John E. Douglas, M.S., is Supervisory Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation and Program Manager, Criminal Profiling and Crime Scene Assessment Program, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA.

Arlene McCormack is Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Lowell, Lowell, MA.

The study of crime scene profiling efforts elicits two important patterns of sexual murders: organized and disorganized. These law enforcement categories have been derived from evidence and patterns of evidence at the site of sexual murders. The study then explores victim information and its relationship to the two categories. In particular, we explored victim response to the offender in terms of no resistance and active resistance to the assault. We found that regardless of type of resistance, active or passive, and category of offender, death ensued. When we examined nine victims who survived, the category of offender was not the predictor, rather, "chance happenings" preserved life.

Sexual Killers and Their Victims

Identifying Patterns Through Crime Scene Analysis

ROBERT K. RESSLER
FBI Academy

ANN W. BURGESS
University of Pennsylvania

JOHN E. DOUGLAS
FBI Academy

CAROL R. HARTMAN
Boston College

RALPH B. D'AGOSTINO
Boston University

Interpersonal violence spans a wide range of human behaviors of which murder represents one of the terminal disruptions in the equilibrium of a society. The tragedy of murder and its irrevocable effect on victims and families is often neglected in the focus on the mur-

derers. This interactional component between victim and murderer and its social impact needs to be addressed constantly if there is to be a balance in the understanding of such violence.

The voluminous scholarly and professional literature on murder traditionally has focused on the murderer and has presented a variety of ways to classify murderers (Lester, 1973; Wolfgang, 1958). Simon (1977) emphasizes that identifying personality profile types is crucial to the task of offender treatment and prediction of dangerousness for the prevention of murder. Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) identify two basic behaviors of murderers: (1) premeditated, intentional, felonious, planned, and rational murder; and (2) killing in the heat of passion or slaying as a result of intent to do harm, but without a specific intent to kill. They observe, "Many authors fail to distinguish between two basic types of murderers" and clarify that their concentration is on the second type, the "passionate" killer. In contrast, the type of killer frequently profiled by agents at the FBI's Behavioral Science Unit, who investigate unsolved murders at the request of local law enforcement officials, are those who not only plan their murders but who repeat their crimes.

The professional literature regarding murder victims has been relatively silent. When the interpersonal aspects of murder have been considered, victims are conceptualized in limited ways. One of the most pervasive ways of analyzing victims has been through the concept of victim precipitation and victim participation, a concept explored by sociologists and criminologists such as von Hentig (1940), Mendelsohn (1963), Wolfgang (1958), and Schafer (1968).

The victim is one of the causes of a crime, suggests Hans von Hentig. In 1948 he stated, "In a sense the victim shapes and molds the criminal. . . . To know one we must be acquainted with the complementary partner." Mendelsohn (1963, pp. 239-241), in writing of the biopsychosocial personality of the accused and of the victim, elaborated on the doctrine of victimology while preparing for the trial of a man who, had it not been for "the perversity of his former wife," would never have been found guilty of murdering her and her lover. Wolfgang (1958) has utilized the concept of victim precipitation in his well-known studies of criminal homicide, applying it to those cases in which the "role of the victim is characterized by his having

been the first in the homicide drama to use physical force directed against his subsequent slayer" (p. 252). An example is the husband who attacked his wife with a milk bottle, a brick, and a piece of concrete block while she was making breakfast. Having a butcher knife in her hand, she stabbed him. Wolfgang (1958) found victim-preciptated homicides represented 26% of a total of 588 homicides studied through police reports in Philadelphia. Adding to this concept, Schafer (1968, p. 152) concluded that "it is far from true that all crimes 'happen' to be committed; often the victim's negligence, precipitative action, or provocation contributes to the genesis or performance of a crime."

In contrast to this view, FBI profilers, in their work of analyzing crime scenes for clues leading to a suspect in an unsolved homicide, took a different approach. They did not find it helpful to perceive the victim as provoking the murder. Rather, the agents tried to be aware of how the offender thought and, subsequently, how he would respond to key characteristics of a victim. For example, a victim wearing a red dress and shoes was perceived by the offender as "asking for it." Such a victim can *not* communicate because the offender selects and interprets "communication cues" of which the victim is totally unaware. The agents understood the offender's habitual reasoning pattern that selects out characteristics of the victim, building a strong justification for violating her. The offender may retrospectively think he went "a bit too far," but will hold to his justifications. If a victim is passive, this is reason for attack; if the victim struggles, this is reason for the attack, and so it goes.

Thus the agents regarded all victim and crime scene information as critical data in their investigations. As a result of their insights into understanding the motivation of the offender, agents at the Behavioral Sciences Unit of the FBI Academy initiated a study of sexual homicide crime scenes and patterns of criminal behavior. Data obtained in the study were examined from the perspectives of crime scene analysis and of victim-murderer interaction.

STUDY

For several years, FBI agents, in profiling sexual murderers by analyzing crime scenes, have typed sexual murderers and the crime scene in terms of an organized/disorganized dichotomy. The premise

for this dichotomy is that facets of the criminal's personality are evident in his offense. Like a fingerprint, the crime scene can be used to aid in identifying the murderer. An organized murderer is one who appears to plan his murders and who displays control (e.g., absence of clues) at the crime scene. The disorganized murderer is less apt to plan, and his crime scenes display haphazard (e.g., presence of clues at crime scene) behavior.

Our study was an exploratory one. Its major objectives were as follows: (1) to test, using statistical inferential procedures, if there are significant behavioral differences at the crime scenes between the crimes committed by organized offenders and those committed by disorganized murderers, and (2) to identify variables that may be useful in profiling murderers and on which the organized and disorganized murderers differ.

For the study to achieve its objectives, the agents first had to classify the 36 participating murderers into the organized/disorganized dichotomy. The dichotomy was as follows: 24 organized (with 97 victims); 12 disorganized (with 21 victims). The method for classification is published elsewhere (Ressler et al., 1985).

Data Set

The data set for the study comprised 36 convicted sexual murderers. Data were collected on 118 victims of these murderers. Of the victims, 9 survived the assaults; thus those 9 assaults were classified as attempted murders.

Each murderer who provided consent was interviewed extensively by FBI agents. The offender was asked questions regarding his background, his behavior at the crime scene, and his postoffense behavior. In addition, FBI agents reviewed criminal records of all participating offenders. The data set for each murderer consisted of the best available data compiled from these two sources.

Due to the complexities of obtaining these data and the confidentiality issues involved, there were "no response" answers to certain questions by some offenders. Although the missing data appear to have little effect on the univariate analysis, any interpretation of the results should consider this situation.

The data for this article were computerized and stored in separate files, which are described below.

(1) Background Information (on offender). This file contains 134 variables pertaining to the murderer. Variables within this file are

64

classified into eight categories: demographics, physical appearance, lifestyle, family structure, subject's early background history, family problems, subject's discipline/abuse, and subject's sexual history.

(2) Offense 1 (on offense). This file contains variables obtained from the offenses (e.g., the crime scenes). There are 119 variables in this file, which contains information for each separate crime. Variables in this file are classified into four categories: leading to the offense (such as frame of mind, premeditation of crime, and precipitating events); offender dress and residence variables relating to the offender at the time of offense; action during offense variables (such as conversation and behavior toward victim, weapons, and substance abuse); postoffense variables (such as keeping news clippings and visiting crime scene site and victim's grave).

(3) Victim 2 (on offense). This file contains 57 variables and is divided into two subsets: (1) victim characteristics (such as victim age, sex, height, weight, physique, race, complexion, attractiveness, marital status, residence, socioeconomic status, and actions during offense); and (2) offender's actions and behavior during the offense (such as victim mode of death, body position, sexual acts before and after death, postmortem acts, postmortem mutilation, and disposition of the body).

(4) Crime Scene (on offense). This file contains 47 variables and is divided into four categories: (1) vehicle variables relating to the mode of transportation of the offender and the description of his vehicle; (2) use of vehicle variable describing how a vehicle was used in the crime; (3) variables concerning physical evidence (weapon, fingerprints, and so on, left at the crime scene); and (4) distance variables measuring the distance from the crime scene to the victim's home, to the offender's home, and so on.

Data Analysis

Basically, the analysis was directed at testing for statistically significant differences between the organized and disorganized murderers. For variables in the Background Information data file, the unit of analysis was the murderer. The maximum sample sizes were 24 for the organized group of offenders and 12 for the disorganized group. For variables in the other data files, the maximum sample sizes were 97 victims for the organized and 21 victims for the disorganized offenders.

The major statistical analysis procedure employed for the variables was the two independent sample t test (D'Agostino, 1971, 1972; Lunney, 1970). For these variables, the F test for equality of variance was employed to aid in selecting the appropriate standard error for the denominator of the t test and the appropriate degrees of freedom. Variables significant at the .05 level of significance by the t test were identified. The full description of statistical tests employed is reported elsewhere (D'Agostino, 1985). The major findings of differences between crime scene variables and profile variables for organized and disorganized offenders are reported as follows. (See Table 1.)

Crime Scene Differences Between Organized and Disorganized Murderers

We first established that based on data available at the crime scene, there are significant differences between the organized and disorganized offender. However, there are no situations where the organized and disorganized offenders are mutually exclusive. That is, both types of murderers are capable of all types of behavior. For example, an organized murderer might not use a vehicle or a disorganized murderer might use restraints. Summary results are listed below. (See Table 2.)

Organized offenders are more apt to

- plan,
- use restraints,
- commit sexual acts with live victims,
- show or display control of victim (i.e., manipulative, threatening, want victim to show fear), and
- use a vehicle.

Disorganized offenders are more apt to

- leave weapon at the scene,
- position dead body,
- perform sexual acts on dead body,
- keep dead body,
- try to depersonalize the body, and
- not use a vehicle.

In meeting the study's first objective, we demonstrated that there are in fact consistencies and patterns in crime scenes that are objectively quantifiable and that distinguish organized from disorganized

66

TABLE 1

p Values for t-Test on Crime Scene and Profile Variables:
Organized and Disorganized Dichotomy

Crime Scene Variable	t-Test	Profile Variable	t-Test
strategy	.003	intell	.19
achvsex	.002	occup	.0001
restrain	.0001	prefocc	.081
weapnlft	.0001	birthord	.001
sexoff	.034	fathrsta	.058
sadism	.34	sexpref	.011
masochism	.0001	sexact1	.018
unusual2	.001	sexact2	.003
conv1	.002	sexconc1	.026
conv2	.010	sexconc5	.27
conv5	.0001	sexprob2	.007
conv6	.039	frame1	.0004
conv8	.045	frame4	.011
conv9	.0001	frame6	.012
react2	.006	frame7	.002
incraggr	.014	frame9	.0001
alcohol	.002	pstrss1	.009
position	.001	pstrss2	.0005
sb4death	.001	pstrss4	.0002
safdeath	.002	pstrss9	.026
pmact	.007	relat	.020
pmact7	.010	livewith	.013
pmact8	.022	distvres	.0001
torture	.0001	distwrk	.40
tort1	.003	trans	.023
tort4	.002	vecond	.044
tort5	.034	behav3	.026
tort9	.021	behav11	.004
keepbody	.090	behav12	.001
deperson	.050		
vehicle	.056		
ride	.0001		
assaults	.0001		
footps	.034		
weapon	.0001		

NOTE: See Tables 2 and 3 for definitions of terms.

TABLE 2

Crime Scene Variables Differentiating
Organized and Disorganized Sexual Murderers

		Percentage	
		Organized	Disorganized

ACTIONS DURING OFFENSE

Offense 1 Data Set

Strategy/	Planned versus Sudden;	86	44
	Organized more likely to have planned	(81)	(8)
Achvsex/	Violent act done to achieve sexual	28	86
	relations; Organized less likely	(68)	(7)
Restrain/	Restraints used;	49	10
	Organized more likely	(97)	(21)
Weaponlft/	Weapon left at scene of crime;	19	69
	Organized less likely	(67)	(16)
Sexoff/	Sexual acts committed;	76	46
	Organized more likely to commit sexual acts	(85)	(13)
Sadism/	Sadistic acts committed;	32	43
	Organized less likely	(97)	(21)
Masochsm/	Masochistic acts committed;	15	0
	Organized may, disorganized did not	(97)	(21)
Swallow semen/	Forced victim to do so;	10	0
	Organized may, disorganized did not	(97)	(21)

Organized shows more control (may be useful for cases in which victim lives)

Conversation with victim (aspects shown)

Manipulative	51	14
Threatening	54	25
Inquisitive	45	10
Polite	43	19
Threatens family	4	0
Obtains name	41	0
	(97)	(21)

Reactions desired by offender

Fear/	Wants victim to show fear;	39	6
	Organized more likely	(69)	(16)
Lie still/	Wants victim to lie still;	29	0
	Organized more likely	(65)	(16)
Incraggr/	Things done to increase aggression;	62	20
	Organized more likely	(55)	(10)
Alcohol/	Alcohol use associated with offense;	56	19
	Organized have greater use	(97)	(21)

Victim 2 Data Set

Position/	Victim's body positioned;	22	55
	Organized less apt to position body	(88)	(20)

(continued)

TABLE 2 Continued

		Percentage	
		Organized	*Disorganized*
SB4death/	Sexual acts before death (evidence at scene); Organized more likely	64 (87)	24 (21)
Safdeath/	Sexual acts after death (evidence at scene); Organized less likely	34 (73)	74 (19)
Victim 2 Data Set (continued)			
Pmact/	Postmorten activity with body; Organized less likely	23 (88)	52 (21)
Pmact7/	Inserts foreign objects into victim's anus	0	29
Pmact8/	Inserts foreign objects into victim's vagina	10	38

VEHICLE IN CRIME

Crime Scene Data Set

Disorganized is less likely to do anything indicating planning or action with a vehicle.

Vehicle/	Vehicle involved in crime; Organized is more likely to use a car	85 (93)	62 (21)

Disorganized is unlikely to do the following:
  Offer victim a ride or give victim a ride
  Force victim into car
  Disable victim's car
  Bump victim's car
  Run victim's car off road
  Pretend to have an accident
  Expose himself from car
  Assault victim in car
  Park car and follow victim on foot
  Transport victim from encounter site to crime scene site or disposal site

Tort/	Postmortem mutilation Organized less likely to mutilate dead victim	27 (88)	76 (21)
Tort1/	Facial mutilation (disfigurement)	6	43
Tort2/	Genital mutilation	15	33
Tort3/	Breast mutilation	12	29
Tort4/	Disembowelment	2	43
Tort5/	Amputation	17	38
Tort9/	Vampirism (drink blood)	0	24
Keepbody/*	Offender keeps corpse; Organized less likely	14 (88)	33 (21)
Deperson/	Offender tries to depersonalize victim (blindfolding, eradication of features); Organized is less likely	8 (88)	32 (19)

VICTIM CHARACTERISTICS

Victim 2 Data Set

Agevic/**	Age of the victim; Organized has younger victims	$\overline{X} =$ 23 (93)	29 (20)

TABLE 2   Continued

| | | Percentage | |
		Organized	Disorganized
Attract/	Physical attractiveness of the victim; Organized has more attractive victims (1 to 4 scale)	$\bar{X} =$ 1.6 (84)	2.0 (20)

EVIDENCE AT SCENE

Crime Scene Data Set

Footps/	Evidence of footprints; Organized less likely to leave footprints	5 (97)	29 (21)
Weapon/	Weapon left (can be used as evidence); Organized less likely to leave weapon for evidence	18 (97)	57 (21)

NOTE: n = numbers in parentheses.
*Level of significance is $p = 0.09$; not $p = 0.05$.
**Level of significance is $p = 0.06$; not $p = 0.05$.

sexual murderers. The labels "organized" and "disorganized" are not only convenient because of their visual connotations to the crime scene but also have an objectivity to them.

Profile Characteristic Differences Between Organized and Disorganized Murderers

After establishing crime scene differences we identified those characteristics that could be used in a criminal profile. By profile characteristics, we mean those characteristics that identify the subject as an individual. This contrasts with crime scene characteristics, the tangible clues left (or missing) at the crime scene where the body is found. Profile variables can be grouped into four areas: background variables; variables describing the situation of the criminal before the crime (precrime state); variables relating to residence, vehicle use, and distance to crime scene; and postoffense behavior variables.

Based on our analysis, there are different characteristics for the organized and disorganized murderers that may prove useful in developing criminal profiles. The statistically significant variables are summarized below. (See Table 3.)

Organized offenders are more

- intelligent,
- skilled in occupation,

TABLE 3

Profile Characteristics Differentiating
Organized and Disorganized Sexual Murderers

		Percentage	
		Organized	Disorganized

BACKGROUND

Background Data Set

Demographic

Intell/ — Intelligence; Organized more intelligent — $\overline{X} =$ 5.0 (22) — 4.2 (12)

Lifestyle

Occup/ — Occupation; Organized more skilled — 50 (24) — 0 (11)

Prsfocc/ — Preferred occupation is skilled work; Organized is more likely to want to do skilled work — 74 (19) — 38 (8)

Family Structure

Birthord/ — Birth order; Organized have a higher birth order — X 2.7 (21) — 1.3 (12)

Fathsta/ — Father's work was unstable; % unstable Organized more stable — 12 (16) — 45 (11)

Discipline/Abuse History

Hostile/ — Subject received hostile discipline as a child; Disorganized treated with more hostility

Sex Acts/Preference

Sexpref/ — Sexual preference % heterosexual = 74 — 100 (heterosexual versus other); All disorganized were heterosexual (23) (11)

Disorganized is more inhibited and more likely to be a compulsive masturbator.

Sexual Concerns

Disorganized is more ignorant of sex and has more sexual aversions.

Sexprob2/ — Sexual problems; Disorganized is more likely to have had sexual problems — 12 (17) — 62 (8)

PRECRIME STATE (leading to offense)

Offense 1 Data Set

Frame1/ — Angry frame of mind; Organized more angry (1 to 5 scale: 1 = predominant; 5 = not at all) — $\overline{X} =$ 2.0 (77) — 3.3 (20)

Frame4/ — Nervous; Organized less nervous — $\overline{X} = 3.5$ X = (73) — 2.6 (20)

Frame6/ — Organized less frightened — $\overline{X} =$ 4.1 — 3.0

Frame7/ — Organized less confused — $\overline{X} =$ 4.4 — 3.0

TABLE 3 Continued

		Organized	Percentage Disorganized
Frame8/	Organized more depressed	$\overline{X} =$ 3.4	4.3
Frame9/	Organized calmer, more relaxed	$\overline{X} =$ 3.1	4.3

Precipitating Events/Precipitating Stress

Organized more likely to have events/stresses due to financial, marital, females, employment before the murder.

RESIDENCE/VEHICLE DISTANCE
Offense 1 Data Set

			Organized	Disorganized
Relat/	Offender knows who victim is;	% know	14	47
	Organized is less likely to know who victim is		(93)	(17)
Livewith/	Offender lives alone;		33	62
	Organized is less likely to live alone		(97)	(21)

Crime Scene Data Set

		Organized	Disorganized
Distvres/	Distance crime scene to victim's house; Organized more apt to have scene farther away from victim's home than disorganized		
Distores/	Distance crime scene to offender's home; Disorganized lives nearer to crime scene than does organized		
Distowrk/	Distance crime scene to offender's work; Disorganized works nearer to crime scene than does organized		
Trans/	Usual transportation is by driving; Organized more apt to drive	70 (97)	43 (21)
Vecond/	Condition of the vehicle; Organized more apt to have better conditioned vehicle	(62)	(11)

POSTOFFENSE BEHAVIOR
Offense 1 Data Set

		Organized	Disorganized
Behav3/	Follows in media; Organized more likely to follow in media	51 (97)	24 (21)
Behav11/	Change jobs; Organized may change jobs, disorganized did not	8 (97)	0 (21)
Behav12/	Leave town; Organized may leave town, disorganized did not	11 (97)	0 (21)

NOTE: n = numbers in parentheses.

- likely to think out and plan the crime,
- likely to be angry and depressed at the time of the murder,
- likely to have a precipitating stress (financial, marital, female, job)
- likely to have a car in decent condition,
- likely to follow crime events in media, and
- likely to change jobs or leave town.

Disorganized offenders are more likely to

- be low birth order children,
- come from a home with unstable work for the father,
- have been treated with hostility as a child,
- be sexually inhibited and sexually ignorant, and to have sexual aversions,
- have parents with histories of sexual problems,
- have been frightened and confused at the time of the crime,
- know who the victim is,
- live alone, and
- have committed the crime closer to home/work.

The analysis established the existence of variables that may be useful in a criminal profile and for which the organized and disorganized sexual murderers differ and thus met the study's second objective.

VICTIMS OF ORGANIZED AND DISORGANIZED SEXUAL MURDERERS

The organized/disorganized dichotomy provided a new context for analyzing the victim-murderer interaction. Rather than using the traditional view of victim focused on the concept of precipitation and provocation as interpreted by criminologists from police reports of a murder, we examined our data of murdered victims from the perceptions of the offenders who had killed them. Thus our view is on victim response by type of offender analyzed through crime scene evidence.

Data were obtained for 118 victims, 9 of whom survived murder attempts. The majority of victims in the sample were white (93%), female (82%), and not married (80%). Ages for 113 victims ranged from 6 to 73 (ages were unavailable for 5 victims). Of the victims, 14, or 12%, were 14 years old or younger; 83, or 73%, were between 15 and 28 years old; and 16, or 14%, were 30 years or older. Thus the majority of victims (73%) were between ages 15 and 28, which matches the age range for rape victims in general.

The majority of victims (81% or 89) were strangers to the offender; 19%, or 21, were known to the murderer. Nearly half (47%) of the victims were closely related in age to the offender. Over one-third of the cases (37%) involved a younger victim than offender, and in 15% of the cases, the victim was older than the offender. More than half of the victims came from average or advantaged socioeconomic levels (62%), 30% had marginal incomes, and 9% had less than marginal incomes. In over one-third of the cases, the victim had a companion (i.e., was not alone) at the time of the assault; 63% were alone at the time of the murder.

Victim Response to Assailant

Any cause-effect determination in victim resistance reports needs to include the total series of interactions between a victim and assailant, including the dynamic sequencing of victim resistance and offender attack. Offenders were asked to report on their victims' resistance in terms of whether they tried to negotiate verbally, verbally refuse, scream, flee, or fight. The offender was then asked to report his own response to the victim's behavior. It is important to keep in mind that the data represent only the offender's perceptions of the victim-offender interaction.

In the 83 cases with victim response data, 23 victims (28%) acquiesced or offered no resistance as perceived by the offender. As one organized murderer said, "She was compliant. I showed her the gun. She dropped her purse and kind of wobbled a second and got her balance and said, 'All right; I'm not going to say anything. Just don't hurt me.'" A total of 26 (31%) victims tried verbal negotiation; 6 (7%) tried to refuse verbally; 8 (10%) screamed; 4 (5%) tried to escape; and 16 (19%) tried to fight the offender.

Offender reaction to the victim's resistance ranged from no reaction in 31 cases (34%) to violence in 24 (25%) cases. In 14 instances (15%), offenders threatened the victim verbally in response to victim resistance; in 23 cases (25%) offenders increased their aggression. Thus in two-thirds of the cases assailants countered victim resistance; often (50%) it was met with increased force and aggression. (In 9 cases the offender both verbally threatened the victim and increased his aggression.)

Our analysis of cases, in terms of an organized/disorganized dichotomy, found that of the 83 cases with data on victim response to

assailant, the organized offenders had 67 victims and the disorganized had 16. Of the 16 victims of the disorganized offenders, 10 used nonforceful resistance acquiescence or verbal resistance) and were killed. With the organized offender, 45 out of 67 victims used nonforceful resistance and died as well. In total, 55 out of 83 victims used nonforceful resistance. The data suggest that nonforceful resistance was not a deterrent with either of these offender types.

The interpretation of what is considered forceful resistance is important to clarify. We identified screaming and fleeing as physical (forceful) reactions because offenders specifically cited those victim responses as the reason for their use of increased aggression. With a majority of the offenders interviewed, both physical and verbal (or forceful and nonforceful) resistance played a part in triggering a reaction by the offenders.

An almost equal number of victims in our sample were said to have resisted physically (25) as were said to have made no attempt at resistance (23). Both types of victim actions resulted in death.

The FBI agents interviewed the murderers about deterrence to kill. This information was analyzed in terms of the organized/disorganized dichotomy. Organized murderers, who had a conscious intent based on motive to kill, said that factors such as witnesses and location did not matter because the murder fantasy was so well rehearsed that everything was controlled ("I always killed in my home, and there were no witnesses"). Or as one murderer said, "The victim did not have a choice. Killing was part of my fantasy." Also, the organized murderer with the detailed fantasy to kill either believed that he would never be caught or that he would have to be killed to be stopped. On the other hand, disorganized offenders, who were not consciously aware of their intent to kill, were able to identify factors that might deter their killing. They stated such deterrence factors as being in a populated location, having witnesses in the area, or cooperation from the victim.

Surviving Victims

The surviving victims of murderers in the study provide insights about victim-murderer interactions in the context of the organized and disorganized classification. Victims who survived murder attempts of these killers used the following strategies: hiding from the assailant, jumping out of a car, feigning death, escaping the area,

knocking the weapon out of the assailant's hand, and screaming for assistance. The following two cases illustrate victim-murderer dynamics as well as the crime scene and profile characteristics for each type of murderer.

Victim of an organized murderer. Driving home from work at 10:30 at night, a highway patrol officer passed a car pulled off the road. He noticed the car's dome light was on and the right front door was open; he then saw two people in a scuffle between the car and the woods. As he turned around to investigate, his headlights picked up a woman lying on the ground, fighting violently with a man on top of her. When the police officer approached them, the man dropped the gun he had been holding and held up his hands. The woman picked up the gun and ran to the officer screaming, "He's trying to kill me!" The assailant was handcuffed. He stated, "I just wanted to scare her. I just wanted to tie her up. I don't know if I would have raped her or not, but I might have. I just met her tonight."

The victim related that she worked part-time as a photographer's model and that she had been told by an agency that a man would take her to his studio to take photographs. As they were driving along the freeway, the man pulled over, saying he thought he had a flat tire. He then pulled a gun and said, "Do as I say and I won't hurt you." The victim reported,

> I said I would do what he said if he didn't hurt me. He told me to turn and put my hands behind my back, which I did, and he proceeded to tie my wrist. When he went to tie my hands together, I began to struggle because the gun was not in his hand. During the struggle the man began choking me and said, "I am losing my patience with you. With my record I would just as soon kill you and go the the gas chamber." He pulled the gun and pointed it at me. I grabbed at the gun, screamed, and beat on the window of the car, but no one would stop. We kept struggling, and the gun was discharged with the bullet going through my skirt and grazing my outer right leg. I decided if I got out of the car, someone would see me and stop. I got the door open and we fell out on the ground and we wrestled. Then the officer arrived.

This case example underscores the organized murderer's premeditated approach to the victim and his planned intent to kill. In this case, when the assailant tried to bargain with her by saying she would not be hurt if she cooperated, the victim did not believe him. Although the victim tried negotiating not to be harmed by the assailant, she

strategically waited for an opportunity when he did not have the gun (he had to drop the gun to tie her wrists) and fought at the point when her wrists were being tied. The gun was a straightforward death threat, yet being immobilized increased the woman's vulnerability. Thus she risked fighting despite the gun.

The assailant's preconceived strategies were based on his understanding of a victim's response to a violent death threat. This assailant had three prior victims whom he murdered. His first victim was contacted after he answered an ad in a lonely hearts column; in the second and third cases he posed as a photographer needing a model and went through an agency. He claimed to have raped all three women and then transported them to another location where he strangled them. The bodies were left in a desert; until the man was apprehended for the attempted murder, the bodies remained missing.

The murderer showed most of the characteristics of an organized sexual killer. The murders were carefully planned. The killer used ropes as restraints and raped the women prior to killing them. He also took photographs of his victims before he killed them; their faces showed great fear. The man's car was used to transport the victims to their deaths. The offender's IQ was in the superior range, and he had recently lost his job and moved from the Midwest to the West Coast. He followed newspaper accounts of his crimes.

However, in this case, this victim did not respond as his other victims. As a victim she did not acquiesce to his multiple threats and gun. She fought him. He continued his pursuit of dominance and intent to kill her. He shot her. From his view, the rules suddenly changed. He had a choice. He did not stop his action and say to himself, "This is not fitting in with my scheme," and leave the scene. Instead, he persisted in fitting her into his mode of escalation.

When apprehended by police, the assailant tried the same manipulative ploy with the officer. He claimed that he did not know if he would have raped the woman. The police officer disbelieved this statement (i.e., he believed the assailant had intended to kill) and the assailant was taken into custody.

Victim statement of disorganized murderer. According to the account of the surviving victim, a 21-year-old woman, she and some friends returned to a girlfriend's apartment after dining at a restaurant. After continued conversation and television viewing, everyone left except one of the men. The victim's girlfriend retired to her room

as she had to work the next day; the victim stayed with the man, whom she knew, hoping he would "get the hint and leave." While they were watching television, she fell asleep lying on her side on the couch. When she awoke, she was "feeling funny" and lying on her back. A shadow or a figure at the edge of the couch was moving toward the bedroom. As the victim started to stand up, she saw her girlfriend standing between the bedroom and the living room with the man holding her by the wrist. Her friend was screaming. At about this time, the victim realized her pants were partly down around her thighs, and as she reached down to pull them up, she discovered she was covered with blood. Her face and abdomen had been slashed. The victim ran outside to a neighbor, holding her stomach as she ran. The neighbor let her in and called the police. After the victim was rushed to the hospital, she was found to have suffered multiple cuts and lacerations to her throat and face and extensive abdominal lacerations. The assailant had attempted to disembowel her. Her girlfriend was found lying nude in her bedroom with fatal multiple knife wounds in the abdomen, throat, and arms. A knife with a ten-inch blade (subsequently identified as the murder weapon) was lying near the victim.

The disorganized murderer often kills quickly to maintain control. In this case, control was achieved by the murderer's attack on sleeping women. The bodies were depersonalized through extensive cuttings and stab wounds and the weapon was left at the crime scene. The murderer knew his victims and had a history of masochistic behavior, as evidenced by autoerotic asphyxial practices as an adolescent and adult. The premeditated aspect of the crime was revealed by a letter, found in the murderer's car and dated five days before the murder, that stated that the killer intended to force one of the victims to eviscerate and emasculate him and that she was to be found innocent of the crimes.

One might speculate that the disorganization of the crime escalated when the offender's fantasy did not match the reality of the situation. In his evisceration fantasy, the assailant rehearsed the disembowelment both by assuming the role of victim and of victimizer. There is similarity in intent at the crime scene with the presence of two women. The assailant tries out the evisceration fantasy on the first victim and then attacks his fantasy object. We speculate that between the first and second victim he experienced tension relief from trying out of the fantasy and he escalates the murder behavior to a second target.

The accounts of surviving victims of an organized and a disorganized offender highlight their levels of awareness regarding the dangerousness of the offender. Both women acted independently in response to a situation they perceived as life threatening, and swift police and medical intervention combined with their efforts to save their lives. The killers were remarkable in their intent and assurance that they could successfully carry out their crimes. These men, at least in their own minds, had already rehearsed how they would kill and escape capture. The killing was an integral part of their fantasy. The murderers, in this sense, had consciously planned their murders—one, setting about to target a victim for his plan, and the other utilizing a chance encounter.

DISCUSSION

This article reports on a new typology of sexually oriented murderers based on crime scene evidence and victim resistance strategies and outcome in terms of this new classification. This new typology provides an opportunity to expand and advance the psychosocial framework for studying murderers that is sometimes criticized for its unproved theories, obscure interpretive level, and lack of attention to cultural factors (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1963) to include measurable, behavioral indicators from analysis of crime scene (e.g., presence or absence of a weapon; injury to victim). This law enforcement typology is based on discrete, verifiable concepts and behavior. It does not rest solely on controversial statements of motivation derived from a complex theory of subconscious motivation. Consequently, the typology has the potential for verifiable classification of acts and visual evidence, enhancing the investigation and study of murderers. For example, to hypothesize that a serial murderer killed a young woman to destroy his internal female identification with his sister is cumbersome and cannot be substantiated by analysis of crime scene evidence or other data available before his capture and evaluation. What is clear is the pattern of killing of young women of a certain age range in a repeated and particular systematic style. Analysis of these data from the crime scene may be useful in understanding the psychosocial nature of the murderer and lead (it is hoped) to his capture.

Additionally, we study victim response to the offender in terms of active versus passive response. We found that regardless of type of resistance (active or passive) or category of offender (organized versus

disorganized), death ensued. When we examined 9 victims who survived, the category of offender was not the predictor, rather, "chance happenings" preserved life.

REFERENCES

Cox, D. R. (1970). *Analysis of binary data.* London: Methuen.

D'Agostino, R. B. (1971). A second look at analysis of variance on dichotomous data. *Journal of Ed. Meas., 8,* 327-333.

D'Agostino, R. B. (1972). Relation between the chi squared and ANOVA tests for testing the equality of k independent dichotomous populations. *American Statistician,* pp. 30-32.

D'Agostino, R. B. (1985). *Statistical inference procedures for crime scene patterns and profile characteristics of organized and disorganized offenders.* In Final Report to National Institute of Justice (#82-CX-0065), Washington, D.C.

Lester, D. (1973). Murder: A review. *Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Applied Behavior Therapy, 19* (4), 40-50.

Lunney, G. H. (1970). Using analysis of variance with a dichotomous dependent variable: An empirical study. *Journal of Ed. Meas., 4,* 263-269.

Mendelsohn, B. (1963). The origin of the doctrine of victimology. *Excerpta Criminologica, 3,* 239-244.

Ressler, R. K., et al. (1985). Violent crimes. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 54* (8), 1-33.

Schafer, S. (1968). *The victim and his criminal: A study in functional responsibility.* New York: Random House.

Simon, R. I. (1977). Type A, AB, B murderers: Their relationship to the victims and to the criminal justice system. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 5* (3), 344-362.

von Hentig, H. (1940). Remarks on the interaction of perpetrator and victim. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 31,* 303-309.

von Hentig, H. (1948). *The criminal and his victim.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wolfgang, M. E. (1958). *Patterns in criminal homicide.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Wolfgang, M. E., & Ferracuti, F. (1967). *The subculture of violence.* Great Britain: Tavistock.

Robert K. Ressler, M. S., is Supervisory Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Program Manager, Violent Criminal Apprehension Program, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA.

Ann W. Burgess, R.N., D.N.Sc., is van Ameringen Professor of Psychiatric Mental Health Nursing, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, and Associate Director of Nursing Research, Boston City Hospital, Boston.

John E. Douglas, M.S., is Supervisory Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Program Manager, Criminal Profiling and Crime Scene Assessment Program, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA.

Carol R. Hartman, R.N., D.N.Sc., is Associate Professor and Coordinator of the Graduate Program in Psychiatric Mental Health Nursing, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA.

Ralph B. D'Agostino is Professor of Mathematics, Boston University, Boston.

In comparing sexual murderers with a history of sex abuse (n = 12) with murderers without such a history (n = 16), findings that approach a level of significance between early sexual abuse and sexual deviations include zoophilia (.06) and sexual sadism (.07) with the ultimate expression of the murderer's perversion being the mutilation of the victim. Murderers with sexual abuse histories report fantasizing about rape earlier than murderers without sexual abuse histories (.05) and report aversion to peer sex in adolescence and adulthood (.05). Significant differences in behavioral indicators comparing across developmental levels of childhood include cruelty to animals (.05), and differences approaching significance include isolation (.09), convulsions (.09), cruelty to children (.09) and assaultive to adults (.09). Significant differences in adolescence between murderers with child sexual abuse history versus nonhistory include running away (.01), sleep problems (.05), daydreams (.05), rebellious (.05), assaultive to adults (.05), and indicators approaching significance include temper tantrums (.09) and self-mutilation (.09).

Murderers Who Rape
and Mutilate

ROBERT K. RESSLER
FBI Academy

ANN W. BURGESS
University of Pennsylvania

CAROL R. HARTMAN
Boston College

JOHN E. DOUGLAS
FBI Academy

ARLENE McCORMACK
University of Lowell

The origins and significance of sexualized acts in the commission of a sexual crime have been implicit themes in the professional literature. Deviant sexual behaviors of offenders have been reported in terms of sexual dysfunction (Groth & Burgess, 1977), sexual

arousal (Abel, 1982), sadistic fantasies (Brittain, 1970; MacCulloch, Snowden, Wood, & Mills, 1983), and childhood sexual abuse (Groth, 1979; Seghorn, Boucher, & Prentky, in press).

In a report of a British study of 16 male patients diagnosed with psychopathic disorders and hospitalized in a psychiatric facility, the crucial link between sadistic fantasy and behavior is discussed (MacCulloch et al., 1983). The authors raise the following question: If sadistic fantasy has a role in the genesis and maintenance of sadistic behavior, what factors lead some individuals to act out their fantasies? Although they state that they believe any answer would include multiple factors, the authors speculate that factors observed in their subpopulation of 13 sadistic fantasizers include childhood abuse (being tied up and anal assault) and/or adolescent sexual experiences (MacCulloch et al., 1983).

The linking of childhood sexual abuse to subsequent problems and behavior is not a new idea. Freud in 1895 believed that hysterical symptoms of his female patients could be traced to an early traumatic experience and that the trauma was always related to the patient's sexual life. The trauma manifested itself when revived later, usually after puberty, as a memory. However, Freud later reversed his belief in 1905 and said that the sexual seductions his patients reported were not all reports of real events, but fantasies created by the individual (Masson, 1984). This reversal created a major shift in the priorities of psychological investigation. The external, realistic trauma was replaced in importance by infantile sexual wishes and fantasies.

In the past decade clinicians (Herman, 1981) and feminists (Rush, 1980) have challenged this perspective and are now proposing that sexual abuse in childhood may have a common base in a wide range of social problems. The propositions are based on observations of the prevalence of early child sexual abuse found in populations of runaways (Janus, Scanlon, & Price, 1984), juvenile delinquents (Garbarino & Plantz, 1984), prostitutes (James & Meyerding, 1977; Silbert & Pines, 1981), psychiatric patients (Carmen, Rieker, & Mills, 1984), substance abusers (Densen-Gerber, 1975), and sex offenders (Groth, 1979; Seghorn et al., in press).

Although these studies have looked at various populations, none has examined sexual murderers. In an attempt to address the question

raised by MacCulloch and colleagues about acting out sadistic fantasies, this article discusses results of an assessment of the relationship between sexual abuse in childhood or adolescence and sexual interests, activities, and deviations in convicted sexually oriented killers.

METHOD

Apprehension of a crime suspect is the job of law enforcement. In many crimes, this task is fairly straightforward when a motive (e.g., robbery, revenge) has been identified. However, in many crimes the motive is not readily apparent. FBI agents became involved in assisting local law enforcement agencies in their profiling of unsolved homicide cases in the early 1970s. These crimes, often referred to as "motiveless," were analyzed by the agents to include a sexual component. The agents, sensitive to crime scene information, began their own efforts at classifying characteristics of the murderer by virtue of evidence found at the crime scene. From this evidence they devised a new typology that characterized crime scene patterns as being organized or disorganized. This typology inferred a motivational framework that included expectations, planning, and justification for the criminal action as well as "hunches" regarding postcrime behaviors. As a result, particular emphasis was placed on the thinking patterns dominating the murderer's actions indicating differences in acts committed against the victim and suggesting subcategories of motivational constructs.

The selection of subjects and methodology used to develop the organized/disorganized typology are reported elsewhere (Ressler et al., 1985). Briefly, FBI special agents collected data in various U.S. prisons between 1979 and 1983. The data set for each murderer consisted of the best available data from two types of sources: official records and interviews with the offenders.

To qualify for the study, a murder had to be classified through crime scene observations and evidence as a sexual homicide. These observations included the following: victim attire or lack of attire; exposure of sexual parts of the victim's body; sexual positioning of victim's body; insertion of foreign objects into victim's body cavities; or evidence of sexual intercourse. Primary analysis was conducted on information about the crime scenes of 36 sexually oriented murderers.