

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND CRIMINOLOGY

Patterns In Homicide Correlates

LOGAN WINCOTT
FALL 2023

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Criminology and Sociology
with honors in Criminology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Dr. Jeffrey Ulmer
Professor of Criminology and Sociology
Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Stacy Silver
Associate Professor of Sociology and Human Development and Family Studies
Honors Adviser

* Electronic approvals are on file.

ABSTRACT

The steps leading up to a homicide and the actions taken post-homicide are crucial to understanding the defendant's malice, culpability, dangerousness, and criminal liability. I analyzed 213 convicted first-, second-, and third-degree homicides across five counties in Pennsylvania from 2012 to 2016. We found a small percentage of approximately 7.7% of cases where the defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body. In 16.2% of cases, the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation of the defendant. In approximately 7.5% of cases there was more than one victim. I divided the dataset into two categories: homicide via firearm and exorbitant killing. I found that in firearm homicides the defendant was less likely to be psychologically evaluated, more likely to be premeditated, and more likely to have a co-defendant. I also found that in exorbitant homicides the victim was much more likely to be familiarly related to the defendant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| LIST OF TABLES | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | ix |
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 2 Review of Literature..... | 3 |
| Chapter 3 Research Questions | 5 |
| Chapter 4 Data and Methods..... | 9 |
| Chapter 5 Results | 11 |
| Chapter 6 Conclusion..... | 21 |
| References..... | 27 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Homicide Charge Filled by County Prosecutor..... | 11 |
| Table 2: Key Variables Using Entire Homicides Dataset..... | 11 |
| Table 3.1: Homicides Via Firearm Key Variables | 12 |
| Table 4.1: Exorbitant Homicides Key Variables | 14 |
| Table 5: Cross-tabulation of Gun Homicides by the Defendant Bringing Weapon Used in Homicide to the Crime Scene (Pre-meditation)..... | 17 |
| Table 6: Cross-tabulations of Exorbitant Homicides by the Defendant Bringing Weapon Used in Homicide to the Crime Scene (Pre-meditation)..... | 18 |
| Table 7: Cross-tabulation of If the Defense Attorney Requested a Psychological Evaluation for the Defendant, Filtered by If the Defendant Brought the Weapon to Crime Scene Out. Exorbitant Homicides and Firearm Homicides..... | 19 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Jeffrey Ulmer who has worked with me and been a mentor to me for the last four years. It has been such an honor to learn from him and have his expertise and guidance in criminology. His patience, dedication to this field, and his knowledge of research are truly one of a kind and I could not have been more fortunate to have him as my thesis advisor throughout this process. I would like to thank Dr. Gary Zajac and Dr. John Kramer for allowing me to work with the dataset they worked endlessly on with other criminologists to code. Next, I would like to thank Dr. Stacy Silver for her guidance and support throughout my time in the Schreyer Honors College. Her commitment to the Schreyer Honors College and her love for working with students has made my time in Schreyer extremely memorable. Lastly, I would like to thank all the Schreyer Honors College faculty and students for the endless opportunities, for pushing me to become the best version of myself, and for the relationships I'll forever cherish.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Murder is the most severe type of crime. Murder is the unlawful taking of another human being's life. Every year innocent lives are unjustly stolen from their loved ones who then have to go on through life without them. Murder is an especially difficult crime to address in criminal justice because, unlike other crimes where a restorative justice approach is taken to help fix the wrongs the offender did to the victim such as theft, burglary, or robbery, there is no way to help bring someone back to life or compensate monetarily for the lost life of a loved one. There are endless aggravating factors that can make a homicide more traumatic for the victim's family. Aggravating factors are anything that makes the crime worse, this could include action taken before, during, or after the homicide, or could include characteristics of the victim such as being pregnant or being a first responder at the time of their murder. There are also mitigating factors that may help lessen the traumatic impact on the victim's family such as unintentional vehicular manslaughter. Mitigating factors are anything that lessens the brutality of the crime, such as the defendant being under duress at the time of the crime, or other motivating factors such as stealing from a convenience store to feed a hungry child.

Murder is an extraordinarily unique crime because the motive behind homicide is different for every defendant, and the means of the crime differs significantly. There are homicides of parents or intimate partners who have abused their children or partners for years until the victim starts to believe the only way to escape the abuse is to kill their abuser. There are homicides between rival gangs. There are homicides over money, drugs, or certain individuals who appear to have no reason at all except it makes them feel powerful. The means of homicide differs from firearms (of which there are many different kinds), to knives, to blunt force objects, to physically by hands via strangulation or with another object such as suffocation with a pillow or bag, or other methods such as drowning, or pushing someone off a

ledge. No two homicides are exactly alike, meaning no investigation or court processes can be exactly alike. This makes it extremely difficult for detectives, officers, lawyers, and judges. This also makes it difficult for criminologists to study and for law enforcement to deter murder.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there are approximately 1100 homicides in Pennsylvania annually (CDC, 2023). I am conducting this study to better understand if there are similarities between homicides and if offenders do act alike in specific cases or ways. If patterns in homicides can be found it could help detectives solve cases quicker, as well as help prosecutors, defense attorneys, and judges in the sentencing process as they will be able to better understand criminal homicide. This research was an exploratory study designed to better understand homicides and evaluate consistencies across homicide behavior. To achieve the goal of this study, I looked at 213 convicted first-, second-, and third-degree homicides in addition to dropped cases, and successful self-defense pleas across five counties in Pennsylvania from 2012 to 2016. I took this dataset of 213 homicides in Pennsylvania analyzed the dataset as a whole and then divided the dataset into two categories based on correlates that began to emerge: weapon type. Homicide via firearm, and what I call “exorbitant killings” which are more extreme, brutal, and violent killings.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Homicide is a multifaceted subject. There is prior research on serial killers, victim-offender relationships, masking the body after the homicide, various theories attempting to explain certain types of homicide, offender's previous violent convictions, defendant's psychological state, the correlation between weapon types, etc. Most researchers have used the rational choice perspective to explain how the criminal acts throughout the commission of a homicide. The rational choice perspective states that an individual will perform a cost-benefit analysis of a crime where they would weigh the benefits and disadvantages of each action before they take another step. We see in previous literature that individual's rational decision-making choices are limited, or bounded by the information readily available to them, making rationality individual-specific (Chai, et al. 2021). It's extremely important to acknowledge in the rational decision-making process outside factors such as the psychology of the individual play a vital role in the crime. Other important factors include the defendant's social interaction with the victim, i.e., their relationship, the defendant's attitudes, feelings, etc. (Tedeschi & Felson, 1996).

In previous research on homicides and the victim-offender relationship regarding the weapon type; in a study of 821 homicides, where 68.2% were homicides via firearm, friends/acquaintances made up 83% of the victim-offender relationships (Pelletier & Pizarro, 2018). This demonstrates the consistency in firearm homicides that show a very small if any familial victim-offender relationship. Most of the victim-offender relationships in gun homicides are friends, acquaintances, or strangers.

In other literature, there is shown to be substantial differences in the behavior of homicide defendants who have mental disorders compared to those who do not have mental disorders (Carabellese, et al, 2021). This is most clear for the homicides that exhibit extreme violent behavior, i.e. what is referred to as exorbitant homicides in this paper. Previous research has delved into specific mental disorders such as schizophrenia that have increased the risk of homicide and contained more violent behavior (Fazel, et al, 2009). Unfortunately, for this research, we do not have the specific mental disorder

of those defendants who were diagnosed incompetent to stand trial. There is also substantial research that connects psychotic symptoms to the defendant's ability to effectively plan a homicide, and carry out the homicide, all while mentally and emotionally detaching from their victims, allowing them to exhibit extreme violence with little to no remorse.

The role that a psychological evaluation plays in court for homicide differs; the main reason a defense attorney seeks a psychological evaluation is to mitigate guilt away from the defendant (Walker, et al, 2020). More research has shown that forensic mental health professionals are asked to evaluate the defendant and then testify on the defendant's extreme mental or emotional abuse in their background, reduced mental capacity, and help to humanize the defendants (Fabian, 2009). Some of these factors could account for the psychological requests in our dataset by the defense attorneys.

I previously discussed the differences in homicide that make each crime so unique, specifically differing motives, furthering this discussion in previous literature homicides have been put into two categories: instrumental and expressive crimes. Expressive and instrumental crimes were first defined by William Chambliss in 1967. Chambliss described instrumental crimes as criminal behavior committed specifically to attain some goal (Chambliss, 1967). He defines expressive crimes as an act that is committed because it is pleasurable in and of itself and not because it is a route to some other goal (Chambliss, 1967). It's important to study these types of homicides in the category they are because a homicide that is goal-oriented can be deterred whereas a homicide that is driven by emotion is much more difficult to deter. "Murder as an expressive act is quite resistant to punishment as a deterrent, as is drug addiction; instrumental acts, such as violating parking regulations and shoplifting by middle-class housewives, are more likely to be influenced by the threat or imposition of punishment" (Chambliss, 1967). There have been thousands of studies since 1967 on expressive versus instrumental crimes. Understanding the difference between expressive and instrumental homicides can be beneficial to detectives and crime scene investigators in solving the case quicker using offender typology research (Adjorlolo & Chan, 2016).

Chapter 3

Research Questions

For a homicide to be considered an exorbitant killing it must meet one of the following criteria:

- The method of killing included one of the following:
 - Stabbing
 - Strangulation/ Drowning/ Asphyxiation
 - Blunt force trauma
- If the defendant was alleged to have tortured the victim
- If the victim had issued a Protection from Abuse order against the defendant and it was granted by the court
- If the victim had their throat slashed
- If the victim had multiple stab wounds
- If the defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body.

I created this category of homicide because these homicides are excessive crimes, these homicides are more complex, they are rare compared to gun homicides, and they are less studied in criminology.

Exorbitant homicides tend to not be premeditated and, therefore are more difficult to deter.

In the United States, the primary method of homicide is by firearm; previous research indicates approximately one-third of homicides in America are committed using firearms (Masscia & Brownlee, 2023; Statista 2022). The reason homicide via firearm was put into its own category is because this is the quickest and most detached weapon choice. With a firearm you can turn your head, you can close your eyes, and you can be over twenty feet away from the victim when the trigger is pulled. Firearm homicides are more common due to their availability, a lot of people's exposure to them, and their long history of

being a self-defense weapon since the 1800s. Firearm homicides lack the aspect of extreme violence on behalf of the offender. For these reasons, they differ from exorbitant homicides.

Originally, I intended to focus on the small percentage of individuals who chose to try and dispose of the body post-homicide. I initially began this study as an exploratory evaluation of action taken to the body post-homicide and the thought process of offenders who try to cover their tracks or desecrate the body. However, of the 213 homicides, only in 16 of them the defendants tried to hide, conceal, or move the body. This was an extremely small dataset to work with, in addition, to obtain the information I needed to adequately address research questions regarding the thorough process of a criminal who takes actions to the body post-homicide, I would have needed to sit down with the defendants and conduct an interview asking them to explain their thought processes before, during, and after the crime. I did not have access to these individuals to conduct such interviews, which led me to focus on the dataset on hand and read through the cases to see if there were other patterns I could study. This brought me to the similarities in homicides by weapon type.

1. Is there an association between a victim-offender relationship and exorbitant killings?

Murder that occurs with close contact weaponry, or is an exorbitant killing tends to be a more vile, expressive, emotional crime. I want to explore if this type of killing is more common when there is a familial relationship between the defendant and the victim than when the victim is a stranger to the defendant or an acquaintance. It is my hypothesis that there will be a higher likelihood that the victim is familial to the defendant because of the emotional attachment involved in expressive killings.

2. Is there a correlation between weapon type and premeditation?

When a homicide is premeditated the defendant not only plans out how they are going to kill their victim, but they also take a substantial step towards committing the crime. It is my hypothesis that when homicide is premediated the weapon of choice is more likely to be a firearm than any other weapon such

as a knife, or object. I believe this is because firearms require the least amount of physical exertion in homicide.

3. Is there a correlation between weapon type and having a co-defendant?

As previously mentioned, it is my hypothesis that when a homicide is premediated the weapon of choice is more often a firearm than not; it is also my hypothesis that when a homicide is premediated there is more often times than not, a co-defendant. I expect to see a higher percentage of co-defendants when the weapon choice is firearm than the number of co-defendants when it is an exorbitant killing.

4. Is there a correlation between weapon type and multiple victims?

As previously stated, homicide via firearm is the weapon choice that requires the least amount of physical exertion, this weapon choice also has substantial room for error in the process of the killing due to the recoil of a gun, the sight or scope being off center, the expertise of the handler, and the possibility of the bullet ricocheting from one victim to another. Due to these reasons, I believe there will be a greater number of victims when the weapon choice is firearm than when there is an exorbitant killing.

5. Is there a correlation between weapon choice and the defense attorney requesting a psychological evaluation?

I believe there will be a correlation between weapon choice and the defense attorney requesting a psychological evaluation. When the homicide is committed with close contact with weaponry, stabbing, blunt force trauma, or close contact via strangulation the defense attorney will be more likely to request a psychological evaluation because this method of killing is perceived to exhibit extreme anger, and violence that may even be seen by a jury as the defendant being out of control of themself.

6. Is there a correlation between premeditation and a request for a psychological evaluation by the defense attorney?

When a homicide is premeditated, there is enough time before, and during to question the morality of the crime. It is my hypothesis that when a homicide is premeditated the defense attorney is less likely to

request a psychological evaluation of the defendant because in their minds, they have logically thought out the crime, compared to an exorbitant homicide where the defendant snapped per se.

Chapter 4

Data and Methods

The sample consisted of 213 homicide cases that went through the Pennsylvania Court system from 2012 to 2016: in Lehigh, Berks, York, Dauphin, and Lancaster counties. These include convicted first-, second-, and third-degree homicides as well as dropped cases due to trial complications and/or successful self-defense pleas. Each of these cases includes court and attorney notes, news articles on the homicide, and all other written documents and publications that discuss the crime.

These data collection from the prosecutors' and court files allowed the researchers to code for variables including: weapon type, if a psychological evaluation was requested by the defense attorney, if the evaluation was granted by the judge, if the victim was tortured, if the body was moved, if a felony was committed in the process of the homicide, if the defendant brought the weapon to the crime scene, if there were co-defendants, the number of victims, if the defendant sexually assaulted the victim, if the defendant had stalked the victim prior to the killing, the employment status of the defendant and victim, the marital status of the defendant and victim, and many other aggravating and mitigating factors.

The researchers that coded each case wrote a two to four-sentence case description and created a column for comments where this description was entered. These case comments ranged from trial complications to lack of evidence notes, to motives of the defendant, to aggravating circumstances that did not fit into one of the predetermined codes. These case descriptions were helpful in painting a better picture of the completed crime.

I began with the dataset in an Excel file organized by docket number, crime characteristics, defendant characteristics, victim characteristics, sentencing decisions, and case comments. As I was reading through all 213 case comments, I noticed themes that were emerging in the homicides. There were similarities between homicides committed via firearm and homicides committed through other

means. This is where I noticed a large difference in malice between homicides via firearm and homicides committed within close contact of the defendant and victim through reading the case notes. After taking note of the difference in malice, this led me to question the difference in premeditation of the homicide. Seeing these patterns and themes arise I chose to divide the dataset into two categories to run frequencies and cross-tabulations on.

One category was firearm homicides. There was a total of 127 homicides in the dataset that were committed via firearms. The second category was homicide via other means: strangulation, drowning, asphyxiation, stabbing, blunt force trauma, or other. This category also included homicides where the defendant tortured the victim, killed the victim execution style, if the victim had an approved Protection from Abuse order against the defendant by a judge, if the victim had their throat slashed, multiple stab wounds, or if the defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body. These homicides are referred to in this paper as 'Exorbitant killings'. It is important to note that any homicides that may have included one of the variables in the inclusion criteria for exorbitant killing that the murder weapon was a firearm were excluded from the exorbitant homicide dataset. Given my research questions, I created two new variables, Firearm Homicides and Exorbitant Killings. I used these variables to differentiate the homicide cases in all the analyses.

Chapter 5

Results

Table 1: Homicide Charge Filled by County Prosecutor

| County | Freq. | Percent |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Berks | 38 | 17.84% |
| Dauphin | 77 | 36.15% |
| Lancaster | 18 | 8.45% |
| Lehigh | 42 | 19.72% |
| York | 38 | 17.84% |
| Total | 213 | 100% |

The dataset included a total of 213 homicides in Pennsylvania between five counties. The number of homicides in each country was as follows; 38 in Berks, 77 in Dauphin, 18 in Lancaster, 42 in Lehigh, and 38 in York. Out of these five counties which comprised our dataset 36.15% of the homicides were committed in Dauphin County. Dauphin County has the smallest population comprised of 287,400 as of the 2021 United States Census Bureau out of all counties in our dataset. The largest county in population is Lancaster with 553,652. Lancaster has the largest population, but the smallest number of homicides in our dataset. The second largest county by population in the dataset is York County, which accounts for 17.84% of our homicides. Berks County has the third largest population of 429,342. Lehigh County is the fourth largest in our dataset with a population of 375,539.

Table 2: Key Variables Using Entire Homicides Dataset

| Variable | Freq. | Valid Percent |
|--|-------|---------------|
| Defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body | 16 | 7.7% |

| | | |
|---|-----|-------|
| Defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation for the defendant | 23 | 10.8% |
| Defendant came to the crime scene with the weapon used to commit the homicide | 114 | 53.5% |
| There was a co-defendant charged in addition to the defendant | 46 | 24.2% |
| Two Victims | 15 | 7% |
| Three Victims | 3 | 1.4% |

Using our dataset of 213 homicides across five Pennsylvania counties, there were 16 cases where the defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body. 23 cases, 10.8% in which the defendant's defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation of the defendant. There were 195 cases, 91.5% of which had a single victim, 15 cases, 7% which contained two victims, and 3 cases, 1.4% which contained three victims. I analyzed these key variables in terms of the entire dataset of 213 homicides to see the frequency at which they occurred in the dataset compared to when we divided the dataset in two between gun homicides and exorbitant homicides. We see that a case in which the defendant attempts to hide, conceal, or dispose of a body is rare, only 7.7% of cases. I sought to better understand if there was a higher percentage of psychological evaluations requested by the defense attorney when the defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body. I used the frequency at which there were multiple victims to differentiate between the two types of homicides and if weapon type correlated to the number of victims.

Table 3.1: Homicides Via Firearm Key Variables

| Variable | Freq. | Valid Percent |
|---|-------|---------------|
| Two Victims | 11 | 8.7% |
| Three Victims | 3 | 2.4% |
| There was a co-defendant charged in addition to the defendant | 33 | 30.3% |

| | | |
|--|------------|-------------|
| The homicide was committed while the defendant was in the process of committing a felony | 105 | 82.7% |
| Defendant came to the crime scene with the weapon used to commit the homicide | 98 | 77.2% |
| The defense attorney requested a Psychological Evaluation for the defendant | 9 | 7.1% |
| The defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body. | 5 | 4% |
| Total | 127 | 100% |

After creating a subset of homicides using only ones committed via firearm, I began running frequencies on the same variables I ran on the entire dataset. First starting with the number of victims; of the 127 homicides via firearm; 11 cases or 7.7% had two victims, and 3 cases or 2.4% had three victims. Out of our entire dataset, there were only 15 cases where there were two victims, meaning 11/15 of cases that contained two victims were homicide via firearm. Out of our entire dataset, there were 3 cases in which there were 3 victims, all 3 of these cases were homicide via firearm. Next, I ran frequencies on if there was a co-defendant charged with the homicide. I found that 30% of homicides via firearm included a co-defendant (33 cases, 30.3%). I also evaluated if the homicide was committed while in the process of committing a separate felony (105 cases, 82.7%). This could be anything ranging from carjacking to selling, distributing, or possessing any drug in Schedule 1 of the Controlled Substances Act. Other felonies that could have been committed in the process of the homicide include home invasion with a deadly weapon or armed robbery. I looked at the number of homicides via firearm where the defendant came to the crime scene with the weapon used in the killing (98 cases, 77.2%). This indicates premeditation and a degree of planning by the defendant to commit homicide. If the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation of the defendant (9 cases, 7.1%). Lastly, I ran frequencies on the percentage of defendants who tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body (5 cases, 4%).

Table 3.2: Homicides Via Firearm - Victim-Offender Relationship

| Variable: Victims Relationship to Defendant | Freq. | Percent |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| Spouse or Intimate Partner | 2 | 1.7% |
| Sibling | 1 | 0.8% |
| Other Familial | 30 | 24.8% |
| Total | 33/127 | 27.3% |
| Acquaintance | 48 | 39.7% |
| Stranger | 37 | 30.6% |
| Unknown | 3 | 2.5% |
| Total | 127 | 100% |

Analyzing the victim-offender relationship for homicides via firearm, we see that in 1.7% of cases, the victim was the defendant's spouse or intimate partner, in 0.8% of cases the victim was the defendant's sibling, and in 24.8% of cases the victim was related to the defendant's in some other way, totaling to 24.8% of cases where there was a firearm used to commit the homicide was the victim related to or intimately involved with the defendant. Whereas in 39.7% of cases, the victim was an acquaintance of the defendant, in 30.6% of cases the victim was a stranger to the defendant, and in 2.5% of cases the victim-offender relationship was unknown.

Table 4.1: Exorbitant Homicides Key Variables

| Variable | Freq. | Valid Percent |
|--|-------|---------------|
| Two Victims | 4 | 4.7% |
| Three Victims | 0 | 0% |
| There was a co-defendant charged in addition to the defendant | 13 | 16% |
| The homicide was committed while the defendant was in the process of committing a felony | 51 | 60.7% |

| | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| Defendant came to the crime scene with the weapon used to commit the homicide | 16 | 18.6% |
| The defense attorney requested a Psychological Evaluation for the defendant | 14 | 16.3% |
| The defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body. | 11 | 13.1% |
| Total | 86 | 100% |

Switching to the dataset of exorbitant killings, I ran the same frequencies for this dataset as the firearm dataset. Exorbitant homicides were a subset of 86 cases out of the main dataset of 213 homicides, created using a set list of inclusion criteria, as explained earlier. Of the exorbitant homicides, 4.7% contained two victims, and 0 cases contained three victims. Of exorbitant homicides, 13 cases or 16% of the cases of exorbitant homicides included a co-defendant. Of exorbitant killings, there were 51 cases, or 60.7% of exorbitant homicides was the life of the victim taken while in the process of committing a separate felony. In 16 cases or 18.6% of exorbitant homicides, the defendant came to the crime scene with the weapon used to carry out the homicide. In 14 cases or 16.3% of exorbitant killings the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation of the defendant. In 11 cases or 13.1% of exorbitant homicides, the defendant tried to hide, conceal, or dispose of the body.

Table 4.2: Exorbitant Homicides - Victim-Offender Relationship

| Variable: Relationship to Defendant | Freq. | Percent |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Spouse or Intimate Partner | 9 | 10.6% |
| Child | 23 | 27.1% |
| Parent | 2 | 2.4% |
| Other Familial | 9 | 10.6% |
| Total | 43/86 | 50.7% |
| Acquaintance | 34 | 40% |
| Stranger | 8 | 9.4% |

| | | |
|--------------|-----------|-------------|
| Total | 86 | 100% |
|--------------|-----------|-------------|

I then ran frequencies on the victim-offender relationship for exorbitant homicides. For the 86 exorbitant homicides, in 9 cases or 10.6%, the victim was the spouse or intimate partner of the defendant, in 23 cases or 27.1% of the exorbitant homicides the victim was the child of the defendant. In 2 cases or 2.4%, the victim was the parent of the defendant, and in 9 cases or 10.6% of exorbitant homicides, the victim was related to the defendant in a different familial manner. This equates to 43 cases or 50.7% of exorbitant killings in which the victim was a family member or intimate partner of the defendant. In 34 cases or 40% of exorbitant homicides, the victim was an acquaintance of the defendant, and in 8 cases or 9.4% of exorbitant killings, the victim was a stranger to the defendant.

Table 4.3: Exorbitant Homicides - Method of Killing (Excluding Firearm)

| Variable: Weapon Choice | Freq. | Percent |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Stabbing | 23 | 26.7% |
| Blunt Force | 24 | 27.9% |
| Strangulation | 14 | 16.3% |
| Other | 22 | 25.6% |
| Unknown | 3 | 3.5% |
| Total | 86 | 100% |

I ran frequencies on the type of murder weapon used in the exorbitant homicides; 23 cases or 27.4% were via stabbing, 24 cases, or 28.6% were via blunt force, 14 cases, or 16.7% were via strangulation, 22 cases, or 26.2% were committed via other means (excluding firearms), and 3 cases or 3.5% of exorbitant killings the cause of death was unknown.

Table 5: Cross-tabulation of Gun Homicides by the Defendant Bringing Weapon Used in Homicide to the Crime Scene (Pre-meditation)

| | | Homicide Via Gun | | Total |
|--|---|------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | | No | Yes | |
| Defendant Came to Crime Scene Armed | Percent Defendant Did Not Come Armed | 70 | 29 | 99 |
| | | 70.7% | 29.3% | 100% |
| | | 81.4% | 22.8% | 46.5% |
| | Percent Defendant Did Come Armed | 16 | 98 | 114 |
| | | 14% | 86% | 100% |
| | | 18.6% | 77.2% | 53.5% |
| Total | | 86 | 127 | 213 |
| | Chi-Square | 70.69 | DF = 1 | P < .001 |

After running frequencies, I went on to run cross-tabulations and conduct chi-square analyses. First, I ran a cross-tabulation on the percentage of defendants who brought the weapon used in the homicide to the crime scene by gun homicides. In 98 or 127 cases of gun homicides, the defendant came to the crime scene armed with the weapon used in the killing; the chi-square for this was 70.69 and equated to a p-value of less than 0.001, this shows that is highly statistically likely in gun homicides for the defendant to bring the murder weapon used to carry out the homicide to the crime scene. Now, I cannot say with 100% certainty that in every case where a gun was brought to a crime scene and used in the commission of the homicide, it was the defendant's premeditation to purposefully bring that gun to kill someone; because we cannot differentiate between citizens who conceal carry on a daily basis, or citizens who may not legally conceal carry but carry frequently. However, I can say upon reading the case summaries that many of the defendants who purposefully brought the gun to the crime scene did so with

the knowledge that they might kill someone. While reading through the comments for gun homicides; a plethora of them included notes on the defendant trying to rob the victim, the defendant trying to burglarize the victim, the defendant planning a home invasion of the victim's home, there was a dispute over some monetary value, drugs were involved, or gang activity was involved. This repetition in themes of theft, and the knowledge of the gun homicides being pre-meditated leads me to believe that many gun homicides are targeted offenses, with an end goal, making this type of crime instrumental. This also suggests that these types of gun homicides may involve more rational, goal-oriented decision-making. For these reasons, I consider for a majority of cases, bringing a gun to the crime scene was a sign of premeditation.

Table 6: Cross-tabulations of Exorbitant Homicides by the Defendant Bringing Weapon Used in Homicide to the Crime Scene (Pre-meditation)

| | | Exorbitant Homicide | | Total |
|--|---|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | | No | Yes | |
| Defendant Came to Crime Scene Armed | Percent Defendant Did Not Come Armed | 29 | 70 | 99 |
| | | 29.3% | 70.7% | 100% |
| | Percent Defendant Did Come Armed | 98 | 16 | 114 |
| | | 86% | 14% | 100% |
| Total | | 127 | 86 | 213 |
| | Chi-Square | 70.69 | DF = 1 | P < .001 |

I ran this same cross-tabulation for exorbitant killings showing that in 16 cases out of 86, the defendant came to the crime scene armed with the weapon used in the killing; this resulted in a chi-square of 70.69 and a p-value of less than 0.001. This demonstrates that there is a high statistical certainty that in exorbitant homicides the defendant is unlikely to bring the weapon used in the killing to the crime scene. For exorbitant homicides, we can say to a certain degree of certainty that in those individuals who did not bring a weapon to the crime scene in the exorbitant killings (70.7%), the defendant did not plan to commit the murder of the victim at that moment. These exorbitant killings where the defendant strangled or beat

the victim to death or used other means, from the lack of bringing a weapon to the crime scene, to the physicality of the murder, to the defense attorney requesting a psychological evaluation of the defendant, that the defendant's in these murders experienced some kind of angry outburst or moment of complete lack of self-control, where emotions took over the defendant during the execution of the homicide.

Table 7: Cross-tabulation of If the Defense Attorney Requested a Psychological Evaluation for the Defendant, Filtered by If the Defendant Brought the Weapon to Crime Scene Out. Exorbitant Homicides and Firearm Homicides

| | | | Was Psychological Evaluation Requested by Defense Attorney | | Total |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|--------|------------|
| | | | No | Yes | |
| Defendant Came to Crime Scene Armed | Homicide via Firearm | Count | 29 | 0 | 29 |
| | | Percent Defendant did not come armed | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| | | Count | 89 | 9 | 98 |
| | | Percent Defendant Came Armed | 90.8% | 9.2% | 100% |
| | | Chi-Square | 2.866 | DF = 1 | P = 0.09 |
| | | Total | | | 127 |
| | Exorbitant Homicides | Count | 58 | 12 | 70 |
| | | Percent Defendant did not come armed | 82.9% | 17.1% | 100% |
| | | Count | 14 | 2 | 16 |
| | | Percent Defendant Came Armed | 87.5% | 12.5% | 100% |
| | | Chi-Square | 0.206 | DF = 1 | P = 0.65 |
| | | Total | | | 86 |

I conducted a three-way cross-tabulation on whether the defendant brought the weapon used in the killing to the crime scene, if the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation, if it was an

exorbitant killing, or if it was a homicide via firearm. In 9 firearm cases, the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation of the defendant, of these 9 cases, all 9 the defendant brought the weapon used in the killing to the crime scene. This produced a chi-square of 2.866 with a p-value of 0.09 this shows there is slight statistical significance that in gun homicides, when the defendant brings the weapon to the crime scene, the defense attorney will not request a psychological evaluation.

For exorbitant homicides, 12.5% did bring the murder weapon to the crime and were psychologically evaluated, for 17.1% of exorbitant homicides the defendant did not bring the murder weapon to the crime scene and was psychologically evaluated, this did not demonstrate statistical significance. For the chi-square for exorbitant homicides, where the defendant brought the weapon to the crime scene, and the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation; the value was 0.206 with a p-value of 0.65. This shows there is not statistically significant association between a defense attorney requesting a psychological evaluation of the defendant in exorbitant killings and whether the defendant brought the murder weapon to the crime scene.

This table shows us that when it comes to exorbitant homicides it is much more likely for the defendant to be psychologically evaluated than in gun homicides when the defendant brings the weapon to the crime scene or does not bring the weapon to the crime scene.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

In this study I examined homicide characteristics to better understand consistencies in homicide for the offender, victim, and characteristics of the crime itself. This goal of this study was to better understand homicide to be able to deter homicide or prevent it from happening in the first place. To achieve this, we need to better understand the defendant characteristics including the defendant typology. As I looked at similarities and differences between homicides via firearms and exorbitant killings, I was able to come to some conclusions with my research questions based on patterns and correlates of the homicides in this dataset.

1. Is there an association between a victim-offender relationship and weapon-type used in the killing?

Referring to Table 3.2, the victim-offender relationship for firearm homicides; we must acknowledge how low the percentage of homicides via firearm is where the victim is related to the defendant in a familial manner. In only 3 cases of homicides via firearm, the victim was an intimate partner or sibling of the defendant. In 24.8% of these cases, the victim was related to the defendant in another familial way. Totaling 27.27% of firearm homicides the victim was of familial relationship to the defendant. Whereas in nearly 40% of homicide cases via firearm the victim was an acquaintance of the defendant. These 'Acquaintances' include rival gang members, neighbors, friends of friends of friends that the defendant vaguely knows. This is important in the field of criminology to understand when investigating a homicide via firearm it's more likely for the defendant to have known the victim but it's unlikely for the defendant to have been related to the victim. When we look at the victim-offender relationship for exorbitant killings we see that a much larger percentage (50.7%) the victim is familial. Nearly double the percentage of victim's are related to the offender when it's an exorbitant killing

compared to when it's a homicide via firearm. I believe this does demonstrate a correlation between victim offender relationship and weapon type.

2. Is there a correlation between weapon type and premeditation?

Now using the information we have in our dataset we can only say to a certain degree of certainty that a defendant who brings the weapon used to kill to the crime scene is used as an indicator of premeditation of the homicide. In 18.6% of exorbitant homicides the defendant came to the crime scene with the weapon used to carry out the homicide. I interpret this as an indication that these homicides are in fact not pre-mediated. The defendant was likely to act alone in the homicide and use either their hands or something they found at the crime scene to kill the victim. Using your hands or an item at a crime scene to kill someone indicates impulsiveness and aggression. When we look at the homicides committed via firearms our table shows that in 81.7% of homicides via firearm, the defendant came to the crime scene with the weapon used in the killing. As mentioned in the findings, we cannot differentiate from individuals who conceal carry, or carry on a regular basis unlawfully. Due to these various factors of course, we would see a higher percentage of individuals who committed homicide via firearm who also brought that firearm to the crime scene. As mentioned in the findings, upon reading the case comments for the reasons the defendants gave as why they committed the firearm; this leads me to believe these cases were majorly premediated, and to conclude there is a correlation between weapon type and premeditation.

3. Is there a correlation between weapon type and having a co-defendant?

Our dataset shows that in 30.3% of cases or 33/109 cases of homicide via firearm there was a co-defendant present. I believe this further reinforces our theory that homicides via firearm are more likely to be premeditated versus homicide by other means because there was another person charged in the act of the homicide using case comments, we saw patterns emerge where one defendant did the majority of the planning of the homicide, or furnished the weapon, and the other defendant was sort of dragged along. We also cite back to our table to show that in 81.7% of homicides via firearm, the defendant came to the

crime scene with the weapon used in the killing. The co-defendant couples with coming to the scene of the crime with the murder weapon demonstrates a degree of planning/premeditation by the defendant(s). It's also important to acknowledge that in only 16% of exorbitant homicides was there a co-defendant. This means in nearly half of the cases that showed a co-defendant in firearm homicides was there a co-defendant in exorbitant killings. I believe this indicates to a small degree that when a homicide is committed via firearm it is more likely to have a co-defendant than when the homicide is committed via other methods.

4. Is there a correlation between weapon type and multiple victims?

Referring to Table 3.1, homicides via firearm we see that where there were 18 cases in which there were multiple victims, 14 of those cases were homicides via firearm. This shows that when there are multiple victims the weapon choice is likely to be a firearm. A limitation to this is we could not differentiate between accidental deaths via firearm if one person was an intended target and another was collateral in the firing. Moving onto the exorbitant homicides, we see that 4.7% of these cases contained a second victim. This demonstrates that in the more malicious homicides, the defendant is unlikely to partake in a killing spree, we can say with confidence that these malicious murders are likely to stop at one victim based on our data.

5. Is there a correlation between weapon choice and the defense attorney requesting a psychological evaluation?

In. firearm homicides the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation in 7.1% of cases, in exorbitant homicides the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation in 16.3% of cases. As exorbitant homicides indicate to a degree, an extreme lack of self-control, I found it interesting that there was not a higher correlation between exorbitant homicides and the defense attorney requesting a psychological evaluation, especially in comparison to firearm homicides. We can say to a small extent that a defense attorney is more likely to request a psychological evaluation for a homicide defendant of an exorbitant killing than for a defendant of a firearm homicide.

6. Is there a correlation between premeditation and a request for a psychological evaluation by the defense attorney?

Looking at the dataset of only homicides committed via firearm, in 7.1% of these cases, the defense attorney requested a psychological evaluation, however 100% of these cases did the defendant bring the murder weapon to the crime scene. I find this interesting because it was my previous interpretation that it would be unlikely for defense attorney is to request a psychological evaluation when there are signs of premeditation because this would mean the individual meticulously planned out the homicide and had to have exhibit some rational thinking. It was my previous interpretation that when a homicide is planned/premeditated, combined with when the homicide is committed via firearm, it is a targeted attack and that how it is viewed by both defense attorneys, and likely, juries; that these homicides can be carried out 'logically' or by sane individuals; hence why a psychological evaluation is not considered necessary by the defense counsel nor sought after. I believe this is still the general census among attorneys and juries due to the fact that only 9 out of 127 firearm cases were psychologically evaluated and 98 of the cases the defendant brought the murder weapon to the crime scene which indicates some degree of premeditation.

For exorbitant homicides it would have been my hypothesis that all these homicides that included a defendant who did not bring the murder weapon to the crime scene, who appeared to have this outburst of physical aggression towards another human being to the point of beating them to death or tangling them would need to undergo a psychological evaluation to determine competency to stand trial. The reason I expected to see this correlation was because not only this huge aspect of physicality of the crime, but also the urge to use your hands or your body or something in your surroundings to murder someone is an indicator of some kind of mental illness. However, this was not the case according to our dataset. Out of the exorbitant homicides, and those who did not come to the crime scene armed, only 17.1% were psychologically evaluated. Our data indicates there is not a correlation between premeditation and the defense attorney requesting a psychological evaluation. This disproves the current public perception that

defense attorneys use psychological evaluations to explain the culpability of defendants in extreme violent crimes. We see requests for psychological evaluations of many school shooters who receive national coverage, in addition to mass murders, however, our dataset shows that it is actually rare for a defense attorney to request a psychological evaluation; although we are limited to five counties in Pennsylvania and it there might be a stigma in the Pennsylvania court system for filing a motion that your client is incompetent to stand trial based on their psychological evaluation.

It's important to acknowledge the limitations of this study. This study was limited to homicides in five counties in Pennsylvania from 2012 to 2016. While the data included relatively few cases, the data collection was very detailed. Due to the breadth of our dataset, our sample size was much smaller. Our dataset included extreme detailed variable of each case including offender IQ, the victim-offender relationship, the sentence of the defendants, both offender and victim characteristics, as well as crime and crime scene characteristics. This compilation of data took extensive time to compile leaving and due to the in-depth nature of the dataset and variables per case, it was more difficult to include a larger number of cases. I suggest further research in the field of criminology on patterns in homicide correlates to a better understanding of actions taken by homicide defendants, and their thought processes before the homicide, during, and after the completion of the homicide. I also suggest further research on the relationship between gun homicide and premeditation, as well as further research on the relationship between weapon choice and victim-offender relationship. I also suggest further research on exorbitant homicides and the request for a psychological evaluation by the defense attorney. I believe we need further research on exorbitant homicides to explore possible avenues for deterrence or possible identifiers in the defendant before the crime takes place. I do believe exorbitant homicides should be considered an expressive crime and are among the most dangerous homicides. This is because expressive crimes occur in a fit of rage, when emotions consume a human being, and they lose all rational thought. When rationality is no longer a concept, we see the most extreme violence a human being is capable of. When

rationality is no longer a factor there is a disconnect between people because a level of understanding cannot be reached. When you cannot rationalize with another human being, when you cannot reach a level of understanding there is no way to explain to someone morality, or ethics of their actions. This means that a person cannot be persuaded against offending in this manner, that we cannot stop or deter someone from committing this crime.

References

Adjorlolo, S., & Chan, H. C. (Oliver). (2017). The Nature of Instrumentality and Expressiveness of Homicide Crime Scene Behaviors: A Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 18*(2), 119-133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838015596528>

Bullock, H. A. (1955). Urban homicide in theory and fact. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 45*(5), 565. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1139550>

Carabellese, F., Mandarelli, G., Felthous, A. R., Catanesi, R. (2021) Forensic psychiatric evaluation of 187 homicidal assailants with and without a schizophrenia spectrum disorder: Clinical, criminological and behavioral characteristics. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 39*(2)190-204. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2515>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2023, September 12). *Pennsylvania*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/states/pennsylvania/pa.htm>

Chai, A., Beaugard, E., Chopin, J., (2021) “Drop the Body”: Body Disposal Patterns in Sexual Homicide. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 65*(6-7)692-714. DOI: 10.1177/0306624X20931436

Fabian, J. (2009). Mitigating murder at capital sentencing: An empirical and practical psycho-legal strategy. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice, 9*, 1–34.

Fazel S, Gulati G, Linsell L, Geddes JR, Grann M (2009) Schizophrenia and Violence: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS Med 6*(8): e1000120. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000120>

French, L. A. (1996). Violence, Aggression, & Coercive Actions: by James T. Tedeschi and Richard B. Felson. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 12*(3), 282-283. <https://doi-org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1177/104398629601200308>

Mascia, J., & Brownlee, C. (2023, March 6). *How many guns are circulating in the U.S.? The Trace*. <https://www.thetrace.org/2023/03/guns-america-data-atf-total/>

Pelletier, K. R., & Pizarro, J. M. (2019). Homicides and Weapons: Examining the Covariates of Weapon Choice. *Homicide Studies*, 23(1), 41-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767918807252>

Statista Research Department, & 20, O. (2023, October 20). *Homicides by murder weapon in the U.S. 2022*. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/195325/murder-victims-in-the-us-by-weapon-used/>

Ulmer, J., Zajac, G., Kramer, J., (2018) *Variations in Murder Conviction and Punishment in Pennsylvania: Disparities and Socio-political Contexts*. National Science Foundation Proposal, Award # SES-1349728

United States Census Bureau. B01001 SEX BY AGE, 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office. Web. 8 December 2022. <http://www.census.gov/>.

Logan Wincott

Current Address:


(813)602-6298
law5983@psu.edu

Permanent Address:

EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University | Schreyer Honors College | Paterno Fellows
College of Liberal Arts
B.S - Criminology, B.S - Sociology

University Park, PA
Expected Graduation: December 2023
Cumulative GPA:

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Nevile & Co. Commercial Lawyers

Legal Intern

Melbourne, Australia

June 2023 – August 2023

- As a legal intern for Nevile & Co I wrote and submitted crucial documents to the courts for extension of time motions, requesting the opposing councils discovery, and various other motions.
- My responsibilities included appearing in court for motions hearings alongside our clients.
- Scheduling mediations, attending and advising clients on their best course of action.
- I took on a wide variety of legal case including writing wills, handling property disputes, drafting contracts, mergers and acquisitions, and a handful of criminal matters.

Neuroethics Lab

Research Assistant and Author

Penn State University

August 2022 – May 2023

- As a member of Dr. Cabrera's team, I assisted in examining adolescents' and parental attitudes toward the use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) and theta burst stimulation (TBS) as a treatment method for adolescents with depression.
- In addition, I studied qualitative research to identify emergent themes in semi-structured recorded interviews, with the use of web-based software.
- I began an individual research paper titled "The attitudes, perceptions, and ethical concerns around the use of neuromodulation. Examining unique issues in children and adolescents." I presented this research on behalf of the Neuroethics Labrotory and was awarded the outstanding Litteracy and Research award by the University Library.

Rural Health Disparities Lab

Research Assistant and Co-Author

Penn State University

January 2022 – May 2023

- I researched the effects social infrastructure has on the perceived social and emotional support of older adults in rural communities. We found social and emotional support is linked to improved cognitive development, and longer life expectancies. My job included comprising the literature review, data analysis, data table creation, and drafting the final paper.
- Our paper has been published in the Journal of Rural Sociology. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12491>
- I assisted with early plans for developing a research project to examine social, emotional, and mental health measures of students who participate in the Penn State student farm. Including searching for and synthesizing previous similar studies, assisting with developing survey/interview instruments, assisting with portions of the IRB application.

Criminal Investigations Department

Criminal Intelligence Analyst

Lewistown Police Department

May 2022 – November 2022

- Lewistown Police Department is located in Mifflin County, Pennsylvania where 415 violent and property crimes took place in 2021. Mifflin County has a violent crime rate of 1.9 per 1,000 residents, a property crime rate of 8.8, and "other" crime rate of 9.7
- As a criminal intelligence analyst I took a hands on approach to appearing on scene for 911 calls, accompanying the detective on suicide and homicide scenes, attending atopsies, transcribing and analyzing the language of interviews of key witnesses in ongoing felony investigations, and analyzing communication records of attempted homicide offenders to inquire if there was a co-conspirator involved.

University of Chicago Summer Immersion Program

Legal philosophy based on Constitutional Law

The University of Chicago

June 2019 – July 2019

- Adapted to complete an accelerated graduate course on constitutional law in three weeks.
- This course introduced some of the most important issues in political thought. Including how we think about the nature of justice, and the relationship between justice, morality, law, and social conventions. We analyzed a few major Supreme Court cases including ROE v. WADE to assess the legitimacy and scope of political authority, and CARPENTER v. UNITED STATES where we assessed whether there is a “reasonable expectation of privacy” in data held by third parties.

Envision Intensive Law and Trial

Lead Attorney

Stanford University

June 2018 – July 2018

- At Intensive Law & Trial I studied the theory and practice of law and developed a roadmap for becoming an advocate.
- Participated in seminars with Stanford Law professionals on legal rhetoric, ethics, and the practice of law.
- Practiced essential legal skills such as delivering impactful opening statements and closing arguments, preparing cases, and readying witnesses for cross examination.

LEADERSHIP

Teaching Assistant

Criminology 249 - Criminological Theories

Penn State University

January 2022 - Present

- Penn State University requires all criminology majors to enroll in this class. The class I assist in has over sixty students, I was their sole Teaching Assistant, advising two classes per week.
- As the Teaching Assistant I held office hours, oversaw all grading, and creating exam study guides as well as hosting review sessions prior to each exam.
- My responsibilities included detailed note keeping, organizing quiz and exam review presentations, offering tutoring appointments, and grading all sixty students quizzes, exams, and essays.

Florida Girls State

Clerk of the Supreme Court

Tallahassee, FL

May 2019 - June 2019

- Florida Girls State is a hands-on week-long educational workshop, focusing on Americanism and the political process, sponsored by the Florida American Legion Auxiliary.
- This program helped me to better understand democratic ideals and the part we as individuals play in carrying out these ideals.

Mock Trial Association

Regional Captain

State College, PA

January 2019 – Present

- Organized and led meetings on how to write, and present a proper closing argument in a trial.
- Attend regular professional development, community service, and social events to improve personal and professional presence.
- My team and I represented Penn State University which is nationally ranked in the top 3% of Mock Trial teams, in a number of tournaments across the nation including Ohio, Albany, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Georgia.

RESEARCH & PUBLICATIONS

Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Logan Wincott

Penn State University

In Progress

- “Patterns in Post Homicide Correlates”
- Scheduled to present at the American Society of Criminology annual conference in November 2023.

Journal of Cognition and Neuroethics

Logan Wincott, Manisha Kodavatiganti, Patricia Henegan, MPH, Laura Y. Cabrera, PhD

Penn State University

In Progress

- “The attitudes, perceptions, and ethical concerns around the use of neuromodulation. Examining unique issues in children and adolescents.”
- Awarded the 2023 Information Literacy award by University Libraries Association at the Undergraduate Research Exhibition.

Journal of Rural Sociology

Danielle Rhubarb, Jennifer Kowalkowski, Logan Wincott

Penn State University

Published May 2023

- “The Built Environment and Social and Emotional Support among Rural Older Adults: The Case for Social Infrastructure and Attention to Ethnoracial Differences”
- DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12491>

Social and Behavioral Human Subjects Research (IRB) Course

CITI Program

Human Subjects Research

Expiration Date: November 2025

- Human Subjects Research (HSR) content is organized into two tracks: *Biomedical (Biomed)* and *Social-Behavioral-Educational (SBE)*. They are intended for anyone involved in research studies with human subjects, or who have responsibilities for setting policies and procedures with respect to such research, including Institutional Review Boards (IRBs).

AWARDS

Awards: Paterno Fellows Honors recipient, Schreyer Honors College acceptance, Paterno Library Outstanding Literacy and Research Award, Dean’s list for Penn State University Spring 2021, Fall 2021, Spring 2022, Fall 2022, Spring 2023.