration by instrumental offenses	.064	.021	9.408**	1.067	1.024–1.111

Note: Variable = predictors in logistic regression equation; *B* = unstandardized logit regression coefficient; *SE* = standard error; Wald = Wald statistic with a chi-square distribution and one degree of freedom; exp ( $\beta$ ) = exponent of the estimated coefficient; 95% CI = 95th percentile confidence interval for the exponent of the estimated coefficient.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

instrumental offenses by prior incarceration interaction variable,  $\chi^2(1) = 11.36$ ,  $p < .001$ , contributed significant information to the prediction of multiple-homicide offending net the competing effects of demographics, arrest onset, prior arrests, prior incarcerations, and concurrent offenses.

## Discussion

It is said that prisons are schools of crime that exacerbate the antisocial thinking styles, personalities, and behaviors that engender recidivism (Maruna & Toch, 2005). In this way, prior imprisonment serves as a causal force for recursive criminal careers characterized by criminal offending, confinement, release, recidivism, and reincarceration. Although Clemmer's (1940) prisonization thesis is nearly 70 years old, researchers have been slow to extend it. As such, the current research redresses the prisonization thesis by examining the interaction between prior incarceration and contemporaneous instrumental criminal offending as predictors of multiple homicide. Offenders with prior prison experience who subsequently commit kidnapping, robbery, rape, or burglary are significantly more likely to murder multiple victims above and beyond the net effect of basic demographics, criminal career variables, and the prior incarceration and concurrent instrumental violence measures that form the interaction. The results observed in the present study point to an additive effect whereby prior incarcerations and contemporaneous kidnapping, robbery, rape, and burglary offenses combined, but not alone, increased the risk of multiple homicide in a sample of 654 convicted murderers.

Theoretical and practical implications can be drawn from the present findings of this research note. Theoretically, the present results indicate that deviant socialization could play a fundamental role in multiple homicide by virtue of the fact that learning is central to prisonization and instrumental violence. Prisonization is the process by which the uninitiated acquire the mores, values, and attitudes conducive to physical and psychological survival in the harsh prison environment (Stretesky, Pogrebin, Unnithan, & Venor, 2007; Walters, 2003a). Whereas brain dysfunction is sometimes considered a major cause of reactive violence, instrumental violence is more often attributed to failed moral learning whereby the person models others' instrumental aggression and so forms positive outcome expectancies for violence (Blair, 2004). Although this discussion is speculative, it suggests that learning may be at least as important as biology in explaining multiple homicide.

If learning is critical to multiple homicide, then a practical implication from the results of this study is that future homicide may be prevented by teaching juvenile and young adult offenders new skills and attitudes. For instance, a variety of scholars (Castle & Hensley, 2002; Singer & Hensley, 2004; J. Wright & Hensley,

2003) applied social learning theory to serial murder by using juvenile fire setting, juvenile history of cruelty to animals, and military experience as the learning mechanisms that ultimately contributed to serial murder. In this way, we are not the first to posit a learning approach to multiple-homicide offending.

To be effective, prevention programs must target prisonization and instrumental criminality. First, prisons need to stop being schools for crime and start being houses of habilitation and rehabilitation. This can be accomplished by changing correctional policies, procedures, and attitudes. For instance, Walters (2003b, 2004) provided evidence that relatively simple interventions, such as psychoeducational programs, can target thinking styles and thus reduce inmate positive outcome expectancies from criminal offending and increase inmate negative outcome expectancies from criminal offending. Second, we must find interventions that are as effective in reducing prisonization and ameliorating instrumental aggression as the anger and stress management strategies that are now routinely used in correctional treatment to reduce reactive and situational aggression (Ireland, 2004). This can be accomplished by gaining greater understanding of the nature of instrumental aggression and criminality.

Some limitations of the current study should be considered in guiding future research of multiple-homicide offenders. The first pertains to the inherent restraints in obtaining data on extreme/rare offenders, such as those who commit homicide and multiple homicides. For instance, in his review of homicide data sources, Reidel (1999) advised that "homicide researchers operate under a severe constraint from the outset; given its rarity, researchers are unlikely to directly observe the subjects in their studies" (p. 175). Consequently, researchers who are interested in homicide must often rely on secondary data, which may not directly address the experimental hypotheses being tested by the researcher, because they were collected for other purposes. Another possible limitation of these data is that the homicide offenders are alive; that is, they did not commit suicide at the time of their homicide event. An estimated 30% of mass murderers exhibit suicidal tendencies (Duwe, 2004; Fox & Levin, 2005), which could pose a selection bias. Moreover, Duwe (2004) suggested that mass murderers who commit suicide are more likely to murder for expressive reasons, whereas those who do not commit suicide are those who commit instrumental, felony murder-type massacres.

Although extant research has similarly used number of prior incarcerations as a measure of prisonization (Dhami et al., 2007; McCorkle et al., 1995), we recognize that it is at best a proxy of the prisonization thesis advanced by Clemmer (1940). It is possible that the total amount of time spent in prison is a better measure of prisonization than the number of prior incarcerations. That is, one long prison sentence (e.g., 20 years) could be much more damaging than several shorter prison sentences. Indeed, Wheeler (1961) found that

the inmate culture should give expression to the values of those who are most committed to a criminal value system—the long termers, those who have followed systematic criminal careers . . . and if the culture is viewed as an outgrowth of the criminogenic character of inmates, it is reasonable to expect a reinforcement process operating throughout the duration of confinement. (p. 708)

Future research should strive for measures that operationalize attitudinal constructs related to being an inmate, to provide a specific test of prisonization theory. Still, the current data are consistent with Heide's (2003) guidelines positing that studies that employ samples with large numbers of murderers, explore clinical or offense-related variables, and utilize a control group are methodologically superior approaches to studying homicide offenders.

A final question that needs to be answered by future research is whether multiple-homicide offenders form a homogeneous group or break down into subtypes. DeLisi and Scherer (2006) contend that traditional boundaries between serial killers, mass murderers, and spree killers may be artificial and empirically unjustified. Unfortunately, there were too few serial and mass murderers in the present sample to conduct meaningful subanalyses. Consequently, future researchers will be left to determine whether multiple killers can be meaningfully organized into subgroups and, if so, whether these subgroups differ in terms of the learning experiences that apparently contribute to multiple murder and make each subgroup more or less amenable to change.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interests with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The author(s) received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

### **References**

- Akers, R. L., Hayner, N. S., & Gruninger, W. (1977). Prisonization in five countries: Type of prison and inmate characteristics. *Criminology*, *14*, 527-554.
- Blair, R. J. R. (2004). The roles of orbital frontal cortex in the modulation of antisocial behavior. *Brain and Cognition*, *55*, 198-208.
- Cameron, J. E. (1999). Social identity and the pursuit of possible selves: Implications for the psychological well-being of university students. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *3*, 179-189.

- Castle, T., & Hensley, C. (2002). Serial killers with military experience: Applying learning theory to serial murder. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 46, 453-465.
- Chaiken, J., Chaiken, M., & Rhodes, W. (1994). Predicting violent behavior and classifying violent offenders. In A. J. Reiss & J. A. Roth (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing violence: Vol. 4. Consequences and control* (pp. 217-295). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. Boston: Christopher.
- Copes, H., Kerley, K. R., & Carroll, A. (2002). Killed in the act: A descriptive analysis of crime-precipitated homicide. *Homicide Studies*, 6, 240-257.
- Cornell, D. G., Warren, J., Hawk, G., Stafford, E., Oram, G., & Pine, D. (1996). Psychopathy in instrumental and reactive violent offenders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64, 783-790.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- DeLisi, M., Hochstetler, A., Scherer, A. M., Purhmann, A., & Berg, M. T. (2008). The Starkweather syndrome: Exploring criminal history antecedents of homicidal crime spree. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 21, 35-45.
- DeLisi, M., & Scherer, A. M. (2006). Multiple homicide offenders: Offense characteristics, social correlates, and criminal careers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33, 367-391.
- Dhami, M. K., Ayton, P., & Loewenstein, G. (2007). Adaptation to prison: Indigenous or imported? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 1085-1100.
- Douglas, J., Burgess, A., Burgess, A., & Ressler, R. (1992). *Crime classification manual*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Dowden, C. (2005). Research on multiple murder: Where are we in the state of the art? *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 20, 8-19.
- Duwe, G. (2000). Body-count journalism: The presentation of mass murder in the news media. *Homicide Studies*, 4, 364-399.
- Duwe, G. (2004). The patterns and prevalence of mass murder in twentieth-century America. *Justice Quarterly*, 21, 729-761.
- Farrington, D. P., Jolliffe, D., Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Hill, K. G., & Kosterman, R. (2003). Comparing delinquency careers in court records and self-reports. *Criminology*, 41, 933-958.
- Ferguson, C. J., White, D. E., Cherry, S., Lorenz, M., & Bhimani, Z. (2003). Defining and classifying serial murder in the context of perpetrator motivation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31, 287-292.
- Fox, J. A., & Levin, J. (1994). *Overkill: Mass murder and serial killing exposed*. New York: Plenum.
- Fox, J. A., & Levin, J. (1998). Multiple homicide: Patterns of serial and mass murder. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (Vol. 23, pp. 407-455). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Fox, J. A., & Levin, J. (2003). Mass murder: An analysis of extreme violence. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies, 5*, 47-64.
- Fox, J. A., & Levin, J. (2005). *Extreme killing: Understanding serial and mass murder*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Geerken, M. R. (1994). Rap sheets in criminological research: Considerations and caveats. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 10*, 3-21.
- Godwin, G. M. (2008). *Hunting serial predators* (2nd ed.). Boston: Jones and Bartlett.
- Hayner, N. S., & Ash, E. (1940). The prison as a community. *American Sociological Review, 5*, 577-583.
- Hazelwood, R. R., & Warren, J. I. (2000). The sexually violent offender: Impulsive or ritualistic? *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*, 307-318.
- Heide, K. M. (2003). Youth homicide: A review of the literature and a blueprint for action. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 47*, 6-36.
- Hickey, E. (2002). *Serial murderers and their victims* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hickey, E. (2006). *Serial murderers and their victims* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Hochstetler, A., & DeLisi, M. (2005). Importation, deprivation, and varieties of serving time: An integrated-lifestyle-exposure model of prison offending. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*, 257-266.
- Ireland, J. L. (2004). Anger management therapy with young male offenders: An evaluation of treatment outcome. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 174-185.
- Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. R. (1962). Thieves, convicts, and the inmate culture. *Social Problems, 10*, 142-155.
- Keeney, B. T., & Heide, K. M. (1994). Gender differences in serial murderers: A preliminary analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9*, 37-56.
- Kerley, K. R., Copes, H., Hochstetler, A. L., & Carroll, A. (2002). Fighting back: Lethal responses to predatory attacks. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 17*, 52-64.
- Knight, R. A. (1999). Validation of a typology for rapists. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 303-330.
- Kraemer, G. W., Lord, W. D., & Heilbrun, K. (2004). Comparing single and serial homicide offenses. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 22*, 325-343.
- Maruna, S., & Toch, H. (2005). The impact of imprisonment on the desistance process. In J. Travis & C. Visher (Eds.), *Prisoner reentry and crime in America* (pp. 139-178). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCabe, M. P., & Wauchope, M. (2005). Behavioral characteristics of rapists. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 11*, 235-247.

- McCorkle, R. C., Miethe, T. D., & Drass, K. A. (1995). The roots of prison violence— A test of deprivation, management, and not-so-total institution models. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41, 317-331.
- Miethe, T. D., & Drass, K. A. (1999). Exploring the social context of instrumental and expressive homicides: An application of qualitative comparative analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 15, 1-21.
- Myers, W. C., Husted, D. S., Safarik, M. E., & O'Toole, M. (2006). The motivation behind serial sexual homicide: Is it sex, power and control, or anger? *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 51, 900-907.
- Paterline, B. A., & Petersen, D. M. (1999). Structural and social psychological determinants of prisonization. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 427-441.
- Petee, T. A., Padgett, K. G., & York, T. S. (1997). Debunking the stereotype: An examination of mass murder in public places. *Homicide Studies*, 1, 317-337.
- Porter, S., & Woodworth, M. (2006). Psychopathy and aggression. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 481-494). New York: Guilford.
- Reisig, M. D., & Lee, Y. H. (2000). Prisonization in the Republic of Korea. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 23-31.
- Rush, G. E. (2003). *The dictionary of criminal justice* (6th ed.). New York: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.
- Santtila, P., Canter, D., Elfgrén, T., & Häkkänen, H. (2001). The structure of crime-scene actions in Finnish homicides. *Homicide Studies*, 5, 363-387.
- Singer, S. D., & Hensley, C. (2004). Applying social learning theory to childhood and adolescent fire-setting: Can it lead to serial murder? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 48, 461-476.
- Smith, M. D., & Zahn, M. (2004). *Homicide: A sourcebook of social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Sorensen, J., Wrinkle, R., & Gutierrez, A. (1998). Patterns of rule-violating behaviors and adjustment to incarceration among murderers. *Prison Journal*, 78, 222-231.
- Stretesky, P. B., Pogrebin, M., Unnithan, N. P., & Venor, G. (2007). Prisonization and accounts of gun carrying. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 485-497.
- Swogger, M. T., & Kosson, D. S. (2007). Identifying subtypes of criminal psychopaths: A replication and extension. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 953-970.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Vaughn, M. G., DeLisi, M., Beaver, K. M., & Howard, M. O. (2008). Toward a quantitative typology of burglars: A latent profile analysis of career offenders. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 53, 1-6.
- Walters, G. D. (1995). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles: Part I. Reliability and preliminary validity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22, 307-325.
- Walters, G. D. (2003a). Changes in criminal thinking and identity in novice and experienced inmates: Prisonization revisited. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30, 399-421.

- Walters, G. D. (2003b). Changes in outcome expectancies and criminal thinking following a brief course of psychoeducation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 691-701.
- Walters, G. D. (2004). Changes in positive and negative crime expectancies in inmates exposed to a brief psychoeducational intervention: Further data. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 505-512.
- Walters, G. D. (2008). Criminal predatory behavior in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. In M. DeLisi & P. J. Conis (Eds.), *Violent offenders: Theory, research, public policy, and practice* (pp. 191-204). Boston: Jones and Bartlett.
- Wheeler, S. (1961). Socialization in correctional communities. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 697-712.
- Woodworth, M., & Porter, S. (2002). In cold blood: Characteristics of criminal homicides as a function of psychopathy. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 111, 436-445.
- Wright, J., & Hensley, C. (2003). From animal cruelty to serial murder: Applying the graduation hypothesis. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 47, 71-88.
- Wright, K. A., Pratt, T. C., & DeLisi, M. (2008). Examining offending specialization in a sample of male homicide offenders. *Homicide Studies*, 12, 381-398.
- Zaitzow, B. H. (1999). Doing time: A case study of a North Carolina youth institution. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 22, 91-124.

## Bios

**Matt DeLisi**, PhD, is coordinator of criminal justice studies, associate professor of sociology, and faculty affiliate with the Center for the Study of Violence at Iowa State University. He has published more than 85 scholarly works and has forthcoming articles in *American Journal of Public Health*, *Crime & Delinquency*, *Criminology*, *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Social Science Research*, *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, and many others.

**Glenn D. Walters**, PhD, currently serves as drug program coordinator at the Federal Correctional Institution, Schuylkill, Pennsylvania. His research interests fall into three areas: the genetic correlates of crime, substance abuse, and problem gambling; psychological assessment of offenders, with an emphasis on criminal thinking and psychopathy; and development of an overarching theory of criminal behavior. He has published nearly 200 articles and book chapters and is the author of 14 books, including *The Criminal Lifestyle* (1990), *Criminal Belief Systems* (2002), and *Lifestyle Theory: Past, Present, and Future* (2006).