



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

User Report

HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION OF
NATIVES AND NON-NATIVES
IN CANADA - 1962-1984

NO. 1987-30

E
98
.C87
M68
1962-84
c.3

Library for General Canada
Library Secretariat

E
98
.C87
M68
1962-84
c.3

Sharon Moyer
The Research Group

LIBRARY
SOLICITOR GENERAL CANADA
JAN 4 1994
BIBLIOTHÈQUE
SOLICITEUR GÉNÉRAL CANADA
OTTAWA (ONTARIO)
K1A 0P8

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown.
Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for
any intended use.
Les droits d'auteur du présent document n'appartiennent
pas à l'État. Toute utilisation du contenu du présent
document doit être approuvée préalablement par l'auteur.

**HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION OF
NATIVES AND NON-NATIVES
IN CANADA - 1962-1984**

NO. 1987-30

This working paper was prepared under contract for the Research
Division in 1987 and is made available as submitted to the Ministry.
The views expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily
those of the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

This working paper is available in French. Ce document de travail
est disponible en français.

ADMINISTRATION ABSTRACT

This report describes the characteristics of Native and non-Native homicide victimization for the period between 1962 and 1984, using data provided by the Homicide Project, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. The analysis represents one of the only investigations of the involvement of Native Canadians as victims of crime.

After reviewing past research on the correlates of homicide victimization, the report presents the empirical data on the socio-demographic characteristics (gender, age, and marital status) associated with Native and non-Native victimization. Characteristics of the victimization incidents are also examined, including the victim-suspect relationship, the location of offence (private versus public places), the presence of alcohol, apparent motive, the means of offence, the type of firearm used in shooting incidents, and the type of offence as initially determined by the police. Any changes over the 23 year period are described for Native and non-Native males and females separately.

The analysis found that not only are Natives victimized in larger proportions than are non-Natives, but also that the nature of their victimization substantially differs. The importance of gender and the victim-suspect relationship was also emphasized. The report concludes with several recommendations for the research required to amplify our understanding of the relationships between race and other factors associated with homicide victimization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
THE DATA	3
THE CORRELATES OF HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	4
Socio-demographic Correlates of Homicide Victimization	4
The Relationship between Victim and Offender	7
Victim-precipitated Homicide	10
The Presence of Alcohol	12
The Situational Correlates of Victimization	14
Summary	18
THE ANALYSIS	20
Victimization Rates	21
Race and Gender	21
Changes over Time in Race and Gender	22
The Age of the Victim	22
Marital Status	23
Changes over Time in Marital Status	24
The Relationship between the Victim and the Suspect	25
Changes over Time in the Relationship between the Victim and the Suspect	27
The Actual Location of the Offence	27
The Actual Location by the Victim's Relationship to the Suspect	28
Alcohol Use	29
Alcohol Use by the Victim's Relationship to the Suspect	30
Apparent Motive for the Homicide	31
The Means of Offence	31
Changes over Time in the Means of Offence	31
Type of Firearm Used in Homicides by Shooting	32
Factors Related to the Means of Offence	33
The Type of Offence	36
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	38
Native Homicide Victimization	38
Non-Native Homicide Victimization	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Implications and Recommendations	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY	51
TABLES	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
1	HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION RATES PER 100,000 POPULATION, 1981	56
2	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: RACE BY GENDER	57
3	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: GENDER BY RACE	58
4	CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE RACE AND GENDER OF ALL HOMICIDE VICTIMS	59
5	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN GENDER	60
6	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: AGE, 1982-83	61
7	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MARITAL STATUS	62
8	CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE MARITAL STATUS OF NATIVE HOMICIDE VICTIMS, BY GENDER	63
9	CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE MARITAL STATUS OF NON-NATIVE HOMICIDE VICTIMS BY GENDER	64
10	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: RELATIONSHIP OF THE SUSPECT (EXCLUDING UNSOLVED HOMICIDES)	65
11	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT, NON-NATIVE FEMALES	66
12	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT, NATIVE FEMALES	67
13	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT, NATIVE MALES	68
14	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT, NON-NATIVE MALES	69
15	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: ACTUAL LOCATION OF OFFENCE	70
16	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: ACTUAL LOCATION OF THE OFFENCE BY THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT	71
17	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE PERCENTAGE OF HOMICIDES INVOLVING ALCOHOL USE (INCLUDES UNSOLVED)	73
18	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: PERCENTAGE OF HOMICIDES INVOLVING ALCOHOL USE BY THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE VICTIM TO THE SUSPECT	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
19	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: APPARENT MOTIVE	75
20	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE	76
21	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN MEANS OF OFFENCE, NATIVE MALES	77
22	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN MEANS OF OFFENCE, NATIVE FEMALES	78
23	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN MEANS OF OFFENCE, NON-NATIVE MALES	79
24	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN MEANS OF OFFENCE, NON-NATIVE FEMALES	80
25	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: TYPE OF FIREARM USED IN SHOOTING HOMICIDES	81
26	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT	82
27	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY THE ACTUAL LOCATION OF THE OFFENCE	84
28	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY ALCOHOL USE	86
29	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY ALCOHOL USE	88
30	HOMICIDE VICTIMS: OFFENCE TYPE, 1977-84	89

INTRODUCTION

Although the over-involvement of Native Canadians in the criminal justice system -- the courts, jails, and penitentiaries -- has received considerable attention, there has been little or no research on the victimization of Natives, and no empirical studies of the differences between victimization of Native and non-Native Canadians. This report analyzes the characteristics of only one, but the most extreme form of victimization -- that involving deadly force.

This report presents descriptive information on a number of factors that are related to the victimization of Natives and non-Natives. Future research can use these results as a starting point from which to further explore the causal inter-relationships among the socio-demographic and situational correlates of homicide victimization.

Our analysis suggests that Natives may be as much as 8 times as likely as non-Natives to be victims of murder or manslaughter -- an even greater discrepancy than found in the United States, where in 1975-6, the homicide rate of American Indians was 26.5 per 100,000 population, compared to 9.6 for the total U.S. population (a ratio of 2.8:1). These data clearly show that the victimization of persons of Indian, Metis or Inuit background is greatly at variance with that of the majority of North Americans. This report represents the first investigation of the differences between Native and non-Native victimization in Canada for a

23 year period between 1962 and 1984.

THE DATA

Summary data (in the form of computer output) were provided to the researchers by the Homicide Project, Law Enforcement Program, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.¹ The database contains information on all homicide incidents reported by police since 1962, and runs were provided for the 1962-84 period. Data on the victim, suspect, and court procedure (if one took place) are included for murder offenses from 1962-73 and murder, manslaughter, and infanticide offenses from 1974 on.

Most of the data on victim and suspects are supplied by police departments via the "Homicide Return". Before 1977, all court and correctional data were obtained from the Centre's Court Program. Native victims are defined as persons classified by police as being Canadian Indian, Metis, or Inuit. Non-Natives are all other victims with an identified race, including Caucasians, orientals and blacks.

The unit of analysis employed in this report is the victim of homicide (with an identified race). If the homicide incident had more than one victim -- for example, some arson cases may involve numerous victims -- that incident will be "counted" in the analysis as many times as there were victims.

¹ We thank Joanne Lacroix and the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics for providing the data required for this report.

THE CORRELATES OF HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this section, we describe the most frequently researched correlates of homicide victimization: the social and demographic characteristics of the victim; the victim's relationship to the suspect; victim precipitation of the incident; the presence of alcohol; and situational correlates, such as the location of the offence, the presence of third parties, and the temporal dimensions of the homicide incident.

Socio-demographic Correlates of Homicide Victimization

Gender, race, age, marital status, and socio-economic status all tend to be highly correlated with victimization.

In most cultures, women are far less likely to be victimized than men, although the proportion of female victims varies among countries. (See Nettler 1982 for a discussion of the findings from cross-national studies.) In the United States, for both blacks and whites, the age-standardized homicide rate for males is about four times that of women (Farley 1980). In the U.S., the percentage of female victims has ranged between about one-fifth and one-quarter depending on the time period and jurisdiction (Wolfgang 1958; Pokorny 1965; Voss and Hepburn 1968; Silverman and Kennedy 1987).

In Canada, females are victimized in larger proportions than in the U.S., perhaps because in Canada more than one-half of female victims are

killed by a family member and in Canada such murders account for a larger proportion of the total homicides than in the United States.

Race and ethnicity are highly correlated with victimization. In the U.S., blacks and Hispanics have higher victimization rates than do others (Wolfgang 1958; Pokorny 1965; Voss and Hepburn 1968; Farley 1980). For example, between 1965 and 1981, in Chicago, 70% of homicides involved black victims (Block 1985). Age-standardized rates are about six times as large for non-whites as whites, and homicide is the fourth leading cause of death among black males in the United States (Farley 1980).² About 80% to 90% of cases of black homicide involve a black killing another black; all studies have reported that homicide is primarily an intra-racial crime. As noted above, the homicide rate of American Indians is also disproportionately high when compared to the rest of the U.S. population.

Age is also closely associated with victimization. Homicide rates in the U.S. and Canada are highest for ages 25 to 34, and decline among older groups (Farley 1980; Wilbanks 1981). Voss and Hepburn (1968) report that in Chicago in 1965, 57% of the victims were between 20 and 39 years of age. A number of researchers have pointed out that the victim's and the offender's age are often relatively similar, although this differs by the type of homicide. The following results have been

² In the 1970's in the U.S., there was a substantial decrease in black and an increase in white victimization. Age-adjusted rates for blacks and other minorities decreased from 41 per 100,000 to 33, while the white rate rose from 4.7 to 6 (Hawkins 1985: 86).

reported by Silverman and Kennedy (1987), using a very similar database to that employed in this paper. Spouse/lover homicides and those involving friends or acquaintances as victims both tend to involve victims and offender of similar ages. There are large differences in the age of the victim by "relational distance". When the suspect is a stranger, victims tend to be older than in other types of homicides; when the suspect is a family member, but not in an intimate relationship with the victim, a high proportion (40%) of victims are under 18 years of age. Spouse/lover and friend/acquaintance homicides show roughly similar age distributions -- there are few very young victims, and a substantial proportion between 26 and 45 years. (These data have been calculated from Silverman and Kennedy, 1987: 39, Table 3.)

The marital status of the victim is infrequently reported in the literature, although Messner and Tardiff (1985) found that 54% of their Manhattan sample (in 1981) had never married. Marital status is almost certainly highly correlated with the incidence of domestic homicides, many of which involve spouse victims.

As Nettler (1982: 27) has commented, social class is associated with criminal violence:

Violence that ranges from brawling to killing is disproportionately practiced by persons of lower social status in all localities for which we have contemporary data. ... Furthermore, the social characteristics of people who are disproportionately involved in homicide are similar to the social characteristics of people who more often injure others physically without killing them.... Homicide is frequently, but not exclusively, the outcome of a career in fighting, and

such careers are distributed unevenly in the social hierarchy.

However, Hawkins (1985: 94) adds that "homicide is primarily a problem of the poor and disadvantaged though... the relationship between socio-economic status and murder has not been thoroughly documented", particularly the relative contributions of race, class, and subcultural factors. Relatively little research has been conducted on the dynamics of the relationship between economic factors and homicide.

The Relationship between Victim and Offender

The victim-offender relationship is one of the most important descriptors available to characterize homicidal incidents.

One common link does occur in much of the writing on homicide. No matter which classification scheme is followed, the relationship between the victim and the offender is considered of paramount importance. Many authors attempt to illuminate some specific aspect of the event in terms of the relationship of victims to offenders. A focus on interpersonal relationships treats the act of homicide as a social event.

Silverman and Kennedy 1987: 1-2.

By now, it is a cliché in criminological work on homicide that most homicides involve victims who have had some prior relationship to the offender. Relatively few homicides involve no relationship between victim and offender. Curtis (1974) reported that strangers made up less than 30% of homicide cases in the various U.S. studies he reviewed. In Canada, Silverman and Kennedy (1987) recently reported that in the most recent years (1981-82), 18% of homicides in this country involved

suspects who were strangers and the average over the 22 years of their data was 22%.

It is also generally acknowledged that males are disproportionately victimized by strangers and females by family members, especially a spouse (Palmer and Humphrey 1982; Wolfgang 1958; Messner and Tardiff 1985). Silverman and Kennedy (1987: 17) reported that in Canada, between 1962 and 1983, men were one-third as likely as women to be victimized by someone with whom they were in a spouse/lover relationship, but were three times more likely to be killed by a stranger, and almost five times as likely as a women to be killed by a friend or acquaintance.

Class has appeared as a factor in at least one study. Green and Wakefield (1979) found that, in their sample of 191 middle and upper class killings reported in the New York Times between 1955 and 1975, intra-familial homicide was much more common (about three times as likely) among their study population than among lower class homicides.

Race may also be a factor. In Chicago, in 1965, 47% of all victims were killed by a family member, 33% by casual acquaintance, and one-fifth by strangers (Voss and Hepburn 1968).³ Race and gender were highly correlated with victim-offender relationship. Few females were killed by strangers but one-fifth of the non-white males and 45% of the white male

³ In New York, in 1981, the proportion of stranger killings was almost identical (21%), but only 11% of victims were killed by a family member, and 68% by a friend or acquaintance -- twice the proportion found 16 years earlier in Chicago (Messner and Tardiff 1985).

victims were killed by strangers. This latter difference is due to the number of white male victims killed in the course of a robbery.

It is also fairly well accepted that the killing of blood relatives occurs less often than killing relatives by marriage. Daly and Wilson (1982) concluded that spouses, common-law and step-relatives are much more likely to be victimized than parents, siblings, etc. From their anthropological perspective, they suggest that "the motive and circumstances surrounding a substantial proportion of kin killings manifest straightforward adaptive logic". They cited defence of one relative against another, and resource competition (e.g., disputes over money or property) as two examples of such "adaptive logic" (Daly and Wilson 1982: 376).

Also of some interest is the finding by Zimring and his associates (1983) that in Chicago, in 1981, their sample of intersexual killings involved a larger number of "romantic involvement" murders than homicides occurring within legal marriages.

There are reasonably consistent findings with regard to changes over time in the incidence of primary (family and friend) murders vs. non-primary homicides. In Zahn's (1979) analysis of U.S. homicide rates between 1900 and 1979, the author concluded that the percent of murders of family members has remained relatively constant, while the number of homicides involving strangers and those committed for unknown reasons have fluctuated. Block (1981) concluded that the increase in the U.S.

homicide rate in the late 1960's and early 1970's resulted from an increase in felony killings. Block also suggested that "shifts in the number or proportion of violent crimes in which a gun was used accounted for more of the change in homicide number and patterns than did the dynamics of victim-offender interaction" (Block 1981: 752).

In Canada, Gillis (1986) found that non-primary homicides increased more rapidly between 1961 and 1974 than did primary homicides. Silverman and Kennedy (1987) in their analysis of the 1961-83 Canadian data report that: spouse/lover homicides declined steadily between the sixties and the early eighties; family (excluding spousal) homicides remained stable; "friend and acquaintance" homicides rose steadily over time and "stranger" homicides increased gradually to 1980 and then declined in the two subsequent years (Silverman and Kennedy 1987: 16).

Victim-precipitated Homicide

Wolfgang (1958) was probably the first researcher to empirically verify that some homicides are victim-precipitated; he put the figure at 26% of the Philadelphia cases he analyzed. It is now widely acknowledged that the pre-homicide interaction between victim and offender in some instances involves the victim "either directly precipitating their destruction, by throwing the first punch or firing the first shot, or contributing to the escalation of some conflict which concludes in their demise" (Luckinbill 1977: 176). However, many (including Luckinbill) have noted that the concept of victim-precipitation is more complex than was initially assumed. Provocation can be "prolonged and subtle"

(Nettler 1982: 30) and not necessarily apparent to the police investigating the incident. Avison (1974) suggests that there is probably a continuum between homicides with no victim precipitation (e.g., "problem-solving" homicides where the murderer decides that the victim "must die, as his continued survival poses too great a threat to the way of life of the offender") to homicides where there is "clear responsibility on the part of the victim for the aggressive action of his attacker" (Avison 1974: 227-8).

Felson and Steadman suggest that it is "not easy" to classify incidents as victim- or offender-precipitated. In their study of homicidal and assaultive events, they concluded that:

In most cases, most of the victim's actions were aggressive, indicating that they at least partially caused the outcome. On the other hand, they were not as aggressive as were the offenders, in that they attacked less and engaged in more evasive actions. Thus, while victims were aggressive, they appeared to be less aggressive than offenders.

Felson and Steadman 1983: 72

Finally, Green and Wakefield (1979) found no examples of victim-precipitated homicide among their middle to upper class murders; there was, however, a high proportion of homicide followed by suicide in their sample. Both findings are the reverse of what occurs among lower class murders, where there is a large percentage of victim-precipitated homicide (as operationalized by Wolfgang) and a low incidence of homicide followed by suicide of the offender.

The Presence of Alcohol

Many studies have reported that alcohol is a major factor in homicide victimization. In Wolfgang's classic study in Philadelphia (1958), 44% of the cases involved the presence of alcohol in both victim and offender; in 9% of the cases in the victim only; and in 11% in the offender only. Avison's 1974 analysis of 600 homicides in Scotland between 1950 and 1968 found that more than one-half of the quarrels resulting in death involved drunkenness in both offender and victim. Haberman and Baden examined 116 homicide victims in New York; about two-fifths had alcohol concentrations of 0.10% or more (1974: 229). In Memphis, Hollis (1974) found that in 80% of the 50 homicides where the drinking behaviour of murderer and victim were available, both had been drinking; the author concluded that there was a close relationship between the blood alcohol levels of the victim and the offender.

Voss and Hepburn's Chicago data could not differentiate between the victim and offender's use of alcohol; in 54% of the cases, alcohol was involved in the incident. Alcohol was involved in a slightly higher proportion of cases involving non-white victims (56% of non-whites versus 46% of white homicides). Wolfgang (1958) also found that homicides involving blacks disproportionately involved alcohol.

More recently, 1974 data from several U.S. cities show that males tend to be under the influence of alcohol at the time of death more frequently than females, that homicides of black males have the highest and white females have the lowest likelihood of involving alcohol, and

that alcohol was involved in more than 50% of deaths (Harper 1976).

Green and Wakefield (1979) reported an inverse relationship between social class and alcohol use: alcohol consumption is "rarely" involved in middle and upper class killings.

Felson and Steadman (1983) reported that the offender was more likely to kill, rather than to seriously assault, victims who were intoxicated from alcohol or drugs. Their analysis of the events preceding the homicide showed that this relationship remained even when the frequency of victim (counter-) attack was controlled. They suggest that this may mean that an intoxicated victim's greater aggressiveness is not the reason why he is killed, but that perhaps some aspect of the victim's demeanor may have elicited aggression from the offender (Felson and Steadman 1983: 72).

Levy et al (1969) reported in their analysis of 43 homicides involving Navajos on or near reservations that there was no relationship between homicide and alcohol use; the typical murder was the result of spousal violence and a high proportion of the offenders committed suicide. Levy and Kunitz (1971) suggested that there are tribal differences in both the abuse of alcohol and in homicide rates. Kupferer and Humphrey (1975) concluded that differences in cultural patterns of Indian tribes account for the extent and direction (i.e., internally versus externally oriented) of individual forms of violence.

A study of drinking and violence among middle American Indians suggested that the impact of cultural expectations on violent behaviour resulting from alcohol consumption are important determinants of that behaviour; that is, violence may not only be function of the amount of alcohol consumed, but also a function of the expectations of other parties involved. "Among cultures where violent behaviour is accepted as a consequence of alcohol drinking in both the drinking and the violence are quite open and forgiven" (U.S. Department of Justice 1980: 426, citing Cinquemani 1975).

The implication is that the "fighting drunk" may be more acceptable among some cultures (for example, the Irish and some Natives) than in other ethnic groups where members are expected to be responsible for their actions, regardless of their alcohol consumption. It is clearly speculative to suggest that there is a higher tolerance for violence in drinking situations among Native Canadians, but the hypothesis does merit further investigation.

The Situational Correlates of Victimization

The location of the offence, the temporal pattern, the means of offence, and the presence of third parties have all been found to have some association with victimization by murder or manslaughter.

Homicides of family members tend to take place in the victim's home (e.g., Voss and Hepburn 1968). In Canada, three-quarters or more of inter-sexual killings involving spouse/lover and other family members

occurred in the home of the victim (Silverman and Kennedy 1987). By contrast, about 40% or fewer of inter-sexual killings involving friend/acquaintance or stranger suspects took place in the victim's home. Almost all research has shown that, compared to women, males are disproportionately murdered while away from home. Middle to upper class killings take place in the victim's home more frequently than do lower class homicides (Green and Wakefield 1979). The findings have been mixed with regard to differences by race; Pokorny (1965) found no difference between blacks and whites in the proportion killed at home, whereas Wolfgang (1958) found that blacks were more likely to be victimized at home.

Pokorny (1965) reported that the distance between the home addresses of a victim and the accused was often less than one mile, even when spouse and common-law victims were eliminated from his Houston sample.

Voss and Hepburn (1968) noted that "criminal homicide is related to the tempo of social life" in terms of the temporal and diurnal patterning of the incidents. A number of studies have found that weekends (Friday, Saturday and Sunday) and 8 p.m. to 2 a.m. are the peak times for homicide (Wolfgang 1958; Pokorny 1965; Voss and Hepburn 1968; Maguire 1978). Middle and upper class killings are also most likely in the evening to early morning hours, but they do not show the same diurnal pattern (Green and Wakefield 1979). Although several researchers have anticipated that in northern cities, more homicides would occur in the summer this was not the case in Chicago or Philadelphia (Voss and Hepburn 1968; Wolfgang

1958); however, in New Jersey, the majority of murders took place in the summer months (Maguire 1978). Wolfgang (1958: 131) did find that homicides were slightly more likely to occur away from home during the summer.

In 1981, New York City homicide data showed a basic similarity in temporal patterns, regardless of the relationship of the suspect to the victim or the location of the incident: "the frequency of homicides tends to be relatively low in the hours around sunrise, to increase in the late afternoon to early evening, and to peak sometime later in the night". However, homicides occurring at the victim's home peak slightly earlier in the evening than do homicides outside the home -- presumably because people often come home for dinner and then go out for the evening (Messner and Tardiff 1985: 260). The "routine activities" approach to homicide hypothesizes that the nature of these activities is affected by socio-demographic characteristics; the activities in turn affect the physical location of potential victims and the pool of personal contacts from which potential offenders are drawn.

The method of offence -- shooting, beating, stabbing or other means -- has been found to be related to the gender of the offender as well as the victim. For example, Allen (1980) reported that in her small sample of California homicides, male victims were more frequently killed by guns or knives, whereas female victims died more frequently from beating. Similarly, in Chicago, females -- both whites and non-whites -- were more likely than males to be beaten to death; however, stabbing

showed no large difference by race or gender; non-white males were most likely (54%), and white females least likely (30%) to be shot (Voss and Hepburn 1968). In Canada, male victims of male suspects are disproportionately shot and less likely to be killed by "other" means (e.g., suffocating, strangling, drowning, etc.) than are female victims of male suspects (particularly when that suspect is a stranger). Females who kill males tend to use a knife, except when the victim is a family member (in these instances, other means tend to be employed) (Silverman and Kennedy 1987). The type of firearm used in domestic homicides is usually a rifle or shotgun, while in non-primary homicides ("felony killings" in the U.S.) easily concealed handguns are more common.

Felson and his colleagues have undertaken several investigations of the presence and role of third parties in homicides and assaults; in their sample, third parties were present in 70% of homicides and assaults. The figure compares to 54% in homicides studied by Swigert and Farrell (Felson and Steadman 1983: 73). The authors described the role of the third party as follows:

In both homicides and assaults third parties were more likely to participate as antagonists than as mediators. In a minority of cases these persons engaged in physical attack themselves, but more often they participated in the verbal conflict. When third parties did attempt to mediate, they did not appear to affect whether or not the victim was killed. However, previous research suggests that mediation may make a difference between these types of incidents and much less serious ones (Rubin and Brown, 1975; Luckinbill, 1977). In addition, evidence not presented suggests that mediation reduces the number of blows that an offender delivers.

Felson and Steadman 1983: 73

Felson et al (1984) hypothesized that (a) violence would be more intense

when the third parties were supportive of violence; and (b) conflicts involving young persons would be intense because significant others present during incidents involving youth are more likely to be supportive of violence. Both hypotheses were supported. For example, offenders delivered more blows in situations where their family or friends were also aggressive and struck fewer blows when the third party attempted to mediate. They suggested that position in the social structure (e.g., age) can affect behaviour because it affects the situations and the types of persons with whom one interacts.

Summary

Much of the homicide literature describes victimization in terms of the socio-demographic characteristics of the victim. These variables -- especially gender, race, and social class -- are obviously important correlates of both the extent and the nature of victimization. However, the review of the literature has indicated that studies should employ the victim-offender relationship as a major dimension of the analysis. Many aspects of homicides differ according to the "relational distance" between victim and offender. At a minimum, analysis of victims should differentiate between domestic and non-domestic homicides and most desirably, between spouse/lover victims, other family murders, friend/acquaintance homicides, and those involving strangers (e.g., Silverman and Kennedy 1987).

Another type of homicide research which raises interesting possibilities for analysis are those studies which explore the pre-

incident interaction between the victim, the offender, and any third parties present. This approach requires different data sources (police reports of homicide incidents rather than aggregate victim and offender information) and a different mode of analysis (a systematic scheme for coding the actions of the participants) than most research. Although these requirements preclude large samples, the approach appears to be a potent line of inquiry leading a greater understanding of the dynamics of the incidents and the reasons why some conflicts end in death and others in an assault. This approach is particularly fruitful for the investigations of homicides involving Native persons, since many are precipitated by an argument or quarrel.

Finally, the "routine activities" approach (Messner and Tardiff 1985; Silverman and Kennedy 1987) offers another potentially useful line of investigation. This approach hypothesizes that the structure of everyday interaction influences illegal as well as legal activities. For it to be expanded beyond relatively simple analysis, the approach requires more knowledge than is currently available of the life styles typical in various segments of society. This approach would assist in investigation of the differences in Native and non-Native victimization, but it cannot be pursued to any great extent because of the lack of empirical information on life style differences of Natives and non-Natives.

THE ANALYSIS

This report has as its primary objective to describe the differences between Native and non-Native homicide victimization between 1962-84. Although most analysis presents the data for the entire 23 year period, changes over time are discussed whenever they occur. After a brief review of victimization rates, the analysis examines the relationships between three demographic variables (the victim's age, gender, and marital status) and victimization of Natives and non-Natives. The circumstances of the incident itself are next described and they include: the relationship between the victim and the suspect; where the offence occurred; alcohol consumption by the victim, the suspect, or both; the apparent motive (as recorded by the police); and, the means of offence.

The analyses must be viewed as preliminary and descriptive in nature; no causal interpretations can be drawn from these data without more sophisticated multivariate techniques than were possible within the parameters of this report. We hope that future researchers will be encouraged by this report to utilize these statistical methods to further explain the sometimes tantalizing results reported here.

The supporting tables are found in the Appendix.

Victimization Rates

An estimate of the homicide rates per 100,000 for Natives and non-Natives, males and females, is shown in Table 1. These rates must be viewed as estimates because it is generally accepted that census data underestimate the number of Natives in Canada. In 1981, Natives were victimized in much higher proportions than their non-Native counterparts; the rate for Natives was about 17 per 100,000 population; for non-Natives, it was about 2 per 100,000.⁴ The ratio between the two rates (of about 8 to 1) did not differ for males and females to any large degree. Table 1 also shows that Native men are more than twice as likely as Native women to be a victim of homicide -- a figure somewhat higher than that for non-Natives (who had a male:female ratio of about 1.4 to 1).

The remainder of this section compares the characteristics of Native and non-Native victimization. No other victimization rates per population could be provided (e.g., age-specific rates) because the data were not provided to us in the same age breakdowns as in published census data.

Race and Gender

People of Native Canadian origin made up 17% of all homicide victims between 1962 and 1984, and there was no difference by gender; 17% of the male victims and 16% of the females were Native (Table 2). Just over

⁴ The U.S. rate per 100,000 population in 1981 was 10 (Luckinbill, 1984).

one-third (36%) of all homicide victims were women and there was no difference by race ⁵ (Table 3).

Changes over Time in Race and Gender

Depending on the period, Natives made up between 14% and 18% of all homicide victims (Table 4). When Native and non-Native victims are separately examined, it becomes apparent that there was a change over time in the proportion of female Natives (Table 5). In the 1960's, 43% of Native victims were women, but in the early 1980's the percentage had dropped to 30%. There was also a small decrease (by 6%) in the proportion of non-Native females. In most time periods, there was not a large difference by race in the proportion of female victims, for example: in 1981-84, non-Native women made up 36% of the non-Native victims, a figure not dissimilar to the 30% for Native women.

The Age of the Victim

Table 6 shows the distribution by age for 1982-83. ⁶ Although Natives do not differ from non-Natives in the proportion of children under 15 years who are victimized (at 7.5% of each group), Native victims were about 10% more likely to be in their twenties than were non-Natives. Although the proportions in their thirties and forties did not greatly

⁵ These Canadian data show a greater likelihood of females being victimized than is the case in the U.S. Wilbanks (1981) states that in the U.S. there are over three times as many male victims of murder and non negligent manslaughter as female victims; the ratio in Canada is 1.75 to 1.

⁶ Unlike most of the analysis in this report, the age data were available only for a more limited time period.

differ, 25% of non-Native, but only 15% of Native victims were 50 years or more. Similar patterns held when gender was controlled. Both Native and non-Native female victims were slightly younger than the men; for example, 27% of Native women were under 20 years compared to 14% of the male Native victims.

It was not possible to compute age-specific victimization rates using published Statistics Canada population data. This is especially unfortunate considering the differences in the age distributions reported here; it would be most interesting to know if the apparent age differences in victimization are eliminated or reduced when the rates per 100,000 population in each age category are calculated.

Marital Status

Native victims were more than twice as likely as non-Natives to be living in a common-law relationship (Table 7) -- a finding that may reflect a general difference between the two groups, rather than one specific to homicide victims. When married and common-law statuses were combined, 51% of Natives versus 40% of non-Natives were in a conjugal arrangement. Non-Natives were disproportionately divorced or separated, but there were no racial differences in the percentage who were widowed or single. The racial difference for women was more marked than it was among the men; almost two-thirds (64%) of Native women were married or living common-law, compared to only 46% of the non-Native women.

Changes over Time in Marital Status

When changes over time in marital status are examined separately for each of the four groups (i.e., Native and non-Native men and women), it is apparent that there have been striking changes between the 1960's and the 1980's. Native men and women, and non-Native men (and to a lesser extent also non-Native women) have shown a large decrease in the proportions who are married or living common-law (Tables 8 and 9).

In the case of Native males, there was a very large reduction in the proportion of married victims (47% to 18%), and even the increase in common-law relationships between 1962-65 and 1981-84 could not compensate for the reduction of 14% in the number of victims in conjugal arrangements between the early 1960's and the early 1980's. There was an increase in the proportion of single Native males. Native females showed no change in the proportion in a common-law status, but there was a reduction (by 15%) in married women. There was no consistent trend in their single status over time. (See Table 8).

The proportion of married and common-law non-Native men decreased from one-half of all victims in the earliest years to 30% in recent years (Table 9). There were small but regular increases in the proportions of separated/divorced males and of single men. There was a slight decrease in the proportion of non-Native women who were married or living common-law, and a slight increase in the proportion of single women, but none of the changes were as large as that of their male counterparts.

The Relationship between the Victim and the Suspect

For the purposes of this report, the relationship between suspect and victim is classified as follows: ⁷

- "Immediate family": the suspect is a spouse, parent, child, or sibling of the victim.
- "Common-law": The suspect is a common-law spouse, parent, child, etc. of the victim.
- "Other kin": the suspect has some other type of family relationship to the victim, including grandparents, uncles and aunts, in-laws, and foster relations.
- "Non-domestic (other)": the suspect is a current or former lover, boy friend, girl friend, is an acquaintance of the victim, or has some type of business relationship, or is a stranger to the victim but the homicide did not involve another crime. (This category may also contain some cases where the nature of the relationship was not ascertainable, but no other crime besides the homicide was involved.)
- "Non-domestic (criminal act)": there was no domestic relationship between the suspect and the victim, and the homicide was committed during the commission of another crime, such as a robbery or sexual assault.

The relationship between the victim and the suspected differed by

⁷ Victims whose murderer was not identified (i.e., unsolved cases) are excluded from this analysis.

both race and gender (Table 10). Compared to non-Natives, Natives were disproportionately murdered by persons with whom they had a common-law relationship and by members of their extended kin network. Only 5% of Natives were killed during the commission of another criminal act, versus 16% of non-Natives. There were almost no differences between Natives and others in the proportions killed by members of the immediate family and those with whom they had a non-domestic (other) relationship.

Female victims differed from the men to a very large extent. As all research has shown, women were more likely to be killed by a member of their immediate family or a common-law relative than were males, and were about half as likely to be killed by someone with whom they had a non-domestic (other) relationship. Turning to differences between Native and non-Native men, Natives were generally more likely to be murdered by someone with whom they had a domestic relationship; the non-domestic (other) category showed no difference by race; non-Natives were disproportionately murdered during another crime. The women showed fewer differences by race; when common-law relatives were combined with "immediate family", 61% of Native and 58% of non-Native females were murdered by one or the other in this category. Approximately one-quarter of both Native and non-Native women were killed by someone with whom they had a non-domestic relationship. There was a very slight tendency for non-Native women to be disproportionately killed during another crime (14% versus 8%).

Changes over Time in the Relationship between the Victim and the Suspect

We anticipated that societal changes in the past two dozen years would have altered the nature of victimization since the early 1960's -- for example, that women, particularly non-Native women, would be more likely to be murdered by persons other than family members as they became more involved in employment and other activities outside the home. Although the difference was in the expected direction, the changes over time were small. In 1962-65, 68% of the non-Native female victims were murdered by someone with whom they had a domestic relationship, versus 57% in the early 1980's; comparable figures for the Native women are 73% (1962-70) and 63% (1981-84). Another finding common to both Native and non-Native women is an increase in the proportion victimized during another crime; even so, in 1981-84, only 11% of Native and 17% of non-Native women were murdered under these circumstances. (See Tables 11 and 12.)

Table 13 shows that there was also a slight decrease in the proportion of Native men murdered by a member of their immediate or extended family, and an increase (by about 10%) in the proportion killed by someone with whom they had a non-domestic (other) relationship. The non-Native men were similar but the change over time was smaller (Table 14).

The Actual Location of the Offence

Of the variables available to this report, the location of the offence showed the least variation by race (Table 15). However, a much

larger proportion of women were killed in their own home than were males. One-half of the Native and 62% of the non-Native women were victimized at their home; the same figures for males were 31% and 38%. These data support the hypotheses of Messner and Tardiff (1985), who suggest that the "routine activities" of men and women determine dimensions such as the location of the homicide -- females are more likely to be victimized at home because they tend to spend more time at home than do males. This same finding was reported by Wolfgang (1958), Swigert and Farrell (1976) and a number of other researchers. Inconsistent results have been reported for the relationship between race (blacks versus whites in the U.S.) and victimization at home; in this study, non-Native homicides more often occurred in the victim's home than did Native incidents (47% versus 38%).

Other than homicides taking place in the victim's home, most incidents were relatively evenly distributed among the suspect's home, other private or work places, public places, and "other" locations (including correctional and mental institutions, and unknown locations). There were no changes over time in the location of the offence (data not shown in table form).

The Actual Location by the Victim's Relationship to the Suspect

As expected, the location of the homicide was closely associated with the identity of the suspect: domestic homicides -- those involving a family member as suspect -- were much more likely to occur in the

victim's home ⁸ than were homicides with a non-family member as suspect (Table 16). About 60% or more of Native domestic homicides, and about three-quarters of the non-Native homicides involving a relative-as-suspect, occurred in the victim's home. ⁹ By contrast, between 16% (Native men) and 45% (non-Native women) of homicides with a non-domestic (other) suspect occurred in the victim's home. The range for homicides taking place during another crime is smaller; between 27% and 38% took place in the victim's home. Finally, non-domestic homicides occurred proportionately more often in a public place than did domestic crimes; this was the case for all four groups -- Native and non-Native men and women.

Alcohol Use

Alcohol consumption prior to the homicide -- either by the victim, the suspect, or both -- is strongly related to race (Table 17). Native victims were almost three times as likely as non-Native victims to involve alcohol (70% versus 25%). (See the 1962-84 column on Table 17.) There were some very interesting, and not easily explicable, changes over the 23 year period. For both Native men and women victims, there was a large decrease (of about 20 percentage points) in the incidence of alcohol use. In the early 1960's, 80% of male and 74% of female Native homicides involved alcohol; the same figures for the early 1980's are 62%

⁸ Again, these data are congruent with the findings of Messner and Tardiff (1985) and Silverman and Kennedy (1987).

⁹ There was one exception to this general pattern; only one-third of murders with members of the extended family as suspects occurred in the home of the Native male victims.

and 53%. While there was no change for non-Native women, there was one for men: there was a slight decrease (9 percentage points) in the proportion of homicides of non-Native men in which alcohol was said to be involved.

Alcohol Use by the Victim's Relationship to the Suspect

The only independent variable that was run against the presence of alcohol in the ^{number} incident was the relationship of the victim to the suspect (Table 18). For Natives and non-Natives, fewer homicides committed during another crime, such as robbery, involved the use of alcohol. Another similarity is that, regardless of race or gender, if the suspect had a common-law relationship to the victim, there was a greater probability that alcohol was consumed prior to the homicide. Other than that unsolved homicides understandably had a lower likelihood of alcohol involvement (since there is no suspect to examine for his/her use of intoxicants), there were no other large differences by race or gender in the presence of alcohol when the identity of the suspect was controlled. This finding somewhat contradicts Nettler's assertion (1982: 55) that "domestic battling is often saturated with alcohol". Excluding situations where there is a common-law relationship, domestic or familial homicides involve alcohol consumption in similar proportions to the non-domestic (other) category. It is, however, possible that if male-female spouse/lover homicides were examined separately, a relationship would emerge.

Apparent Motive for the Homicide

The "apparent motive" differed by race, and to a lesser extent also by gender. Over one-half of Native homicides were said to be the result of an argument or quarrel, compared to 28% of the non-Native murders, and this difference remained even when the victim's gender was controlled. (However, males were more likely than females to be murdered during an argument.) Revenge, mental illness or retardation (presumably of the suspect), and criminal acts were more commonly given by the police as the reasons for non-Native homicides. (See Table 19.)

The Means of Offence

Non-Natives were slightly more likely to be shot, while Natives -- primarily the women -- were disproportionately beaten to death (Table 20). Stabbing deaths did not differ greatly by race. However, Native men were almost twice as likely as Native women to be stabbed (30% versus 16%). Strangling, although an infrequent homicide method overall, constituted the means of offence for 6% of Native women but 15% of non-Native females. "Other" means -- such as drowning, arson, suffocating, etc. -- showed no differences by race or gender. Means of offence is closely related to the gender of the assailant and future research should include this factor in a multivariate analysis.

Changes over Time in the Means of Offence

Several interesting differences over time appeared when the means of offence was examined for the period between the early sixties and the early eighties (Tables 21 to 24). For all groups except Native women,

the incidence of homicides involving firearms decreased by 9 to 14 percentage points. There were particularly large changes over this period for Natives. Homicide using a firearm and beating deaths of Native men decreased, and homicide by stabbing doubled over the 23 years (from 21% to 42%) (Table 21). Although death by shooting remained constant for the Native women, homicide by beating decreased and stabbings showed a twofold increase (from 11% in the 1960's to 24% in the early 1980's) (Table 22). Tables 23 and 24 show that the changes for non-Natives were less notable; compared to 1962-65, in the 1980's males were somewhat more likely to be stabbed to death (17% to 27%) and less likely to be shot (48% to 38%). While death by shooting decreased from 44% to 29% for non-Native women, no one other means of offence showed an increase; stabbing, strangling, and "other" methods all rose slightly.

Type of Firearm Used in Homicides by Shooting

The type of firearm used in shooting homicides was closely associated with race (Table 25). Non-Native victims were much more likely to be killed by a handgun than were Natives (31% versus 6%); this finding probably reflects at least two factors. First, handguns are less likely to be owned by Natives than by non-Natives; and second, non-Natives are more likely than Natives to be killed in the course of another criminal act, where handgun use is more common. More puzzling is the disproportionate use of rifles in shooting deaths of Native persons (75% of Natives versus 43% of non-Natives were killed by a rifle), but shotgun deaths showed no difference by race. Although the ownership of

shotguns is less common than rifle ownership,¹⁰ availability would not seem to account for the Native/non-Native differences in rifle firearm homicides. Perhaps Native Canadians prefer rifles to shotguns for hunting purposes and own rifles in larger proportions than do the non-Native population.

Factors Related to the Means of Offence

When the victim's relationship to the suspect was controlled, some differences in the choice of means of offence emerged for Native and non-Native victims (Table 26). Males of both races who were killed by a common-law relative were more likely to be stabbed than were others. Presumably, these men were murdered by their common-law partner, whose choice of weapon may often be limited to a knife -- a gun may be unavailable or difficult to use, and a woman's physical strength usually precludes homicide by beating. Another finding common to all Natives and to non-Native women (but not non-Native men) is the lower likelihood of a firearm being used by offenders who killed during another crime, when these homicides are compared to those which there was a victim-suspect relationship. For example, only 7% of Native women were shot to death during another crime, whereas a relative used a firearm in 29% of domestic murders, and 29% of persons with whom the victim had a non-domestic (other) relationship used a gun.

¹⁰ Stenning and Moyer reported that "approximately 1 in 12 Canadians own at least one shotgun, 1 in 9 Canadians own at least 1 rifle, and that 17% of all Canadians report owning handguns" (1981: 27); according to this 1976 survey data, Canada had an estimated total gun stock of 3 million rifles, just over 1.75 million shotguns, and 284,000 handguns. (Ibid: 29).

Native men who were killed by a member of their family (their immediate or common-law family) were less likely to be beaten to death than were male Natives killed by other types of suspects. Again, this finding is probably related to the gender of the offender -- it is probable that a sizeable proportion of the group with a relative-suspect were killed by their wives who lacked the strength to overpower physically and murder by beating.

Native women, on the other hand, were much more likely to be beaten to death when the suspect was a family member than when the suspect was in a non-domestic relationship. Stabbing deaths showed the opposite pattern; compared to family members, suspects in non-domestic (other) relationships disproportionately chose a knife as a weapon.

Other than those described above, there were few differences for non-Native victims in the means of offence by the type of relationship to the suspect.

When the location of the offence was taken into consideration, Natives (both males and females) and non-Native men showed an association between death by firearms and victimization in the suspect's home (Table 27). Presumably the suspect's access to his/her gun increases the probability that it will be used in the incident. For non-Native women, however, almost 40% of incidents occurring in their or the suspect's home involved shooting, in comparison to about 28% of the homicides that took place in a public or "other" location. Therefore, non-Native women

differed from others in that they were as likely to be shot in their own home as in the suspect's home.

Access to firearms may also be a reason why there was a lower likelihood for Native men and women to be shot when the incident takes place in public. "Public place" homicides of Native males tended to involve proportionately more beating deaths -- one could speculate that in these instances arguments or quarrels had escalated into a far more serious outcome. Why there is no large difference in shootings in public (versus other locations) for non-Natives may be related to the higher probability of premeditation on the part of the suspect in non-Native homicides -- perhaps the firearm had been brought by the suspect to the location of the homicide. The finding may also be related to the disproportionate use of handguns in non-Native homicides; such weapons are much easier to carry and conceal than are long guns, the usual firearms used by Natives.

The presence of alcohol in the homicide incident (i.e., consumption by the victim, the suspect, or both) was the third variable introduced as a control factor for the means of offence used (Table 28). The consumption of alcohol had no major effect on the method chosen by the suspect for Native victims¹¹ and non-Native women over the entire 23 year period. However, in 1981-84, if alcohol was involved, a larger

¹¹ However, Table 28 shows that female Natives were somewhat more likely to be beaten to death when alcohol was present than when it was not.

percentage of male Natives were beaten or stabbed than when no alcohol was involved (Table 29). About one-fifth of Native male homicides with alcohol present involved a shooting, compared to 43% of the homicides where alcohol was not present. There were identical findings for non-Native men so that 35% of incidents with alcohol, but 49% of those not involving alcohol resulted in death by shooting; like the male non-Natives¹² were disproportionately beaten or stabbed when alcohol was present at the scene (1962-84, with no variation over time). (See Table 28.)

As with the other results of this analysis, we cannot be sure that it is the use of alcohol itself or other factors associated with alcohol consumption that affected the choice of means of offence. Multivariate analysis would be required to answer such questions more definitively than is possible here.

The Type of Offence 12

Second degree murder was more frequently found among cases involving Native victims (62% versus 44% of non-Native victims were in this category), whereas premeditated, first degree homicides were more common among non-Natives (35% versus 23%) (Table 23). Surprisingly,

12 Note that these data exclude unsolved first and second degree murders and are for the 1977-84 period. This period was selected because the homicide and related offence categories differed in earlier years, making comparisons difficult.

manslaughter showed no difference by race.¹³ "Other" murders -- primarily murder followed by the suicide of the offender -- disproportionately appeared in the non-Native group. Few differences in the overall results were found when gender was controlled.

¹³ This may be because the initial determination of type of offence is made by the police, not the Crown or the court -- it is common for murder charges to be reduced to manslaughter later in the criminal justice process.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The preceding analysis has shown that, on a number of dimensions, the victimization of Natives differs from that of non-Natives. Throughout the analysis, the focus was on comparing Native and non-Native victimization for the period between 1962 and 1984. In this concluding section, however, we summarize the main features of homicide victimization for Natives and non-Natives separately in order to clarify the most important characteristics, especially the gender differences, of homicide victimization for each group.

This section concludes with a brief list of recommendations for future research in this area.

Native Homicide Victimization

Males were more than twice as likely to be homicide victims as female Natives when the rates per 100,000 population for 1981 were calculated. The rate for all Natives was 17 per 100,000.

For the total period between 1962 and 1984, just over one-third of Native victims were women. However, by the early 1980's, women were less likely (by 11%) to be victims than in the 1960's.

In 1982-3, female victims of Native origin were somewhat younger than their male counterparts, for example: 17% were 19 years or younger,

compared to 14% of the men. Most victimization occurred between 20 and 49 years: two-thirds of male and 62% of female victims were in this age group.

Female Natives were more likely to be living in a common-law situation than were the men (31% versus 17%). Although the percentages of married persons did not greatly differ by gender, the overall proportions in some form of conjugal arrangement showed a substantial difference (64% of females versus 44% of males were married or living common-law). Almost one-half of the men were single, in comparison to 29% of the women. All Natives showed a decrease (of about 15%) over time in conjugal situations -- by the early 1980's, 40% of the men and 55% of the women were living in a conjugal arrangement, and 52% of the men and 31% of the women were single.

The victim-suspect relationship for Natives also showed a substantial gender difference -- not surprising, perhaps, considering the differences in marital status. Two-thirds of the women were victimized by a family member, in contrast to 44% of the men. Native men were twice as likely as women to be victimized by someone in the "non-domestic (other)" category -- in most cases, probably a friend, acquaintance or work associate. Only 3% of the male and 8% of the female Natives were victimized in the course of another crime, such as robbery or sexual assault. There was some change in the victim-offender relationship over the 23 years: domestic murders decreased slightly (by about 10%) among both men and women.

Since domestic murder accounts for such a disproportionate amount of female victimization, it is not unexpected to find that one-half of the females, but only 31% of the males, were killed in their own home. Males were disproportionately murdered in either the suspect's home or in an "other private or work place". When the victim's relationship to the suspect was controlled, the findings were as predicted -- regardless of gender, a majority of domestic murders took place in the victim's home (except for men killed by "other kin"), whereas non-domestic murders were distributed relatively evenly over the other categories of the "location" variable.

One of the most puzzling findings in our investigation of the characteristics of Native homicide victimization was the reduction over time in the percentage of homicides in which alcohol was present at the crime scene (either in the victim, suspect, or both). Since we have no comparable population data on the use of alcohol by Natives, we cannot conclude that the reduction is related to a general decrease in the use of alcohol by Natives, or to a specific decrease in the use of alcohol by homicide victims and/or suspects.¹⁴ Whatever the reason, by the early 1980's, 62% of male and 53% of the female Native homicides involved the presence of alcohol -- a reduction for both sexes of about 20% over two decades.

¹⁴ Or, perhaps, a change in the reporting practices of the police. It does not, however, seem likely that the change is totally an artifact of changes in police investigative or recording practices -- particularly since no change over time was found for the presence of alcohol in non-Native homicide victimizations.

We next examined whether the relationship between the victim and the suspect was related to the presence of alcohol at the crime scene. Between 1962 and 1984, 68% of domestic murders of women involved the presence of alcohol, versus 76% of the males. There was a 10% difference by gender in the percentage of "non-domestic (other)" incidents involving alcohol, again higher for men (75% versus 65%). Homicides committed during the commission of other crimes involved the least use of alcohol (53% of male and 59% of female incidents involved the use of alcohol). There were no trends over time in the relationship between alcohol use and victim-suspect relationships for the female Natives. However, incidents where males were victimized by a member of the immediate family were as likely to involve alcohol in the 1960's as in the 1980's, while all other victimization showed a drop in the presence of alcohol.

The "apparent motive" as recorded by the police showed a slight difference by gender; over one-half (58%) of the men were killed as a result of an argument or quarrel, whereas 45% of the Native women victimizations involved this motive. Jealousy was given as the motive for proportionately more female deaths (16%) than male (7%).

For the entire period between 1962 and 1984, men were more likely to be shot (37% versus 25%) or stabbed to death (30% versus 16%), but women were more likely to be beaten (40% versus 26%) or to die by strangling or "other" means such as suffocating, drowning, arson, etc. (19% versus 8%). Over the 23 years among Native males, there was a marked decrease in deaths by beating and shooting, and a doubling of death by stabbing;

Native women also showed a reduction in victimization by beating and an increase in stabbings but there was no change in shooting deaths.

The means of offence was associated with the victim's relationship to the suspect. Common to all Natives was the finding that murders committed in the course of another crime were less likely to involve firearms use than were other murders. Stabbing deaths disproportionately occurred when the suspect was in a common-law relationship with the male victim, while for women, beatings predominated under these circumstances. These findings are undoubtedly related to the gender of the suspect -- data which were not, unfortunately, available for this analysis. In addition, when an immediate or common-law family member was the suspect, the Native men were less likely to be beaten to death than in cases with other types of suspects, whereas the reverse was the case for the Native women.

The relationships between the means of offence and the actual location of the offence were not outstanding. Both male and female Natives were shot in larger proportions when the homicide took place in the suspect's home rather than elsewhere; presumably, the availability of a firearm has a substantial bearing on its use. Homicides occurring in public places involved beatings in substantial proportions (38% of the men and 45% of the females who were killed in public died in this manner); only for men, however, was this proportion higher than homicides taking place in other locations. A lower proportion of public place homicides involved firearms when compared to private places (such as the

victim's or suspect's home, or "other" private places). This finding is in keeping with the finding that the large majority of Native deaths by firearms involved a long gun -- these weapons are probably less accessible in public than in private places.

Although for most of the time period under discussion, the presence of alcohol made no difference in the means of offence for males, in the early 1980's there was a marked relationship. Male Natives were about one-half as likely to be shot when alcohol was present than when it was not. If the male victim, or suspect, or both were imbibing, death was most likely to be by stabbing (45%) or beating (26%); comparable figures for incidents with no alcohol present are 36% and 14%. For the total period, Native women were 11% more likely to be beaten to death if alcohol was on the scene than if no alcohol was said to be present.

The final variable available to this analysis was the type of offence as determined by the police. In 1977-1984, the majority of both male (64%) and female (57%) victimizations were classified as second degree murder, with first degree murder occurring in 22% of the male and 26% of the female homicides. Only about one-tenth of the Native cases were reported as being manslaughter. Murder-suicides were infrequent among Natives -- applying to 2% of the men and 8% of the women.

Non-Native Homicide Victimization

In 1981, the victimization rate for non-Natives was 2 per 100,000, and males were 1.4 times as likely as females to be murdered. Just over

*PN
reu*

one-third (37%) of the non-Native victims were female, when the entire period between 1962 and 1984 is considered; there was little fluctuation over time in that proportion.

In 1982-3, non-Native women victims were slightly younger than the males; 20% were 19 years or younger, compared to 11% of the men; 55% of the women were 30 years or over, in contrast to 64% of the men.

The female non-Native victims were more likely to be married and less likely to be single than were males. Over time, there was a decrease in the percentage of married men, and to a much lesser extent females were also less likely to be married or in a common-law living arrangement. By 1981-84, 30% of the males were in a conjugal arrangement as were 41% of the females; 54% of the males were single but only 37% of the females were unmarried.

There were extremely large differences between men and women in the type of suspect: 46% of the non-Native women were murdered by a member of their immediate family, compared to 17% of the men; all domestic relationships accounted for 61% of female victimization, but only 25% of male homicides. The majority of the male non-Natives were killed by someone in the "non-domestic (other)" category -- a friend, acquaintance, work associate, etc. We anticipate that the women would show a change over the 23 year period in the nature of the suspect-victim relationship. One was found, but it was not large. In 1981-84, women were 10% less likely than in the early 1960's to be murdered in a domestic incident,

and there was an increase in homicides during the course of another crime (9% to 17% in 1981-84). The men showed no difference in the relationship to the suspect over this time period.

As we expected considering the gender differences in the victim-suspect relationship, the location of the offence also showed substantial differences by gender. Three-fifths of the women were killed in their own home, compared to 38% of the men. Males tended to be victimized in an "other private/work place" (17%) or in public places (24%) in larger proportions than the women, who were victimized in these locations in 9% and 13% of incidents (respectively).

Both men and women victimized by a family member were largely murdered in their own home -- about three-quarters or more of non-Native domestic murders took place at the victim's home. Women victimized in non-domestic murders were more likely to be killed at home than any other location, but this was less true for males. Between one-quarter and one-third of the males killed in a non-domestic homicide were victimized at their home; the same figure for females was about 40%. All non-Natives killed in a non-domestic homicide were somewhat more likely to be killed in an "other private/work place" or in a "public place", when compared to persons killed in a domestic murder.

About three out of ten murders of non-Native men involved the presence of alcohol at the crime scene, in comparison to about two out of ten women. These proportions showed no consistent changes over the 23

years.

Alcohol use was related to the type of suspect. Non-Natives murdered by someone with whom they had a common-law relationship showed the highest incidence of alcohol at the scene (54% of the males and 38% of the females). A larger proportion of men killed in non-domestic but non-criminal circumstances were involved in incidents where alcohol was present; 40% of males, versus 23% of females killed by someone in the "non-domestic (other)" category had alcohol present in victim, suspect, or both.

The motives for the homicides, as reported by the police, did not show major gender differences; nor did any one motive predominate. The most frequent category -- "arguments or quarrels" -- was cited for 31% of the males and 22% of the females. Revenge was more often given as motive for males (17%) than females (8%) whereas the reverse was true for jealousy (6% of men, and 19% of women were said to be killed for this reason).

The main difference between men and women in the means of offence was that women were 10% less likely to be shot than males; females were strangled in larger proportions than males (15% and 4%, respectively), but death by beating and stabbing showed no large variation by gender. Over time, there was a slight increase in the incidence of stabbing deaths for Native males, and a reduction in death by firearms by a similar percentage (10%). The women, however, showed a slightly larger

drop in shooting deaths (44% in 1962-65 versus 29% in 1981-84), and stabbing, strangling and other means all showed slight increases.

Over one-third (35%) of non-Native men who were shot were killed by a handgun and a similar proportion (39%) were killed by a rifle; the same figures for women were 23% (handgun) and 52% (rifle).

When the means of offence was examined in relation to the victim-suspect relationship, it was found that men murdered by a common-law relative were much more likely to be stabbed than when other suspects were involved, and that members of the extended family were more likely to kill with a firearm than were other relatives. All non-Natives, but especially the women, were less likely to be shot in a homicide involving another crime than in other types of incidents. Other than these differences, domestic and non-domestic homicides did not greatly differ in terms of the means of offence.

There were almost no gender differences in the means of offence when the homicide took place in the victim's home: about two-fifths of victims were shot, about one-fifth were beaten to death, and a similar proportion stabbed. In other circumstances, however, males were more likely to be shot than females, regardless of the location of the offence. In general, there were no other striking relationships between location and method of the offence for non-Natives.

Although there was no association for women between the means of offence and the presence of alcohol at the scene, the data for men showed that beatings and stabbings disproportionately occurred in the presence of alcohol, and incidents with no alcohol were more likely to involve a shooting death (49% of alcohol-free male incidents versus 35% of alcohol incidents involved shooting as the method of offence).

In 1977 to 1984, just over one-third of the non-Native victimizations were classified as first degree murder, and about two-fifths as second degree. The only gender difference was related to murder followed by suicide of the offender -- 18% of women, but only 5% of the men, were killed in a homicide followed by suicide.

Implications and Recommendations

The analysis has shown that Canada presents a very different picture from the United States in terms of homicide rates, the question of race, and the use of guns. It cannot be assumed that the forces shaping the characteristics of homicide victimization for Native Canadians and American minority groups are identical, despite their shared characteristics, such as high unemployment rates and low socio-economic status.

Canada's treatment of its Native people was and may still be socially and economically poor, but it has not been nearly so violent (as the treatment of blacks and Natives in the U.S.). It seems unlikely from a structural perspective that this difference in the form of mistreatment would not have had behavioural consequences, for example, in rates of violent crime.

In addition, the availability of handguns is severely limited in Canada by legal restrictions -- a situation drastically different from the U.S. As Hagan predicts (Ibid.), Canadian Natives are "less violent" than their counterparts, at least with regard to homicide rates. In the mid-1970's, in the U.S., the rate for Indians was 27 per 100,000; the rate for Canadian Natives was 17 per 100,000 in 1981.¹⁵

Future research using the homicide data collected by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics should consider the following lines of investigation:

- Merge the victim and suspect databases (such as has been reported by Silverman and Kennedy 1987), to introduce suspect variables (especially race, gender, and age) into the analysis.
- Investigate the changes over time in the following factors: marital status, the proportion of incidents in which alcohol is involved (Natives only), the relationship between the victim and suspect, and the means of offence. This analysis would attempt to explain, rather than to merely describe, these changes by using multivariate techniques.
- Examine regional differences in Native and non-Native victimization and, if possible, rural and urban differences.
- Develop causal models, based on hypotheses such as the "routine activities" approach (Messner and Tardiff 1985). The dependent

¹⁵ Since most homicide in both countries is intra-racial, we have assumed the victimization rates reflect offending rates with reasonable accuracy.

variables could include the victim-suspect relationship, the means of offence, and the location of the homicide.

Homicide victimization in Canada exhibits different dynamics for Natives and non-Natives. The number of differences between the two groups greatly outweighed the similarities. The analysis also showed -- as all research has suggested -- that there are large variations by gender. Indeed, for some variables, gender differences were more striking than racial differences. These findings point to the need to continue analysis of the special features of homicides involving Native and non-Native men and women as victims.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akiyama, Y. 1981. Murder victimization rates: A statistical analysis. F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin 50(3): 8-11.
- Allen, N.H. 1980. Homicide: Perspectives on prevention. New York: Human Sciences Press. (Abstract)
- Avison, N.H. 1974. Victims of homicide. International Journal of Criminology and Penology 2: 225-237.
- Bailey, W.C. 1984. Poverty, inequality and city homicide rates. Criminology 22(Nov.): 531-50.
- Barnard, G.W. et al. 1982. Till death do us part: A study of spouse murder. Bulletin of the AAPL 10: 271-279.
- Beauvais, F. and S. LaBoueff. 1985. Drug and alcohol abuse intervention in American Indian communities. International Journal of the Addictions 20 (1): 139-171.
- Blau, J. and P. Blau. 1982. The cost of inequality: Metropolitan structure and violent crime. American Sociological Review 47: 114-129.
- Block, C.R. 1985. Race/ethnicity and patterns of Chicago homicide 1965 to 1981. Crime and Delinquency 31 (Jan.): 104-116.
- Block, R. 1981. Victim - offender dynamics in violent crime. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 72 (Summer): 743-61.
- Boris, S.B. 1979. Stereotypes and dispositions for criminal homicide Criminology 17 (August): 139-58.
- Bynum, T.S. and R. Paternoster. 1984. Discrimination revisited: an exploration of frontstage and backstage criminal justice decision making. Sociology and Social Research 69 (Oct.): 90-108.
- Cinquemani, D.K. 1975. Drinking and violence among middle American Indians. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University (abstract).
- Cohen, Lawrence E. and M. Felson. 1979. Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. American Sociological Review 44: 588-608.
- Cohen, Lawrence E., Felson, M. and Land, K. 1980. Property crime rates in the United States: A macro-dynamic analysis 1947-1977 with ex ante forecasts for the mid - 1980's. American Journal of Sociology 86: 90-118.
- Curtis, L.A. 1974. Criminal violence: National patterns and behaviour. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.

- Daly, M. and M. Wilson. 1982. Homicide and kinship. American Anthropology Journal 84 (June): 372-8
- Davis, J.H. 1975. Alcohol as a precursor to violent death. Journal of Drug Issues 5 (Summer): 270-5.
- Dressler, J. 1982. Rethinking heat of passion. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 73(Summer): 421-70.
- Farley, R. 1980. Homicide trends in the United States. Demography 17 (2): 177-188.
- Farrell, R.A. and V.L. Swigert. 1978. Legal disposition of inter-group and intra-group homicides. Sociological Quarterly 19 (Autumn): 565-76.
- Farrell, R.A. and V.L. Swigert. 1978. Prior offense record as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Law and Society Review 12: 437-453.
- Felson, R.B. and H.J. Steadman. 1983. Situational factors in disputes leading to criminal violence. Criminology 21 (Feb.): 59-74
- Felson, R.B. et al. 1984. Age and the effect of third parties during criminal violence. Sociology and Social Research 68 (July): 452-462.
- Gillis, A.R. 1986. Domesticity, divorce and deadly quarrels: An exploration of integration, regulation and homicide. In T. Hartnagel and R. Silverman (eds.), Critique and explanation: Essays in honour of Gwynne Nettler.
- Green, E. and R.P. Wakefield. 1979. Patterns of middle and upper class homicide. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 70 (2): 172-81.
- Hagan, John. 1985. Toward structural theory of crime, race and gender: The Canadian case. Crime and Delinquency 31 (Jan.): 129-146.
- Haberman, P.W. and M.D. Baden. 1974. Alcoholism and violent death. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 35 (1): 221-31.
- Harper, F.D. (ed.) 1976. Alcohol abuse and Black America. Alexandria, Va.: Doublass Publishers.
- Hawkins, D.F. 1985. Black homicide. Crime and Delinquency. 31 (Jan): 83-103
- Hollis, W.S. 1974. On the etiology of criminal homicides: The alcohol factor. Journal of Police Science and Administration 2 (Mar.): 50-53.
- Howard, M. 1986. Husband-wife homicide: An essay from a family law perspective. Law and Contemporary Problems 49 (1): 63-88.

- Huard, M. 1979. Specific and non-specific murder. Canadian Journal of Criminology 21 (Oct): 442-452.
- Humphrey, J.A. and S. Palmer. 1980. Stressful life events and criminal homicide victim-offender relationships. Victimology 5 (2-4): 115-120.
- Jilek, W. and C. Roy. 1976. Homicide committed by Canadian Indians and non-Indians. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 20 (3): 201-216.
- Kelly, H.E. 1976. Comparison of defence strategy and race as influences in differential sentencing. Criminology 14 (2): 241-249.
- Kupferer, H.J. and J.A. Humphrey. 1975. Fatal Indian violence in North Carolina. Anthropological Quarterly 48 (Oct.): 236-244.
- Lester, David. 1986. The murderer and his murder: A review of research. N.Y. N.Y.: AMS Press p.244.
- Levy, J.E. and S.J. Kunitz. 1971. Indian reservations -- Anomie and social pathologies. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 27 (Summer): 97-128.
- Levy, J.E. et al. 1969. Navajo criminology homicide. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 25: 124-152.
- Luckinbill, D. 1977. Criminal homicide as a situated transaction. Social Problems 25 (Dec.): 176-186.
- Luckinbill, D. 1984. Murder and assault. In R.F. Meier (ed.), Major forms of crime. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- MacDonald, John M. 1986. The murderer and his victim. Springfield, Il.; Charles C. Thomas Publ.
- Maguire, F.J. 1978. Descriptive study of homicide in Hudson County (NJ), 1971-1977. (Abstract)
- Mayfield, D. 1976. Alcoholism, alcohol, intoxication and assaultive behaviour. Diseases of the Nervous System 37 (May): 288-91.
- Messner, S.F. and K. Tardiff. 1985. The social ecology of urban homicide: An application of the routine activities approach. Criminology 23 (May): 241-67.
- Messner, S.F. and K. Tardiff. 1986. Economic inequality and levels of homicide: An analysis of urban neighbourhoods. Criminology 24 (2): 297-317.

- Mones, P. 1985. The relationship between child abuse and parricide. In: E.H. Newberger and R. Bourne (eds.), Unhappy Families. Littleton, Mass: PSG Publishing. 31-38.
- Moyer, Sharon. 1987a. Homicides Involving Adult Suspects 1962-1984: A Comparison of Natives and Non-Natives. A report to the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Moyer, Sharon. 1987b. Homicides Involving Juvenile Suspects 1962-1984: A Comparison of Natives and non-Natives. A report to the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Myers, Maith A. and S.M. Talarico. 1986. The social contexts of racial discrimination in sentencing. Social Problems 33 (Feb.): 236-251.
- Nettler, G. 1982. Killing one another. Cincinnati Anderson
- Ogden, M. et al. 1970. Suicides and homicides among Indians. Public Health Reports 85 (1): 75-80.
- Palmer, S. and J.A. Humphrey. 1982. Familial and other relationships in criminal homicide in North Carolina. Journal of Family Issues 3 (Sept.): 301-318.
- Parker, R.N. and M.D. Smith. 1979. Deterrence, poverty and type of homicide American Journal of Sociology 85 (3): 614-624.
- Pass, A.D. 1982. The MMPI personality profiles of murderers and other violent offenders. Dissertation: University of Pittsburgh. (abstract)
- Pokorny, A.D. 1965. A comparison of homicides in two cities. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 56: 479-487.
- Riedel, M. and M.A. Zahn. 1985. The nature and pattern of American homicide. Washington DC: U.S. National Institute of Justice.
- Rizzo, N.D. 1982. Murder in Boston - Killers and their victims. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 26 (1): 36-42.
- Rosenbaum, M. and B. Bennett. 1986. Homicide and depression. American Journal of Psychiatry 143 (3): 367-370.
- Russell, D.H. 1984. Study of juvenile murders of family members. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 28 (3): 177-192.
- Russell, D.H. 1985. Girls who kill. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 29 (2): 171-6.

- Sampson, Robert J. 1985. Race and criminal violence: A demographically disaggregated analysis of urban homicide. Crime and Delinquency 31 (Jan.): 47-82.
- Schichor, D. 1985. Effects of development on official crime rates 1967-78: homicide and larceny patterns differ greatly. Sociology and Social Research 70 (Oct): 96-97.
- Silverman, R. and S.K. Mukherjee. 1987. Intimate homicide: An analysis of violent social relationships. Behavioral Sciences and the Law 5.
- Silverman, R.A. and L.W. Kennedy. 1987. Relational distance and homicide: The role of the stranger. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (forthcoming).
- Smith, M.D. and R.N. Parker. 1980. Type of homicide and variations in regional rates. Social Forces 59 (Summer): 136-47.
- Solursh, L.P. 1975. Psychoactive drugs, crime and violence. Psychological Reports 37: 1177-78.
- Swigert, V.L. and R.A. Farrell. 1976. Murder, inequality and the law. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.
- Swigert, V.L. and R.A. Farrell. 1977. Normal homicides and the law. American Sociological Review 42 (Feb): 16-32.
- U.S. Department of Justice. 1980. Reports of the National Juvenile Crime Assesment Centers, A National Assessment of Serious Juvenile Crime and Juvenile Justice System. Vol. II. (By C.P. Smith et al.) Washington: Office of juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Voss, H. and J. Hepburn. 1968. Patterns of criminal homicide in Chicago. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 59 (4): 499-508.
- Wilbanks, W. 1981. Women as murder victims: An international perspective. Prepared for the Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, Haifa, 1981. (Abstract)
- Wolf, A.S. 1980. Homicide and blackout in Alaskan Natives -- A report and reproduction of five cases. Journal of Studies on Alcohol 41 (5): 456-62.
- Wolfgang, M.E. 1958. Patterns in Criminal Homicide. New York: John Wiley.
- Zahn, M.A. 1979. Homicide in the twentieth century United States. Philadelphia: Temple University. (Abstract)
- Zimring, Franklin E. et al. 1983. Intimate violence: A study of intersexual homicide in Chicago. University of Chicago Law Review 50: 910-930.

TABLE 1

HOMICIDE VICTIMIZATION RATES PER 100,000
POPULATION, 1981

	<u>Rate per 100,000</u>	<u>Ratio</u>
<u>Natives</u>	17.29	
Male	24.60	
Female	10.16	2.42
 <u>Non-Natives</u>	 2.13	
Male	2.85	
Female	1.43	1.42
 Native:Non-Native ratio		 8.12
Male Native:Male non-Native ratio		8.63
Female Native:female non-Native ratio		7.10

- Notes: (1) Population data were taken from the 1981 census, catalogue number 92-911, Statistics Canada. It is well accepted that census data underestimate the Native population of Canada; for that reason, these data should be viewed as estimates only.
- (2) Because of random fluctuations in the annual number of homicide victims, a three year average was computed (1980-82) and used in the rate calculations above.

TABLE 2

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: RACE BY GENDER

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Native	17.1%	15.7%	16.6%
Non-Native	82.9	84.3	83.4
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	6,646	3,797	10,443

TABLE 3

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: GENDER BY RACE

	<u>Native</u>	<u>Non-Native</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	65.6%	63.3%	63.6%
Female	34.4	36.7	36.4
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	1,729	8,714	10,443

TABLE 4

CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE RACE AND GENDER
OF ALL HOMICIDE VICTIMS

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>
<u>Natives</u>					
Male	8.7%	19.4%	11.2%	11.9%	9.9%
Female	6.6	7.6	5.7	5.6	4.3
Subtotal	15.3	18.0	16.9	17.5	14.2
<u>Non-Natives</u>					
Male	49.5	48.7	52.8	54.3	52.9
Female	35.2	33.3	30.3	28.2	29.8
Subtotal	84.7	82.0	83.1	82.5	82.8
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	875	1,514	2,535	2,981	2,617

TABLE 5

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN GENDER

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>
<u>Natives</u>					
Male	56.7%	57.9%	66.4%	68.2%	69.9%
Female	43.3	42.1	33.6	31.8	30.1
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	134	273	428	522	372
<u>Non-Natives</u>					
Male	58.4%	59.4%	63.6%	65.8%	63.9%
Female	41.6	40.6	36.4	34.2	36.1
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	741	1,241	2,107	2,459	2,166

TABLE 6

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: AGE, 1982-83

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native
Under 11 years	2.2%	3.9%	11.1%	7.1%	5.0%	5.0%
11-15 years	2.2	1.8	3.2	3.7	2.5	2.5
Subtotal	4.4	5.8	14.3	10.8	7.5	7.5
16-19 years	9.4	5.6	12.7	9.4	10.4	7.0
20-29 years	37.7	24.6	30.2	24.4	35.3	24.6
30-49 years	31.9	40.7	31.7	28.1	31.8	36.3
50 years or more	16.7	23.2	11.1	27.3	14.9	24.7
Total %	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.1%
Total number	138	710	63	381	201	1,091

TABLE 7

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MARITAL STATUS

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native
Married	27.9%	29.0%	32.7%	33.8%	29.5%	30.8%
Common-law	16.5	7.1	31.3	11.6	21.6	8.8
Subtotal	44.4	36.1	64.0	45.5	51.1	39.5
Separated/ Divorced	4.0	11.9	4.2	12.0	4.1	11.9
Widowed	3.1	3.1	2.7	6.6	3.0	4.4
Single	48.5	49.0	29.1	35.9	41.8	44.2
Total %	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%
Total Number	1,129	5,456	594	3,185	1,723	8,643

TABLE 8

CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE
MARITAL STATUS OF NATIVE HOMICIDE VICTIMS, BY GENDER

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>
Males					
Married	47.4%	40.5%	31.9%	22.0%	18.2%
Common-law	6.6	6.3	14.2	20.8	22.1
Subtotal	53.9	46.8	46.1	42.8	40.3
Separated/ Divorced	-	1.9	2.8	5.4	5.8
Widowed	7.9	3.2	3.5	2.3	2.3
Single	38.2	48.1	47.5	49.6	51.6
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%
Total Number	76	158	282	355	258
Females					
Married	38.3%	40.9%	35.7%	28.5	23.4%
Common-law	31.7	27.0	34.3	31.5	31.5
Subtotal	70.0	67.8	69.9	60.0	55.0
Separated/ Divorced	-	-	6.3	3.0	9.9
Widowed	-	7.0	2.1	-	4.5
Single	30.0	25.2	21.7	37.0	30.6
Total %	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%
Total Number	60	115	143	165	111

TABLE 9

CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE
MARITAL STATUS OF NON-NATIVE HOMICIDE VICTIMS BY GENDER

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>
Males					
Married	46.7%	40.1%	31.2%	24.5%	20.7%
Common-law	3.1	3.4	7.9	7.3	9.3
Subtotal	49.8	43.5	39.1	31.8	30.0
Separated/ Divorced	5.6	5.7	10.9	15.7	13.6
Widowed	4.2	2.9	3.1	3.1	2.7
Single	40.4	47.9	46.9	49.4	53.7
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	426	731	1,334	1,595	1,370
Females					
Married	42.5%	44.0%	30.5%	30.9%	30.2%
Common-law	7.5	5.6	16.4	12.9	11.2
Subtotal	50.0	49.6	46.9	43.8	41.4
Separated/ Divorced	10.4	7.6	11.0	13.6	14.6
Widowed	7.8	6.0	5.8	7.2	6.8
Single	31.8	36.9	36.3	35.4	37.2
Total %	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	308	502	763	836	776

TABLE 10

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: RELATIONSHIP OF THE SUSPECT
(EXCLUDING UNSOLVED HOMICIDES)

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native
Immediate family	21.1%	17.2%	31.1%	45.9%	24.5%	28.2%
Common-law relationships	7.2	4.0	29.5	11.8	14.8	7.0
Other kin	15.7	4.0	7.5	3.4	12.9	3.8
Subtotal	44.0	25.3	68.0	61.1	52.2	39.0
Non-domestic (other)	52.9	57.4	23.8	25.2	43.0	45.1
Non-domestic (criminal act)	3.1	17.2	8.2	13.7	4.8	15.9
Total %	100.0%	99.8%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	1,097	4,470	563	2,773	1,660	7,243
Number of unsolved homicides	37	1,042	32	429	69	1,471

TABLE 11

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE
RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT, NON-NATIVE FEMALES

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>
Immediate family	54.9%	55.8%	42.2%	42.8%	42.2%
Common-law relationships	8.3	7.2	16.5	12.1	11.6
Other kin	4.5	1.8	2.6	4.5	3.5
Subtotal	67.7	64.8	61.3	59.4	57.3
Non-domestic (other)	23.6	24.2	23.3	28.0	25.5
Non-domestic (criminal act)	8.7	11.0	15.4	12.6	17.1
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%
Total Number	288	446	656	729	654

TABLE 12

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE
RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT, NATIVES FEMALE

	<u>1962-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>
Immediate family	33.7%	29.4%	31.3%	28.6%
Common-law relationships	32.5	32.4	26.4	25.5
Other kin	6.6	7.4	7.4	9.2
Subtotal	72.9	69.1	65.0	63.3
Non-domestic (other)	22.2	21.3	26.4	25.5
Non-domestic (criminal act)	4.8	9.6	8.6	11.2
Total %	99.8%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%
Total Number	166	136	163	98

TABLE 13

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE
RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT,
NATIVE MALES

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>
Immediate family	25.0%	24.4%	21.4%	21.5%	17.1%
Common-law relationships	5.3	2.6	5.8	9.0	9.8
Other kin	17.1	17.3	17.0	16.3	11.8
Subtotal	47.4	44.2	44.2	46.8	38.8
Non-domestic (other)	48.7	53.8	52.9	49.4	58.4
Non-domestic (criminal act)	3.9	1.9	2.9	3.8	2.9
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total Number	76	156	276	344	245

TABLE 14

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE
RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT,
NON-NATIVE MALES

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>
Immediate family	22.9%	22.3%	17.0%	15.1%	15.1%
Common-law relationships	3.1	3.5	5.2	3.3	4.4
Other kin	3.9	3.4	4.2	4.0	4.4
Subtotal	29.9	29.3	26.4	22.4	23.9
Non-domestic (other)	51.5	54.5	56.7	60.4	58.2
Non-domestic (criminal act)	18.6	16.2	16.9	17.1	17.9
Total %	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%
Total Number	388	622	1,072	1,319	1,070

TABLE 15

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: ACTUAL LOCATION OF OFFENCE

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native
Victim's home	30.9%	37.7%	50.1%	61.9%	37.5%	46.6%
Suspect's home	15.3	7.9	6.9	5.3	12.4	6.9
Other private or work place	22.6	16.5	13.8	8.6	19.5	13.6
Public place	15.0	23.9	14.1	12.6	14.7	19.8
Other, institutions, not known	16.2	14.0	15.1	11.5	15.8	13.1
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%
Total number	1,134	5,512	595	3,202	1,729	8,714

TABLE 16

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: ACTUAL LOCATION OF THE OFFENCE
BY THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT

	<u>Immed. Family</u>	<u>Common Law</u>	<u>Other Kin</u>	<u>Sub- Total</u>	Non- Dom. (Oth.)	Non- Dom. (Crim.)	Total
Native Males							
Vic.'s home	58.6%	65.8%	33.1%	50.7%	15.5%	26.5%	31.4%
Susp.'s home	7.8	3.8	16.3	10.1	20.9	11.8	15.9
Other private	17.2	13.9	25.0	19.5	26.6	11.8	23.0
Public place	4.3	6.3	9.9	6.6	19.7	23.5	14.0
Other	12.1	10.1	15.7	13.0	17.4	26.5	15.8
Total %	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.1%	100.1%
Total number	232	79	172	483	580	34	1,097
Native Females							
Vic.'s home	67.4%	60.2%	61.9%	63.7%	26.1%	28.3%	57.9%
Susp.'s home	2.3	2.4	11.9	3.4	14.9	17.4	7.3
Other private	10.9	15.1	9.5	12.5	17.9	15.2	14.0
Public place	9.7	11.4	9.5	10.4	18.7	21.7	13.3
Other	9.7	10.8	7.1	9.9	22.4	17.4	13.5
Total %	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	175	166	42	383	134	46	563

TABLE 16

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: ACTUAL LOCATION OF THE OFFENCE
BY THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT

	<u>Immed. Family</u>	<u>Common Law</u>	<u>Other Kin</u>	<u>Sub- Total</u>	<u>Non- Dom. (Oth.)</u>	<u>Non- Dom. (Crim.)</u>	<u>Total</u>
Non-Native Males							
Vic.'s home	79.5%	77.9%	60.8%	76.2%	26.8%	32.8%	40.3%
Susp.'s home	4.8	7.2	14.9	6.8	12.9	3.4	9.7
Other private	5.3	6.1	9.9	6.2	19.1	24.4	16.7
Public place	4.4	2.2	7.2	4.5	29.0	27.1	22.5
Other	6.0	6.6	7.2	6.3	12.3	12.3	10.8
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	770	181	181	1,132	2,567	771	4,470
Non-Native Females							
Vic.'s home	79.6%	82.6%	70.2%	79.6%	44.9%	37.7%	65.1%
Susp.'s home	3.9	5.8	10.6	4.6	10.3	5.5	6.2
Other private	4.6	3.4	7.4	4.5	13.9	16.1	8.4
Public place	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.2	19.1	24.0	11.3
Other	6.8	3.0	6.4	6.1	11.9	16.6	9.0
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%
Total number	1,272	328	94	1,694	700	379	2,773

Note: These distributions exclude homicides which took place in unknown locations.

TABLE 17

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN THE PERCENTAGE OF
HOMICIDES INVOLVING ALCOHOL USE (INCLUDES UNSOLVED)

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>	<u>1962-84</u>
<u>Natives</u>	Percentage of homicides involving alcohol use					
Male	80.3	86.7	83.5	68.5	61.5	74.0
Female	74.1	73.9	66.0	58.4	52.7	63.7
Total %	77.6	81.3	77.6	65.3	58.9	70.4
	(104)	(222)	(332)	(341)	(219)	(1218)
Total Number of Natives	134	273	428	522	372	1,729
<u>Non-Natives</u>						
Male	32.1	30.9	33.3	29.2	22.9	29.1
Female	15.9	21.6	23.0	17.4	12.9	18.2
Total %	25.4	27.2	30.0	25.1	19.3	25.1
	(188)	(337)	(623)	(618)	(418)	(2,184)
Total Number of non- Natives	741	1,241	2,077	2,459	2,166	8,714

TABLE 18

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: PERCENTAGE OF HOMICIDES INVOLVING ALCOHOL
USE BY THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE VICTIM TO THE SUSPECT

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native
Percentage of homicides involving alcohol use						
Immediate family	74.6	24.0	64.6	16.1	70.3	19.1
Common-law relationships	87.3	54.1	73.5	37.5	78.0	43.4
Other kin	73.8	32.6	59.5	18.1	71.0	27.6
Subtotal	76.4	30.2	67.9	20.4	72.6	24.3
Non-domestic (other)	75.2	39.7	64.9	22.7	71.8	36.1
Non-domestic (criminal act)	52.9	21.4	58.7	17.9	56.3	20.3
Total excl. unsolved hom.	75.0	34.1	66.4	20.6	72.1	29.0
	(823)	(1,526)	(374)	(572)	(1,197)	(2,098)
Total Number	1,097	4,470	563	2,773	1,660	7,243
Unsolved homicides	43.2	7.3	15.6	1.1	30.4	5.4

TABLE 19

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: APPARENT MOTIVE

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native
Revenge	7.0%	17.1%	4.3%	7.7%	6.1%	13.7%
Jealousy	6.5	5.8	16.4	18.8	9.8	10.4
Anger, hatred	14.7	9.1	13.3	8.6	14.3	8.9
Argument, quarrel	58.2	31.1	45.0	22.0	53.9	27.9
Self defence	3.5	2.0	0.6	0	2.6	1.3
Inadvertent act	2.4	1.9	2.0	1.6	2.2	1.8
Mentally ill, retarded	1.1	7.7	4.7	14.8	2.2	10.2
Criminal act	4.0	20.2	11.9	19.3	6.6	19.9
Other motive	2.6	5.1	1.8	7.3	2.3	5.9
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	1,046	4,865	511	2,720	1,557	7,585

TABLE 20

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native
Shooting	36.5%	44.8%	24.7%	34.8%	32.4%	41.1%
Beating	26.0	20.4	39.8	16.6	30.8	19.0
Stabbing	29.8	21.0	16.1	19.1	25.1	20.3
Strangling	1.3	3.8	6.1	14.6	2.9	7.8
Other means	6.3	10.0	13.3	14.9	8.7	11.8
Total %	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%
Total number	1,134	5,512	595	3,202	1,729	8,714

TABLE 21

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN MEANS OF OFFENCE,
NATIVE MALES

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>	<u>Total</u>
Shooting	40.8%	46.8%	39.8%	33.7%	29.6%	36.6%
Beating	34.2	27.8	26.4	26.1	21.5	25.9
Stabbing	21.1	18.4	24.3	32.3	41.9	29.8
Strangling	1.3	0.6	1.1	2.0	1.2	1.3
Other means	2.6	6.3	8.5	5.9	5.8	6.3
Total %	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%
Total number	76	158	284	356	260	1,134

TABLE 22

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN MEANS OF OFFENCE,
NATIVE FEMALES

	<u>1962-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>	<u>Total</u>
Shooting	23.7%	27.1%	24.1%	25.9%	25.0%
Beating	42.8	43.1	39.2	30.4	39.5
Stabbing	11.0	13.9	19.3	24.1	16.5
Strangling	8.7	4.2	6.0	4.5	6.1
Other means	13.9	11.8	11.4	15.2	12.9
Total %	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%
Total number	173	144	166	112	595

TABLE 23

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN MEANS OF OFFENCE,
NON-NATIVE MALES

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>	<u>Total</u>
Shooting	47.6%	52.6%	50.8%	41.2%	38.2%	44.8%
Beating	21.9	18.5	19.6	21.4	21.0	20.4
Stabbing	16.9	17.4	16.3	22.5	26.8	21.0
Strangling	3.9	3.8	3.1	3.9	4.0	3.8
Other means	9.7	7.7	10.2	11.1	10.0	10.0
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	433	737	1,339	1,618	1,386	5,512

TABLE 24

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: CHANGES OVER TIME IN MEANS OF OFFENCE,
NON-NATIVE FEMALES

	<u>1962-65</u>	<u>1966-70</u>	<u>1971-75</u>	<u>1976-80</u>	<u>1981-84</u>	<u>Total</u>
Shooting	43.5%	37.5%	38.9%	31.3%	29.2%	34.8%
Beating	17.5	16.3	18.0	15.1	16.6	16.6
Stabbing	16.6	18.7	15.4	20.1	23.2	19.1
Strangling	11.4	15.1	12.5	15.9	16.4	14.6
Other means	11.0	12.5	15.2	17.6	14.6	14.9
Total %	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	308	504	768	841	781	3,202

TABLE 25

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: TYPE OF FIREARM USED IN
SHOOTING HOMICIDES

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non- Native	Native	Non- Native	Native	Non- Native
Rifle	73.9%	38.9%	79.6%	51.7%	75.4%	42.9%
Shotgun	17.4	17.0	11.6	19.8	15.9	17.9
Handgun	5.3	34.7	6.1	23.0	5.5	31.1
Sawed off rifle, shotgun	1.4	3.0	2.7	2.2	1.8	2.7
Type not known	1.9	6.4	0	3.3	1.4	5.4
Total %	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	414	2,470	147	1,113	561	3,583

TABLE 26

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY THE
RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT

	<u>Immed. Family</u>	<u>Common Law</u>	<u>Other Kin</u>	<u>Sub- Total</u>	Non- Dom. (Oth.)	Non- Dom. (Crim.)	Total
Native Males							
Shooting	41.8%	25.3%	41.9%	39.1%	36.6%	17.6%	37.1%
Beating	18.1	7.6	27.9	19.9	29.7	41.2	25.7
Stabbing	32.2	63.3	24.4	34.6	26.6	11.8	29.6
Strangling	1.3	-	-	0.6	1.4	8.8	1.3
Other means	6.5	3.8	5.8	5.8	5.9	20.6	6.3
Total %	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.2%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	232	79	172	483	580	34	1,097
Native Females							
Shooting	29.1%	25.9%	35.7%	28.5%	26.1%	6.5%	26.1%
Beating	42.3	51.8	38.1	46.0	25.4	32.6	40.0
Stabbing	14.9	11.4	11.9	13.1	24.6	15.2	16.0
Strangling	6.3	3.6	2.4	4.7	4.5	13.0	5.3
Other means	7.4	7.2	11.9	7.8	19.4	32.6	12.6
Total %	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%
Total number	175	166	42	383	134	46	563

TABLE 26

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY THE
RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUSPECT

	<u>Immed.</u> <u>Family</u>	<u>Common</u> <u>Law</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>Kin</u>	<u>Sub-</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Non-</u> <u>Dom.</u> <u>(Oth.)</u>	<u>Non-</u> <u>Dom.</u> <u>(Crim.)</u>	<u>Total</u>
Non-Native Males							
Shooting	43.2%	35.4%	57.5%	44.3%	42.9%	34.0%	41.7%
Beating	15.8	17.1	17.1	16.3	23.3	24.4	21.7
Stabbing	18.2	41.4	15.5	21.5	23.9	19.1	22.5
Strangling	4.8	1.1	2.2	3.8	2.8	5.7	3.5
Other means	17.9	5.0	7.7	14.2	7.1	16.9	10.6
Total %	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%
Total number	770	181	181	1,132	2,567	771	4,470
Non-Native Females							
Shooting	44.4%	37.5%	45.7%	43.2%	35.4%	11.3%	36.9%
Beating	14.8	26.2	18.1	17.2	14.0	18.2	16.5
Stabbing	15.8	17.1	16.0	16.1	24.7	23.0	19.2
Strangling	9.6	13.4	9.6	10.3	14.9	24.3	13.4
Other means	15.4	5.8	10.6	13.3	11.0	23.2	14.1
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%
Total number	1,272	328	94	1,694	700	379	2,773

TABLE 27

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY THE ACTUAL
LOCATION OF THE OFFENCE

	Vic's home	Susp. home	Other Priv.	Inst.	Public Place	Other	Unk.	Total
Native Males								
Shooting	35.4%	62.1%	34.0%	-	22.9%	34.7%	28.7%	36.5%
Beating	20.6	16.7	28.5	25.0	38.2	26.4	33.3	26.0
Stabbing	34.9	16.1	34.8	50.0	28.8	20.8	28.7	29.8
Strangling	1.1	1.1	0.8	25.0	1.8	2.8	2.8	1.3
Other means	8.0	4.0	2.0	-	8.2	15.3	6.5	6.3
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%
Total number	350	174	256	4	170	72	108	1,134
Native Females								
Shooting	26.8%	39.0%	26.5%	-	14.5%	14.3%	23.4%	24.7%
Beating	39.6	26.8	41.0	-	44.6	42.9	40.4	39.8
Stabbing	15.1	19.5	12.0	-	19.3	19.0	19.1	16.1
Strangling	5.4	7.3	3.6	-	7.2	4.8	12.8	6.1
Other means	13.1	7.3	16.9	100.0%	14.5	19.0	4.3	13.3
Total %	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	298	41	83	1	83	42	47	595

TABLE 27

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY THE ACTUAL
LOCATION OF THE OFFENCE

	Vic's home	Susp. home	Other Priv.	Inst.	Public Place	Other	Unk.	Total
Non-Native Males								
Shooting	40.0%	57.7%	49.0%	0.9%	45.9%	55.7%	47.1%	44.8%
Beating	20.8	13.2	19.6	23.9	23.3	13.0	23.3	20.4
Stabbing	23.5	22.4	22.3	57.8	17.1	10.3	13.4	21.0
Strangling	4.7	2.8	2.8	5.5	2.0	6.0	6.6	3.8
Other means	10.9	3.9	6.4	11.9	11.8	15.0	9.6	10.0
Total %	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	2,077	433	909	109	1,319	300	365	5,512
Non-Native Females								
Shooting	38.2%	40.9%	33.0%	-	27.7%	28.7%	18.0%	34.8%
Beating	16.9	15.8	11.6	57.1%	16.8	15.0	20.1	16.6
Stabbing	20.8	17.0	20.3	14.3	16.6	14.4	11.9	19.1
Strangling	12.7	17.0	17.8	28.6	14.4	15.6	27.3	14.6
Other means	11.4	9.4	17.4	-	24.5	26.3	22.7	14.9
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	1,983	171	276	7	404	167	194	3,202

TABLE 28

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY
ALCOHOL USE

	Alcohol	No Alcohol	Total
Native Males			
Shooting	36.0%	38.0%	36.5%
Beating	26.0	26.1	26.0
Stabbing	31.0	25.8	29.9
Strangling	1.1	2.7	1.3
Other means	6.0	7.5	6.3
Total %	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%
Total number	839	295	1,134
Native Females			
Shooting	24.1%	25.8%	24.7%
Beating	43.9	32.7	39.8
Stabbing	15.3	18.0	16.1
Strangling	4.8	8.3	6.1
Other means	11.9	15.2	13.3
Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total number	378	217	595

TABLE 28

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY
ALCOHOL USE

	Alcohol	No Alcohol	Total
Non-Native Males			
Shooting	34.9%	48.9%	44.8%
Beating	27.0	17.7	20.4
Stabbing	26.2	18.9	21.0
Strangling	2.6	4.1	3.8
Other means	9.4	10.3	10.0
Total %	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%
Total number	1,602	3,910	5,512
Non-Native Females			
Shooting	35.4%	34.6%	34.8%
Beating	20.6	15.7	16.6
Stabbing	18.6	19.3	19.1
Strangling	10.8	15.5	14.6
Other means	14.6	15.0	14.9
Total %	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%
Total number	582	2,620	5,202

TABLE 29

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: MEANS OF OFFENCE BY
ALCOHOL USE,
MALE NATIVES, 1981-84

	Alcohol	No Alcohol	Total
Shooting	21.3%	43.0%	29.6%
Beating	26.3	14.0	21.5
Stabbing	45.6	36.0	41.9
Other means	6.9	7.0	6.9
Total %	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%
Total number	160	100	260

TABLE 30

HOMICIDE VICTIMS: OFFENCE TYPE, 1977-84

	Male		Female		Total	
	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native	Native	Non-Native
1st Degree murder	21.5%	35.8%	25.9%	34.6%	22.8%	35.3%
2nd Degree murder	64.1	46.7	57.1	40.3	62.0	44.3
Murder (other) e.g., murder-suicide	2.1	5.0	7.6	18.2	3.7	9.9
Manslaughter	12.4	11.8	8.9	5.7	11.3	9.6
Infanticide	0	0.7	0.4	1.2	0.1	0.9
Total %	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%
Total number	526	2,157	224	1,256	750	3,413

Excludes unsolved 1st and 2nd degree murders.



