



**Online citation:** Mays, G. Larry and David Keys. 2011. "Normal Homicides, Normal Defendants: Finding Leniency in Oklahoma's Murder Conviction Machinery." *Western Criminology Review* 12(1):35-42. (<http://wcr.sonoma.edu/v12n1/Mays.pdf>).

## Normal Homicides, Normal Defendants: Finding Leniency in Oklahoma's Murder Conviction Machinery

G. Larry Mays  
New Mexico State University

and

David Keys  
New Mexico State University

---

**Abstract:** *Data derived from Oklahoma Criminal Offender Records, Oklahoma Criminal Court of Appeals, and newspapers of record (1973-2008) were analyzed along with interviews of key criminal court officers, assessing the normal crimes concept (Sudnow 1965) and common-sense considerations in homicide case dispositions (Garfinkel 1956). Statistical analyses of charging patterns in murder cases in Oklahoma (n = 2,629) demonstrate that defendants' legal representation, both public and private, dispose of large numbers of cases as normal homicides and that specific predictor variables exist that influence the decision to treat a given homicide as normal.*

**Keywords:** social disorganization, collective efficacy, informal control, formal control, crime, victimization

---

### Introduction and Literature Review

This paper utilizes the concept of *normal crimes* developed by Sudnow (1965) to determine the extent to which this notion explains the manner in which death penalty cases are disposed in Oklahoma. Historically, in excess of 71% of homicide cases in Oklahoma are disposed of via plea negotiations that alter charging and reduce sentences. Thus, it is clear that a functional and enduring structure is in place that selects less offensive cases. It is not surprising, therefore, that the late ethnomethodologist, David Sudnow, in his classic paper "Normal Crimes: Sociological Features of the Penal Code in a Public Defender Office" (Sudnow 1965), analyzed a broad range of criminal offenses, finding that public defenders and prosecutors worked in a coordinated and complimentary fashion, in many cases coupling charge reductions with guilty pleas, all toward quick disposal and avoiding trial.

In a similar study of jury deliberations, Garfinkel (1956) found that panel members, in the face of opposing views on a given defendant's guilt, formed what he called "common-sense considerations that anyone could see," in arriving at the necessary unity in their verdict (Garfinkel 1956: 240-241). Sudnow's work looked at the interactions of supposed adversaries that were, in reality, cooperative relationships vital to the smooth operation of a criminal court. Sudnow (1965) documented opposing counsel's considerations of the "typical manner in which the offenses are committed, the social characteristics of the persons who regularly commit them, the features of settings in which

they occur, and the types of victims often involved" as key organizing concepts in understanding and explaining the normality of a given homicide (Sudnow 1965: 256).

*Normal crimes* are the result of criminal justice actors creating a sense of structure through their interpretations of circumstances surrounding criminal behaviors and legal procedures. Out of these concepts Sudnow constructed the idea of *normal crimes*: an array of offenses, whose typical features (e.g., manner of occurrence, personal characteristics of the persons who commit them) both defense and prosecution agreed merited mutually beneficial legal compacts, thus dispensing with trials. Garfinkel (1967) observed jurors working across what could have been significant disagreements, using a body of common-sense knowledge and a range of procedures and considerations that permitted the finding of unanimous verdicts. Garfinkel (1956) found that jurors worked through a number of challenging distinctions (e.g. "fact versus opinion," "what the evidence shows and it says to each of us," "what was reasonable doubt") in arriving at unified decisions (Garfinkel 1956: 241). In reference to homicides in particular, Garfinkel (1949) found very early in the history of the death penalty research that courts formed norms, what he termed *local knowledges*, shaped by the racial discourse in a specific social landscape and that these imposed guidelines on the responses to certain crimes and treatment of defendants.

Both studies examined emerging and functional patterns of agreement within *common sense-making*

procedures that any ordinary members of society would understand and use. Sudnow (1965) and Garfinkel (1967) sought out organized patterns of interaction, institutionalized treatment of circumstances, and constructions of order in the everyday business of the courts. It is within these existing interactional constructions that the “usual and ordinary” sharply contrast with the abnormal and unusual, that the unwritten rules of normality become dominant, and that stock interpretations produce what appear to be, and are subsequently treated as, objective reality. Both Sudnow (1965) and Garfinkel (1967), in very different settings, outlined how seemingly disparate interests actually work together to achieve a mutually acceptable and essentially efficient conclusion of the respective business.

These ideas of norm formation in the operation of justice are applicable in Oklahoma’s circumstances as an execution state. Although Oklahoma is second only to Texas in total number of executions since 1976 and maintains the highest death sentence rate in the post-*Furman* period (1972-present), a majority of homicide prosecutions in Oklahoma never advance to trial. Of those intentional homicides (by statute 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> degree murders), 61% conclude in plea-bargaining, where charge reductions and/or sentence decreases are the norm (Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation). Clearly, if prosecutors and defense attorneys in Oklahoma were not disposed to make such concessions, the state’s criminal courts would be overwhelmed. It bears asking, how do opposing attorneys, in what appears to be a highly adversarial system, come to such vital and frequent agreements on a weighty issue such as homicide? How are *normal* cases selected for plea bargains, and how are the requisite reductions in charge and sentence arrived at? In essence, what constitutes a *normal homicide* and a *normal defendant*, or how does the *normalization* process operate, and what comprises leniency within Oklahoma’s murder conviction machinery?

The literature associated with plea agreements and bargaining has not addressed homicides in a manner commensurate with property and lesser violent crimes. The standard texts on plea agreements (Fisher 2003; Heumann 1981; Vogel 2007) mention the incidence of guilty pleadings in exchange for “life sentences” (which almost never result in a criminal spending the rest of his/her life in prison), but understandably amalgamate homicide with rape, robbery, and felonious assault in their discussions, treating prosecution/defense dialogue as an opportunistic conference without guidelines or governance, either by design or default. The only serious discussions of plea agreements in homicide cases come from a comparative systems approach in Nasheri (1998) and a victim’s right perspective in McCoy (1993). That being said, neither Nasheri (1998) nor McCoy (1993) put forth the idea of a structure of normalcy negotiated between prosecution and

defense, which this research seeks to distinguish and clarify.

## Data Description, Methodology, and Theory

Data were collected from a multitude of sources, from the Oklahoma Offender Database (OOD) for the years 1973-2008, Oklahoma Indigent Defense System records, circuit court annual reports, and crime reporting collected from 44 local newspapers covering cases charged as “capital” and “second degree” homicides. This period spanned the first 35 years of Oklahoma’s current, post-*Furman* use of capital sentencing law with 7,662 reported homicides in the state. Complete case information, amounted to 34.3% (n = 2,629) of that total. Offender information data systems, appellate documents, individual circuit reports, and newspaper accounts carried a wealth of information (e.g. name, department of corrections number, age, ethnicity, years of education completed, criminal record, and eligibility for parole if applicable) and circumstances of the crime (newspapers usually carried a narrative description of the events, method, and weapon used; victim information such as age, ethnicity, possible relation to the offender). Oklahoma Attorney General’s Office and Oklahoma Criminal Court of Appeals records included statutory aggravators (following a 1981 revision of the capital punishment statute), legal representation of the defendant, and accompanying facts of the crimes, including victim particulars. In that logistic regression requires complete case information, a large portion (approximately 65%) of the original data set had to be excluded.

The data set conformed to the guiding assumptions related to binary logistic regression: (1) The data set contains more than the minimum of 25 cases per independent variable (Tabachnick and Fidell 1996); (2) Logistic regression relies on a *goodness-of-fit* test to assess the fit of the model to the data (Tabachnick and Fidell 1996), as the -2 Log likelihood, Cox & Snell R<sup>2</sup>, and Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup>; (3) Multicollinearity in the predictor variables was checked by a preliminary linear regression and is not present; and (4) Case outliers have been eliminated via the Mahalanobis distance Chi-square test for outlying cases.<sup>1</sup> The logic of binary logistic regression relies upon probabilities or odds (a ratio of probability) that a given event or condition will occur divided by the probability that such an event or condition will not occur. The effect of each independent or predictor variable/s on a dichotomous outcome is/are represented by an odds ratio, an *expected beta*, (*ExpB*), that is converted into an increase or decrease in the probability of one outcome of the dependent or response variable.

Employing *binary logistic regression* techniques on a variety of categorical *predictor variables* on a single binary *response variable* is a *logit model*. The design follows the categorical parameters emphasized in Agresti (2002), where analyses seek significant *categorical predictor variables*

that demonstrate increased or decreased likelihoods that a given attribute of a crime and/or a defendant would/would not realize treatment as a *normal homicide* or *normal defendant*. These predictors act on the *criterion variable*, in this case a categorical variable of *normalcy* (Cleary and Angel 1984; Morgan and Teachman 1988; Tate 1992).

With Sudnow (1965) for theoretical guidance, *normal homicides* were assumed to have one specific attribute: less harsh sentencing. In Oklahoma's legal environment, a plea bargain, a *normal homicide* would theoretically receive a relatively light sentence (Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation), i.e., 17.29 years or 208 months, defined for our purposes as at least one standard deviation (8.81 years or 106 months) under the average numbers of years (26.1 years or roughly 312 months) for murder in the second degree; or one "Life" sentence with the possibility of parole beginning 15 years or 160 months hence. Offenders receiving in excess of 17.29 years or 208 months of incarceration for murders in the second degree, or those who elect to go to trial on charges of capital homicide, which entails prosecutor's requests for the death penalty and result in either a death sentence or life without the possibility of parole (LWOP), are considered outside the "normal" designation. These categories were designated as dichotomous conditions of a dummy variable NORMDUM of the *response* or *dependent* variable.

Using Sudnow's (1965) findings, it was possible to theoretically extract the typical features of a *normal homicide* and *normal defendant*, as well as hypothesize elements of the cases considered *normal*, i.e., most highly predictive variables (race of offender and victim, combinations of victim-offender races, typical relationships of victim to offender, weapon used) in explaining the interactions of prosecutors and defense attorneys in attaining a reasonable compromise.

Inverting the premise that "the selection of homicide defendants for death is the cumulative result of a series of decisions and evaluations" by state's attorneys and juries (Radelet and Pierce 1985: 617), examinations of defendants and circumstances of their offenses were done in order to understand those factors having reasonable predictive power in the construction of a *normal homicide*, a crime that meets the norms in its details (e.g., weapon employed, victim selection, overall race, age, and social congruency of assailant and assailed) and accordingly, could be disposed of without seemingly undue investigation, court time, or public notice.

### Normal Procedures in the Normal Homicide

Oklahoma's homicide prosecutions are similar to most criminal courts in the U.S. in that prosecutors provide details of the crime in the original complaint, with the most prominent facts brought forward at arraignment, bail hearings, and any evidentiary proceedings. Pre-trial conferences between prosecution and defense counsels

work to establish the normality of the crime, where offenders "receive their due" to the satisfaction of prosecutors and the defense receive incentives to surrender a plea of guilty (Sudnow 1965: 264). If an agreement is reached regarding the "normal" nature of a given crime, defense will accordingly stipulate its client's guilt, while agreeing, or disagreeing, with specifications of the charges, with the expressed goal of arriving at a plea agreement and a satisfactory sentencing recommendation. In many cases, the admission of guilt is not necessarily an important bargaining point, whereas the specifications of a given crime and the resulting sentencing memo, signed by the prosecutor and returned to the court, are the most serious points of contention between prosecution and defense, in that these directly affect the eligibility and circumstances (evidence of remorse, future dangerousness, possibility of recidivism) in the eventual parole of a given offender. The *normal crime* emerges as one with origins and motives as one between familiars, involving young, male offenders and victims of the same race, usually motivated by passion/vengeance, done with a firearm, and experiencing little media exposure. To establish a *normal homicide* and *normal offender*, prosecutors and defense counsels labor to link the act of murder with the *normal* category of homicide. It was generally accepted in nearly every case that this relationship precluded the possibility that the defendant might not be guilty, that the victim might have been a party to his/her own death, or that the homicide was justifiable, all conditions that would have mitigated the seriousness of the crime or closed any prosecution.

The decisions to normalize cases (or not) are completed very early in the process as one urban police force has stated, "Homicides are broken down into the following categories in Oklahoma City: gang-related, domestic, robbery, self-defense, officer-involved, argument, child abuse, accidental, other and unknown, which are typically unsolved" (McCool 2008). In that both prosecutors and public defenders have limited resources to devote to heavy caseloads, the impetus for employing serious hours of investigation, research, and strategy-making must come from someplace other than the fact that a homicide has been committed. The streamlining of the litigation process with the changes in the capital punishment statute in 1981 seemed to have no affect on the normalizing process.

The emphasis on the normality of a given case, as it fits cases already decided and conforms to conditions already determined, strongly implies that defense attorney and prosecutor know beforehand the conditions under which they will request/grant a plea bargain, in common sense situations whose features are largely taken for granted. At the same time, prosecutors are aware of the priorities of their colleagues across the aisle.

Sudnow's observation that, "To put on a fight is a disconcerting task for persons who regularly work together as a team" (Sudnow 1965: 275). The agreed-upon

circumstances usually entail a homicide where a young person, more often than not in Oklahoma City or Tulsa, an African-American male, has killed another young African-American male, where offender and victim know each other or share a situation where circumstances connect them in some way (e.g., gang rivalry, personal jealousy, revenge for a past wrong). In doing so, the defendant has committed a personal crime, commonly without endangering the lives of others, and usually does not have a lengthy or serious criminal record. As a rule, such cases do not appear prominently in the leading media outlets of record in the two counties (Oklahoma and Tulsa) that encompass 78% of the state's homicides over the period examined. In these "low-visibility" cases, prosecuting attorneys feel no pressure to request a death penalty and tend to process murder cases with minimum resources (Paternoster 1983). Defense attorneys and prosecutors, having agreed on the types of cases and the character of defendants on whom they would be willing to compromise, essentially program the process of bargaining in the incidence of what can be a *normal homicide*. Again, Garfinkel expressed the crux of the issue saying that the "outcome comes before the decision" (Garfinkel 1967: 114). In the final assessment, prosecutors were responsible to the public if a given case realized subsequent publicity, expressed by Garfinkel's idea that the "decision maker's task of justifying a course of action" (Garfinkel 1967:114) was a factor that all prosecutors took to heart.

Based on theoretical statements emerging from Sudnow (1965), the *normal defendant* appeared in the case of Oklahoma to be:

- male offenders
- non-white
- most often African-American
- no serious criminal history

while *normal homicides* had characteristics akin to:

- crimes assailing other young, non-white men
- weapon most likely involved was a firearm
- offender linked to or was very similar in social, economic, or some personal circumstances to the victim.

Table 1 includes all the predictor variables as they coded in the logit. Similarly, more current empirical studies of executions identified other predictor variables that could be tested. Widely accepted empirical studies in Maryland found that "state's attorneys were approximately twice as likely to file a notification to seek a death sentence and not withdraw that notification when the homicide victim was white rather than black" (State of Maryland 2000); as well as a later report that found "blacks who kill blacks and homicides involving 'other' combinations of offender's and victim's race are significantly less likely to have a death notification 'stick' than homicides involving black

offenders and white victims" (State of Maryland 2000: 37). Applying the inverse and considering the racial variety in Oklahoma (e.g. African-Americans, Latino/s, Asians, and Native Americans), the data set should exhibit crimes involving non-white offenders and victims in Oklahoma receiving more leniency, i.e., charges of 2<sup>nd</sup> degree homicide or charges of 1<sup>st</sup> degree homicide with a waiver of death penalties including the possibility of parole.

### The Response Variable

The dependent variable works on the presence or absence of *lenient treatment* (i.e., 17.29 years or 208 months or less) versus negotiated sentences of more than 17.29 years or 208 months defined as *harsh treatment*, as well as sentences of life without parole (LWOP) or death at trial.

### Predictor Variables as Hypotheses

**Hypothesis #1:** Non-white offenders will exceed statistical expectations in lenient treatment when victims are non-white.

**Hypothesis #2:** In an analysis across all ethnic categories (white, African-American, Latino/a, Native American, and Asian), offenders and victims with the same race/ethnicity are more likely to attain *lenient treatment*.

**Hypothesis #3:** Offenders with previous felony convictions are less likely to receive *lenient treatment*. At least one previous felony conviction will reduce the probability of one being defined as *normal defendants*.

**Hypothesis #4:** Cases that receive significant pre-trial publicity are less likely to receive leniency and will not be treated as *normal homicides*.

**Hypothesis #5:** Cases involving firearms are more likely to receive leniency and be treated as *normal homicides*.

**Hypothesis #6:** Defendants with public defenders are more likely to realize *normal* classification.

### Results and Conclusions

**Hypothesis #1:** It was hypothesized that non-white offenders would exceed statistical expectations in lenient treatment when victims are non-white. Only black offenders assailing black victims demonstrated a clear indication. The analysis revealed black on white homicides realize a 96% reduction in the probability of a *normal* classification (*ExpB* of .042 with a .000 sig.; n = 302).

**Hypothesis #2:** In an analysis across all ethnic categories (White, African-American, Latino/a, Native American, and Asian), offenders and victims with the same race/ethnicity are more likely to attain *lenient treatment*. Only black on black (BLK/BLK) homicides realized a 30% increase in the probability of a *normal* classification (*ExpB*

<b>Table 1. Codings and Descriptions for Predictor Variables</b>	
<b>Coding</b>	<b>Variable Description</b>
<i>Offender Characteristics</i>	
OLESS22	Offender 21 years of age at the time of the offense = 1; < 21 = 0
ONONWHITE	Offender non-white = 1; Offender white = 0
OPRIORS	Offender has prior felony conviction/s = 1; no felony convictions = 0
OYBLKPriors	Offender black male w/ prior conviction/s = 1; no OYBLKPriors = 0
OYNWPriors	Offender other non-white w/ prior convictions = 1; no OYNWPriors = 0
<i>Victim Characteristics</i>	
VLESS22	Victim > 21 years of age = 1; < 21 = 0
VSEXFML	Victim sex female = 1; male = 0
VSEXML	Victim sex male = 1; female = 0
VWHITE	Victim white = 1; non-white = 0
VNONWHITE	Victim non-white male = 1; female = 0
<i>Offender/Victim Ethnicity &amp; Proximity</i>	
BLK/BLK	Black Offender-Black Victim = 1; everything else = 0
BLK/ONW	Black Offender-Other nonwhite Victim = 1; everything else = 0
BLK/WHT	Black Offender-White Victim = 1; everything else = 0
ONW/BLK	Other nonwhite Offender- Black Victim = 1; everything else = 0
ONW/WHT	Other nonwhite Offender- White Victim = 1; everything else = 0
ONW/ONW	Other nonwhite Offender- Other nonwhite Victim = 1; everything else = 0
WHT/BLK	White Offender -Black Victim = 1; everything else = 0
WHT/ONW	White Offender-Other nonwhite Victim = 1; everything else = 0
WHT/WHT	White Offender-White Victim = 1; everything else = 0
STRANGER	Stranger = 1; familiar to victim = 0
<i>Offender/Victim Sex</i>	
OM/VFM	Male Offender-Female Victim = 1; everything else = 0
OM/OM	Male Offender-Male Victim = 1; everything else = 0
OFM/VFM	Female Offender-Female Victim = 1; everything else = 0
OFM/VM	Female Offender-Male Victim = 1; everything else = 0
<i>Weapons, Publicity, and Offender Representation</i>	
GUN	Gun = 1; everything else = 0
KNIFE	Knife = 1; everything else = 0
PERSONAL	Personal Assault (hands/fists) = 1; everything else = 0
BLUNT	Blunt Instrument = 1; everything else = 0
OTHER	Other (poison, bomb, automobile) = 1; everything else = 0
PUBDEFDUM	Public Defender = 1; everything else = 0
MEDIADUM	High Media Profile = 1; everything else = 0

of 1.302 with a .064 sig.; n = 279). In all other pairings (OTH/OTH and WHT/WHT), no indications of *normalcy* were revealed.

**Hypothesis #3:** The alternative hypothesis was accepted in that offenders with previous felony convictions are less likely to receive *lenient treatment*. Existence of a previous felony conviction will reduce the probability of *lenient treatment* by 34% (*ExpB* of .664 with a .001 sig.; n = 918). OPRIORS, or offender prior felony convictions, are the strongest predictor of harsh treatment across the entire data set.

**Hypothesis #4:** Cases that receive significant pre-trial publicity are less likely to be treated as *normal homicides*, indicated by a 94% reduction in the probability of a *normal* classification (*ExpB* of .061 with a .008 sig.; n = 2,196).

**Hypothesis #5:** Based on these analyses, we must accept the *null hypothesis* in that firearms are positively associated with *normalcy*. Lenient treatment, *normalcy*, is linked to the general weapon category of “other,” composed in large part of vehicular homicides and use of poison. There is a 63% increase in the probability of a *normal* classification (*ExpB* of 1.631 with a .072 sig.; n = 124). However, it is clear that homicides involving knives seem to preclude *normalcy*, having grisly crime scene photos that are characteristic of such a weapon, impressing on prosecutors the need for a harsher sentence. The use of a knife as a murder weapon realizes a 36% reduction in the probability of a *normal* classification (*ExpB* of .640 with a .049 sig.; n = 298).

## Conclusions

As Skolnick (1966) found, defense attorneys often attempt to diminish offenders’ identities in favor of a broad social justice explanation for their client’s behavior and in the same fashion prosecutors often attempt to minimize the personal elements of a defendant’s character in exchange for a moniker (e.g., “the pro” or “the strangler”). In the same fashion Goffman (1961) pointed out that hospital personnel erased names and patients become their disease, developing *master status* of “the amputation,” or “the cancer.” Offenders in particular, undeserving as it were of an individual identity, were referred to as “the gang shooting” or “the domestic killing” occupying a spot on the court docket in a given week. These identities, and their associated charges and sentences, were negotiated, usually without undue perspiration, by respective counsels, with a settlement that legally confirmed the *normalness* of the crime and criminal as well. For non-white offenders, leniency was systematically related to the non-white condition of their victims. Non-white offenders realized harsher treatments when their victims were white, and our analysis shows that assailing white victims precipitated

harsher punishments. Analysis of the data set indicated that non-whites’ crimes would be more likely to be *normalized* if their victims were also non-white. What has become common currency, that prior felony convictions posed a significant obstacle to leniency, were substantiated by the analysis. Overall, one of the strongest predictors of a *normal homicide* was a similarity of offender to victim in personal and social senses, and it is clear that homicides across race/ethnic divisions offend the racial etiquette of those communities, while same-race homicides were more likely to be treated as *normal*.

It is also clear that homicides involving firearms were more likely to be considered *normal*. The data set bore out this assumption, which at first glance seems counterintuitive, but might be explained by the availability of graphic crime scene photos of knife killings that leave large blood pools and mutilated body parts for a jury to see. Such photos imply gross brutality compared with what might seem less brutal crimes involving firearms or poison.

Bargaining pleas and sentences, apparently for both defense counsels and prosecutors, supported the idea that justice would be possible only if a small percentage of cases charged out actually went to trial. It was clear that defense counsels and prosecutors had to have substantial faith in the fairness of the system that their day-to-day practices produced, setting up what Garfinkel (1967) called *incorrigible propositions*, i.e., a continued belief in the face of objective contradictions. Empirical findings herein demonstrate that races of victims and offenders, the relationship of assailant to victim, and the presence of any prior felony conviction were key elements in the determination of leniency/harshness.

The data set confirmed the categories and types of crimes that afford negotiation, that is men of color accused of assailing other men of color, realized the highest probability of obtaining leniency and exercised significant power of choice in whether they would be offered a plea bargain or go to trial. The chances of receiving harsher penalties, a life sentence without the possibility of parole or death, were further decreased if the offender had no prior felony convictions.

In conclusion, the concepts of *normal defendant* and *normal homicide* are empirically verifiable in the case of Oklahoma, operating within a particular legal culture and social conditions that structure decision-making and trial outcomes for the most serious of crimes, homicide.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> The -2 Log likelihood (142.12), Cox & Snell R<sup>2</sup> (0.320), and Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> (0.473) were within acceptable ranges. Classification table indicates that predicted and observed values overlap (correct predictions) in 82.6% (cut value = 0.5).

**Table 2.** Probability of an Offender/Homicide, NORMDUM (n=2,629); Model Sig.= .002

Predictor Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	Exp (B)	+/- % Probability	n
<i>Offender Characteristics</i>								
<b>OLESS22</b>	.107	.149	.514	1	.473	1.113	+11%	348
<b>ONONWHITE</b>	-.260	.383	0.050	1	.823	.918	-8%	832
<b>OPRIORS</b>	-.409	.121	11.51	1	.001	.664	-34%	918
<b>OYBLKPriors</b>	-.626	.438	2.040	1	.153	.535	-47%	76
<b>OYNWPriors</b>	.556	.369	2.227	1	.131	1.744	+74%	54
<i>Victim Characteristics</i>								
<b>VLESS22</b>	-.177	.170	1.080	1	.299	.838	-16%	516
<b>VSEXFML</b>	-1.297	1.048	1.531	1	.216	.273	-73%	664
<b>VSEXML</b>	-.182	.080	5.189	1	.023	.834	-17%	1285
<b>VWHITE</b>	-1.430	.547	6.827	1	.009	.239	-76%	1304
<b>VNONWHITE</b>	1.514	.548	7.636	1	.006	4.543	+354%	633
<i>Offender/Victim Ethnicity &amp; Proximity</i>								
<b>BLK/BLK</b>	.263	.569	.214	1	.064	1.301	+30%	279
<b>BLK/ONW</b>	-.204	.727	.758	1	.779	.816	-18%	30
<b>BLK/WHT</b>	-3.167	.877	13.121	1	.000	.042	-96%	302
<b>ONW/BLK</b>	-.476	.793	.360	1	.548	.621	-38%	19
<b>ONW/WHT</b>	-1.554	.813	3.652	1	.056	.211	-79%	93
<b>ONW/ONW</b>	-.375	.570	.433	1	.510	.687	-31%	109
<b>WHT/BLK</b>	.143	.607	.055	1	.814	1.154	+15%	137
<b>WHT/ONW</b>	-.107	.605	.031	1	.860	.899	-11%	91
<b>WHT/WHT</b>	.094	.248	.144	1	.705	1.099	+1%	896
<b>STRANGER</b>	-2.247	.996	7.062	1	.006	.446	-55%	2267
<i>Offender/Victim Sex</i>								
<b>OM/VFM</b>	-.227	1.021	.050	1	.824	.923	-8%	608
<b>OM/OM</b>	-1.714	1.164	2.167	1	.141	.118	-88%	1189
<b>OFM/VFM</b>	.223	1.077	.043	1	.836	1.250	+25%	59
<b>OFM/VM</b>	-2.135	1.238	2.976	1	.085	.836	-16%	95
<i>Weapons, Publicity, &amp; Offender Representation</i>								
<b>GUN</b>	.014	.147	.009	1	.923	1.014	+17%	1179
<b>KNIFE</b>	-.446	.226	3.891	1	.049	.640	-36%	298
<b>PERSONAL</b>	.033	.240	.019	1	.889	1.034	+3%	241
<b>BLUNT</b>	.228	.312	.534	1	.465	1.256	+26%	107
<b>OTHER</b>	.489	.272	3.230	1	.072	1.631	+63%	124
<b>PUBDEFDUM</b>	.841	.102	1.933	1	.016	2.454	+145	2629
<b>MEDIADUM</b>	-2.711	.822	5.673	1	.008	.061	-94%	2196
<b>CONSTANT</b>	.946	1.380	.469	1	.002			2629

## References

- Agresti, A. 2002. *Categorical Data Analysis, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.* New York: Wiley.
- Cleary, Paul D. and Ronald Angel. 1984. "The Analysis of Relationships Involving Dichotomous Dependant Variables." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 25(3):334-348.
- Fisher, George. 2003. *Plea Bargaining's Triumph: A History of Plea Bargaining in America.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1949. "Research Note on Inter- and Intra-Racial Homicides." *Social Forces* 27(4):369-372.

- , 1956. "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies." *American Journal of Sociology* 61:240-244.
- , 1967. "Some Rules of Correct Decision Making That Jurors Respect." Pp. 104-115 in *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, edited by XXXX. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Heumann, Milton. 1981. *Plea Bargaining: The Experiences of Prosecutors, Judges, and Defense Attorneys*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- McCoy, Candace. 1993. *Politics and Plea Bargaining: Victims' Rights in California*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Morgan, S. Philip and Jay D. Teachman. 1988. "Logistic Regression: Description, Examples, and Comparisons." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 50(3):929-926.
- McCool, Steven. 2008. "In Oklahoma City Murder Trend is Hard to Spot." *The Oklahoman* 8 January, 3.
- Nasheri, Hedieh. 1998. *Betrayal of Due Process: A Comparative Analysis of Plea Bargaining in the United States and Canada*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Reports. Available at [www.ok.gov/osbi/Publications/Crime\\_Statistics.html](http://www.ok.gov/osbi/Publications/Crime_Statistics.html). Accessed June 23, 2009.
- Paternoster, Raymond. 1983. "Race of the Victim and Location of the Crime: The Decision to Seek the Death Penalty in South Carolina." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 74:754-785.
- Radelet, Michael L. and Glenn L. Pierce. 1985. "Race and Prosecutorial Discretion in Homicide Cases." *Law & Society Review* 19:587-621.
- Skolnick, Jerome H. 1966. *Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- State of Maryland. 2000. *Capital Punishment in Maryland 1978-1987: A Report by the Maryland Public Defender on the Administration of Capital Punishment*. R. Paternoster, Principle Investigator.
- Sudnow, David. 1965. "Normal Crimes: Sociological Features of the Penal Code in a Public Defender's Office." *Social Problems* 12:255-276.
- Tabachnick, B.G. and L.S. Fidell. 1996. *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: Harper Collins.
- Tate, Robert. 1992. "General Linear Model Applications." Unpublished manuscript, Florida State University, Department of Sociology.
- Vogel, Mary E. 2007. *Coercion to Compromise: Plea Bargaining, the Courts, and the Making of Political Authority*. New York: Oxford University Press.

---

## About the authors

**G. Larry Mays** is Regents Professor of Criminal Justice at New Mexico State University. He holds a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Tennessee, and he has held faculty positions at East Tennessee State University and Appalachian State University as well as at New Mexico State over his 34 year teaching career. He is author or editor of 17 books and has published over 100 articles, book chapters, and encyclopedia entries. Email: [glmays@nmsu.edu](mailto:glmays@nmsu.edu)

**David P. Keys** (PhD, Missouri-Sociology) is author of several papers on capital sentencing, is co-author of *America Without the Death Penalty* (2002), and currently is Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at New Mexico State University at Las Cruces. Dr. Keys is past associate professor and chairperson of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at State University of New York-Plattsburgh and consults pro bono as an advocate for death row inmates. Email: [davekeys@nmsu.edu](mailto:davekeys@nmsu.edu)

**Contact information:** David Keys, Department of Criminal Justice-MC3487, New Mexico State University, PO Box 30001, Las Cruces, NM 88003; Phone: (575) 646-7184; Email: [davekeys@nmsu.edu](mailto:davekeys@nmsu.edu).

---