Reliability and validity of cross-national homicide data: A comparison of UN and WHO data

ANDERSSON, Catrin <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4336-4771> and KAZEMIAN, Lila

Reliability and Validity of Cross-national Homicide Data: A Comparison of UN and WHO Data

Corresponding author:
Catrin Andersson
Sheffield Hallam University
Heart of the Campus HC2.14
Collegiate Crescent
Sheffield
S10 2BQ
England
+44 114 225 6372
c.andersson@shu.ac.uk
@catrin82
ORCHID ID: 0000-0003-4336-4771

Lila Kazemian
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
520.13, Haaren Hall
899 Tenth Avenue
New York, NY 10019
USA
+1 212 484 1301
lkazemian@jjay.cuny.edu

Submitted for publication to the International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice

Word count: 9,305

Abstract

Data reliability and validity are major methodological concerns in cross-national analyses of crime. Despite the large literature on cross-national homicide rates, there is little agreement on which source of data provides the most reliable estimates. In addition, few studies have examined the potential threat to validity posed by unclassified deaths. Through a description of trends over time as well as multivariate analyses, the current study aims to shed some light on these questions by (1) assessing the reliability of cross-national homicide data from the United Nations and the World Health Organization, and (2) investigating the impact of unclassified deaths on the validity of WHO data. Findings indicate that UN and WHO homicide rates (n=56) differ in magnitude but produce similar outcomes. Drawing on well-known correlates of cross-national homicide rates, the UN data provide more robust results and produce statistical models with less error. We find that WHO data are more stable and reliable over time, and better suited for longitudinal analyses. Findings also suggest that analyses drawing on WHO homicide data should not disregard unclassified deaths because their inclusion produces better fitted statistical models and provides a closer estimate of the true number of homicides.

Keywords: Cross-national; homicide; unclassified deaths; reliability; validity; World Health Organization; United Nations.

Introduction

In 2012, the United Nations documented 437,000 homicides worldwide (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2014). According to the most recent Global Study on Homicide (United Nations, 2013), homicide rates, and their fluctuations across time, vary by region. For instance, decreases in homicide rates were observed in Europe while increases in violence have been noted in the Americas, though these appear to be stabilizing. Approximately half of the homicides reported in 2012 occurred in non-Western nations, despite the fact that these countries only make up 11 percent of the overall world population (United Nations, 2013).

Various studies have examined variations in cross-national homicide rates. These studies have been confronted with a number of methodological challenges, such as small sample size and missing or inconsistent data. In addition, researchers have raised concerns about the reliability and validity of cross-national data (Bennett & Lynch, 1990; Rubin, Culp, Mameli, & Walker, 2008; Schaible, 2012). Testing the reliability of cross-national data has become increasingly challenging, as the availability of sources of homicide data has declined since the seminal work of Bennett and Lynch in 1990. In the past, the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) data were the most frequently used source of crime data (Bennett & Lynch, 1990), but these data are no longer available. The only remaining sources of cross-national homicide data are compiled by the United Nations (UN) and the World Health Organization (WHO). Scholars do not agree on which source provides the most reliable data.

The validity of homicide data is equally important in the assessment of cross-national homicide research. Homicides, unlike other crimes, leave a body behind, making this offense more visible and detectable by the authorities (Ouimet & Montmagny-Grenier, 2014). As a result, homicide data are believed to be characterized by greater external validity when

compared with other types of crimes (Lauritsen, Rezey, & Heimer, 2015). Notwithstanding the fact that this distinctive feature of homicide lends to more valid cross-national comparisons, homicide data are not immune to validity concerns, particularly at the cross-national level (Bennett & Lynch, 1990). Unclassified deaths (i.e., deaths of an unknown cause) pose a significant threat to the validity of homicide data. In suicide studies, researchers have investigated the influence of unclassified deaths on the distribution of suicides (Björkenstam et al., 2014), but this issue has seldom been examined in homicide research. Unclassified deaths are likely to result in an underestimation of homicide events, potentially undermining the validity of findings. The detailed nature and consistent data collection procedures (i.e., completed death certificates) of the WHO data offer an opportunity to examine the potential influence of unclassified deaths in analyses of homicide rates. Despite calls for tests of reliability and validity of the UN data, these analyses are lacking but these data continue to be used frequently in homicide research (e.g., Chu & Tusalem, 2013; Wolf, Gray, & Fazel, 2014).

The current study aims to address knowledge gaps in cross-national research in two ways. First, it assesses the reliability of cross-national homicide data from the United Nations and the World Health Organization (n=56) by drawing on more recent data than in prior research (1995 to 2012). Drawing on robust indicators identified in the cross-national homicide literature, we assess whether multivariate analyses of homicide rates produce similar results when using UN versus WHO data. Second, through a multivariate analysis of the predictors of homicide rates, the study investigates the validity of the WHO data by comparing results with and without the inclusion of unclassified deaths. With the exception of one Russian study (Andreev, Shkolnikov, Pridemore, & Nikitina, 2015), no homicide study has, to our knowledge, examined the potential threat posed by unclassified deaths to the validity of cross-national homicide data.

Methodological Issues in Homicide Research

Studies on the reliability and validity of crime data

Rigorous methodological studies on national crime data have emerged from the United States, partly due to the greater availability of longitudinal and multisource crime data in the U.S. (Berg & Lauritsen, 2015; Lauritsen et al., 2015; Loftin & McDowall, 2010). These studies have investigated the degree of convergence in longitudinal crime trends (Lauritsen et al., 2015; Lynch & Addington, 2006; McDowall & Loftin, 2007), as well as issues with the reliability and validity of crime data across different sources.

In the United States, homicide data are gathered through two main sources: the Uniform Crime Report's (UCR) Supplemental Homicide Reports (SHR), and the Fatal Injury Reports included in the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) (U.S Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2014). The SHR are drawn from criminal justice agencies, while the NVSS are public health data. Both sources capture homicide incidents, but they each pose distinctive reporting issues. Homicides are more likely to be under-reported in the SHR data, while these events may be misclassified in the NVSS (Wiersema, Loftin, & McDowall, 2000). This discrepancy has direct relevance for cross-national comparisons, given the similar underlying structure of different homicide data sources (i.e., criminal justice versus public health data).

NVSS consistently reports higher rates of homicide when compared with SHR data. This difference may be due to disparities in definitions (Wiersema et al., 2000) or the fact that unlike the NVSS, criminal justice agencies report data voluntarily for the SHR (U.S Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2014). Research has found significant disparities between the SHR and NVSS. Data from the 1980s suggest that only 22% of U.S. counties had perfect agreement on estimates from the two sources (Wiersema et al., 2000).

These discrepancies in agreement rates are also likely to be observed at the cross-national level (Marshall & Block, 2004).

Analyses investigating the reliability and validity of international homicide data are even more scarce than those conducted at the national level. Bennett and Lynch (1990) evaluated the reliability of cross-national crime data using a sample of 31 nations between the years 1975 to 1980, drawing on data from Interpol, the United Nations, the World Health Organization, and the Comparative Crime Data File (CCDF; Archer & Gartner, 1984). Their analyses showed that multi-year averages of homicide rates produced similar results across sources. However, the WHO homicide rates were generally substantially lower than UN homicide rates, leading the authors to conclude that the WHO data were more reliable in cross-sectional analyses. Bennett and Lynch's (1990) analysis was cross-sectional, and they did not examine homicide trends over time. The authors suggested that the selection of data source for cross-national analyses should be based on the completeness of data.

Data availability is only one of the obstacles faced by cross-national scholars. Cross-national analyses can be influenced by data irregularities, which can impact both reliability and validity. In 2001, Huang re-evaluated Bennett and Lynch's (1990) data with a slightly different methodology and investigated irregularities in the data. Two triangulated methods were used to reveal that the UN homicide data displayed the most discrepancies between mean rates, standard deviations, and adjusted values when compared with the WHO data (Huang, 2001). Similarly, in a study conducted by Rubin, Culp, Mameli and Walker (2008), the UN data were reported to have up to 24 percent of missing items, as well as a greater frequency of "anomalies" (i.e., large fluctuation in homicide rates) when compared with the Interpol data. Rubin et al. (2008) called for more efforts to assess the validity of the UN data,

The question of whether homicide data originating from public health (WHO) or criminal justice (UN) sources are more reliable remains unresolved. A handful of studies

have examined the reliability and validity of homicide data, dating back to the seminal work of Bennett and Lynch (1990) nearly three decades ago. While many scholars favor WHO data because of its professed reliability (Levchak, 2015; Messner, Raffalovich, & Sutton, 2010; Nivette & Eisner, 2013), the use of UN data is also prevalent in cross-national research (Chu & Tusalem, 2013; Pridemore & Chamlin, 2006; Wolf et al., 2014). Although the UN data are characterized by increased irregularities when compared with the WHO data, it remains unclear whether Bennett and Lynch's (1990) key finding (i.e., that the UN and the WHO homicide data produce similar results) continues to hold with more recent homicide data.

The Potential Influence of Unclassified Deaths

The World Health Organization's mortality data are collected rigorously, but nonetheless include a significant proportion of unclassified deaths (otherwise referred to as *Events of Undetermined Intent*, or EUI). These events are unclassified due to insufficient information surrounding the circumstances of the death. In these cases, at the time that the expert completed the death certificates, it was unclear whether the incident was a homicide, a suicide, or an accident. It has been argued that events may be misclassified into this category intentionally, and there "… there are reasons to believe that in some nations at some times this category may be employed to purposely misclassify homicide and suicide deaths" (Andreev et al., 2015, p. 13). The WHO homicide data may be misrepresented or underestimated due to this often neglected mortality category. These unclassified deaths have been shown to make up at least one third of unclassified homicides in a Russian sample (Andreev et al., 2015). Unclassified deaths reveal valuable information about the reporting practices of different countries.

The exclusion of unclassified deaths can have serious implications for research because it may lead to an under-estimation of mortality rates (Andreev et al., 2015)(While

countries vary in their rates of reported unclassified deaths, the exclusion of these events from cross-national analyses may impact the validity of the findings. Many studies have not tested the validity, but provide detailed discussions, of issues relevant to unclassified deaths (Bhalla, Harrison, Shahraz, & Fingerhut, 2010), namely classification accuracy (Prinsloo, Matzopoulos, Laubscher, Myers, & Bradshaw, 2016) and implications for data quality (Hu & Mamady, 2014; Prinsloo et al., 2016). Andreev and colleagues (2015) re-classified Russian mortality data in an attempt to establish the true cause of death in unclassified cases. Drawing on detailed Russian death records (n> 3 million) and using a multinomial logistic regression model, the authors produced an estimated classification probability (ECP). ECP measures the probability that an unclassified incident was either a non-transport accident, a homicide, or a suicide. This analysis drew on specific information about each case (e.g., sex, age, and event characteristics) in order to predict the correct type of death. The unclassified deaths were shown to be primarily non-transport accidents (48%), homicides (33%) and suicides (16%). While these results from Russia do not necessarily generalize to all countries, the findings suggested that a sizeable proportion of unclassified deaths may be homicides.

In a Swedish study examining the influence of unclassified deaths on suicide rates, Björkenstam and colleagues (2014) argued that it is not good practice to ignore unclassified deaths, or to simply combine these events with suicide data. Rather, the authors recommended that analyses be conducted with two variables (i.e., suicide only, and suicide and unclassified deaths combined). Björkenstam et al. (2014) further argued that homicides were less likely to be misclassified when compared with suicides. However, this statement is solely based on a 1989 study that investigated the validity of suicide data (O'Carroll, 1989). Other scholars have stated that there was no reason to believe that unclassified deaths were primarily suicides (Värnik et al., 2009). The correct classification of deaths leads to more

accurate data, which are crucial for the development of effective violence prevention measures (Hu & Mamady, 2014).

In summary, drawing on samples of varying sizes and from varying periods, it has been suggested that there are substantial differences between homicide data from the United Nations and the World Health Organization However, researchers have been largely silent on which source of homicide data is the most reliable. With regards to the validity of homicide data, the state of knowledge is equally nebulous. Scholars have called for validity tests of the United Nations data (Rubin et al., 2008), but the data required to conduct such tests are not available. The current study aims to address some of these knowledge gaps in cross-national research.

The Current Study

Drawing on data from the United Nations (UN) and the World Health Organization (WHO), this paper investigates whether cross-national trends and findings about homicide remain consistent when drawing upon different sources of data, a topic that has been neglected in criminological research (Liem & Pridemore, 2011). In addition, this study also examines another key methodological issue that is relevant to cross-national comparisons, namely the influence of deaths without a known cause. Unclassified deaths (i.e., “Events of Undetermined Intent”, or EUI) are included in the World Health Organization's mortality data, and pose an often-overlooked threat to the validity of homicide data. Some European countries report remarkably high rates of unclassified deaths (e.g., 12% in the UK, 10% in Poland, and 8 % in Sweden; Andreev et al., 2015). These figures are higher in the developing world. More than 20% of injury deaths in many Asian, African and Middle Eastern countries are unclassified (Bhalla et al., 2010).

This paper aims to assess the reliability of cross-national homicide data from the United Nations and the World Health Organization, and well as the validity of the WHO data based on the unclassified deaths. Drawing on homicide data from 1995 to 2012 (n=56 countries), the current study has three main objectives: 1) to compare the UN and WHO homicide trends; 2) to assess whether the predictors of cross-national homicide rates vary when using UN versus WHO data; and 3) to estimate the validity of the WHO data by replicating analyses inclusive of unclassified deaths. To our knowledge, no such efforts have been undertaken with recent cross-national homicide data.

Methods

Data

The United Nations (UN)

The United Nations defines homicide as an "unlawful death purposefully inflicted on a person by another person" (“UNODC: Global Study on Homicide,” 2013). The counting unit is body count or number of homicide incidents; counting units vary across countries. These two methods of counting homicides can lead to different data because a homicide "event" can implicate more than one body, but would nonetheless be regarded as one homicide incident. In comparison, the body count method is based on the number of bodies, irrespective of the number of homicide events. The data exclude infanticides, and some nations include attempted homicides (Lynch & Pridemore, 2011).

The UN collects crime data in two ways. First, the crime survey (i.e., *United Nations Surveys on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems*, or CTS) is distributed to and collected from criminal justice agencies in UN member nations every year. If there are any reported discrepancies in the collected data (i.e., a 30 or more percent change in the crime statistics from one year to the next), the UN requests an explanation from the

reporting source (Lynch & Pridemore, 2011). Second, a more complete set of data is collected and disseminated by a large division of the UN, the *United Nations Office on Crime and Drugs* (UNODC). These data are drawn from multiple sources, including the CTS survey, police forces, and the World Health Organization. The number of countries with national registration systems for homicide has increased since 2011, resulting in improved cooperation with the UN's homicide data collection program ("UNODC: Global Study on Homicide," 2013; for a more comprehensive review of homicide data from the United Nations, see Lynch & Pridemore, 2011).

The World Health Organization (WHO)

According to the World Health Organization, homicides are defined as "injuries inflicted by another person with intent to injure or kill, by any means" (World Health Organization, 2014). This definition is based on the premise that homicides are intentional. However, because the WHO cannot enforce compliance with the definition, Smit, de Jong and Bijleveld (2012) argued that deaths are likely to include both intentional and unintentional homicides; body count is the measurement unit. Certain deaths are excluded from the WHO data: legal intervention deaths, (i.e., caused by law enforcement or military personnel), war-related deaths, lives lost as a result of dangerous driving, assistance with suicide, abortion, and homicide attempts. The WHO collects mortality data based on death certificates that are completed by medical doctors or, in certain countries, police officials (Smit et al., 2012).

Comparability Issues between the UN and WHO Data

There are some tangible differences between the UN and WHO data. The two sources employ different definitions of homicide, and draw on different measurement units (i.e., body count in the WHO data versus body count and/or number of homicide incidents in the UN

data; Lynch & Pridemore, 2011). The two data sources also exclude different categories of deaths (infanticides in the UN data versus various other types of death in the WHO data; see above). It has been argued that disparities in findings across the different data sources may be due to operational differences relating to the types of incidents included in the homicide category (Smit, et al., 2012). In terms of comparability, the UN and the WHO are challenged by potential limitations in their respective data collection methods. The level of expertise of public health officials is variable (Howard, Newman, & Pridemore, 2000), and they are at times unable to determine the cause of death. Similarly, there are concerns about homicide data collection procedures, as there are no assurances that the UN's data collection regulations are respected (Lynch & Pridemore, 2011).

In short, the most fundamental challenge in comparisons of UN and WHO data relates to their divergent inclusion criteria and definitions of homicide. There is no agreement in the cross-national homicide literature as to which source provides the most valid and reliable data. WHO data tend to be favored because of the rigorous recording method (LaFree, 1999), larger sample sizes, and the exclusion of homicide attempts (Lynch & Pridemore, 2011), while others have argued that the multisource nature of the UN data render it most appropriate for cross-national comparisons (Ouimet, 2012). These issues are explored in this paper.

Variables

Dependent Variables

The current study employs three dependent variables: UN homicide rates, WHO homicide rates with unclassified deaths, and WHO homicide rates without unclassified deaths; all three rates reflect the number of deaths per population of 100,000 ("UNODC Statistics Online," n.d., "WHO- CoDQL - Cause of Death Query online," n.d., "WHO

Mortality Database," n.d.). Mortality data were obtained for 56 countries[1] between 1995 and 2012. The sample date range is limited because the UN did not publish homicide data online prior to 1995. As a result of missing values on the independent variables, a smaller range of years was used for the cross-sectional multivariate analyses, using multiyear averages for the most recent years available (i.e., 2008-2012). Analyses drew on these years because this was the range with the most complete data for the selected countries. In addition, the inclusion of developing nations typically results in a shorter range of years (Lappi-Seppälä & Lehti, 2014). Many researchers have attempted to maximize sample size in cross-national studies (Koeppel, Rhineberger-Dunn, & Mack, 2015). While this may strengthen statistical models and enable the inclusion of more predictors, this practice comes at the cost of range in development levels. This is important because much of what is known about homicide on a macro level derives heavily from research on Western and modernised nations. Data on unclassified deaths were available between 1998 and 2010 for 42 of the countries included in the overall sample. All dependent variables were transformed from counts into rates using World Health Organization population data (or World Bank data when the WHO data were unavailable).

Predictor and control variables were selected on the basis of indicators that have been consistently found to be associated with variations in cross-national homicide rates (Nivette, 2011; Trent & Pridemore, 2012): poverty (infant mortality rate), Human Development Index, quality of governance, female labor participation, and male-to-female sex ratio.

The infant mortality rate is defined as the number infants dying before reaching one year of age, per 1,000 live births; these data were obtained from the World Bank. This

[1] [1] Countries in UN and WHO samples (N=56): Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Bermuda, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and Grenadines, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

indicator commonly serves as a proxy for poverty (Dasandi, 2013; Pridemore, 2011). As a measure of absolute deprivation, poverty is one of the most salient indicators of aggregate homicide rates (Pridemore, 2011; Rogers & Pridemore, 2016).

While many studies have focused on economic measures, such as GDP, these indicators do not capture the social aspects of development levels (Cao & Zhang, 2015). The Human Development Index (HDI) measures the level of development. HDI is a composite measure consisting of life expectancy at birth, educational attainment (i.e., adult literacy rate), and adjusted real income (i.e., GDP per capita). HDI data were obtained from the United Nations. Ouimet (2012) argued that the HDI is a better measure of national development because it integrates several indicators and does not focus solely on the economic dimension. The HDI is also advantageous because data for this indicator are widely available for most countries.[2]

Recent research has indicated the need to evaluate the effects of political and governmental functioning on levels of violence (Cao & Zhang, 2015). The current study draws on a measure of quality of governance (i.e., the World Governance Indicators, or WGI), which is available from the World Bank and includes several indicators. These include measures of voice and accountability; political stability and absence of violence; government effectiveness; regulatory quality; rule of law; and control of corruption. Instead of focusing on a single dimension of governance, a composite measure was created through factor analysis, capturing the overall quality of governance (Cao & Zhang, 2015). [3]

Prior research has also found links between the proportion of women in the work force and violence rates, largely due to the weakened social control in families (Neumayer,

[2] HDI is scored between 0 and 1.Because of issues of multicollinearity with another key variable (i.e., poverty; VIF>10), the HDI was recoded into a dummy variable, using cutoffs determined by the UN (HDI, 2014). A value of 0 corresponded to low/medium level HDI (<.799), and a value of 1 denoted high level HDI (>.800).
[3] An explanatory factor analysis revealed that all the WGI items (i.e., voice and accountability, political stability and absence of violence, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law, and control of corruption) loaded onto a single factor and reflected the same dimension. A reliability test on the quality of governance factor provided an alpha of .961, indicating high reliability.

2003). Female labor participation is measured by the percentage of women in the population who are active in the labor force.

Finally, sex-ratio distributions (i.e., higher ratios of men to women) are strongly and positively associated with homicide rates (Chamlin & Cochran, 2006; Chu & Tusalem, 2013), as men are more likely to perpetrate and also to be victims of homicide. The sex-ratio measures the number of males per 100 females in the population (Messner & Rosenfeld, 1997). Both variables were obtained from the World Bank. All predictor variables were drawn from the year 2007 in order to create a lag with the dependent variables, which were measured between 2008-2012. Descriptive statistics for all variables are presented in Table 1.

[Table 1 near here]

Analytical strategy and procedures

The current study presents three main analyses. First, trend analyses investigate differences over time between the UN and WHO homicide data patterns. Second, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression and Weighted Least Squares (WLS) regression were carried out on the two dependent variables (i.e., the United Nations homicide rate and the World Health Organization homicide rate) to compare differences in outcomes based on each data source (see Lauritsen et al., 2016). Third, in order to test for data validity, an Ordinary Least Squares regression was conducted (with and without unclassified deaths) in order to assess whether the inclusion of unclassified deaths produced different results. In two of the models, heteroscedasticity was present[4], and subsequently, alpha and beta estimates were not BLUE (i.e., best linear unbiased estimation). WLS was used to adjust for this issue, resulting in smaller standard errors than a corrected OLS model (McClendon, 2002).

[4] The Breush-Pagan/Cook-Weisburg test revealed that two of the three models (UN and WHO) failed to meet the OLS assumption.

Multiyear averages were created for the years 2008-2012 to control for yearly fluctuations (and to some extent, measurement errors) in homicide rates (Altheimer, 2008; Cao & Zhang, 2015; Chon, 2011; Krahn, Hartnagel, & Gartrell, 1986). Due to the skewed distribution of homicide rates, the natural log was applied (Altheimer, 2008; Elgar & Aitken, 2011; Sun, Chu, & Sung, 2010); the same solution was applied to other independent and control variables that deviated from a normal distribution. These transformations were used in all multivariate analyses. Variance inflation factors (VIF) were tested for all independent variables, none of which exceeded the standard threshold of 10 for multicollinearity (Neter, Kutner, Nachtsheim, & Wasserman, 1996).

Results

Comparing homicide trends in the UN and WHO data

Figure 1 shows parallel trends between UN and WHO homicide patterns between 1995 and 2010. This indicates that despite the definitional differences, the two sources of homicide data seem to capture similar events. However, the magnitude of homicide rates differs between the two sources. The highest reported homicide rate in the period between 1995 and 2010 was about 8 per 100,000 in the WHO data in 1997, and close to 12 per 100,000 in the UN data in1995. Bennett and Lynch (1990) reported similar patterns in their analysis. It is unsurprising that the UN consistently reports higher homicide rates since these data unlike the WHO, may include homicide attempts. There is no consensus on the effects of these operational differences on the validity of the data. Some have argued that these different definitions of homicide employed in UN and WHO data have been reported to be a significant problem in cross-national comparisons (Liem & Pridemore, 2011; LaFree, 1999),

while others have found that definitions produce very small discrepancies in statistical effects (Barclay, 2000).

[Figure 1 near here]

Scholars have suggested that longitudinal homicide data can be regarded as reliable if variations do not exceed 10% from one decade to another (Lappi-Seppälä & Lehti, 2014). According to this reliability index, the WHO data are more reliable than the UN data, with less than 10% variation in the homicide rate across available data years; the mean WHO homicide rate ranges between 7 and 8, while the mean UN homicide rate ranges between 9 and 11. The UN reports a drop in homicide rate in the mid to late 1990s, which may be a result the crime decline that has been observed in most nations during this period (Baumer & Wolff, 2014; Eisner, 2008; Lappi-Seppälä & Lehti, 2014). Western and highly developed nations experienced a shared decrease in violence rates while other countries, such as some Latin American nations and Russia, displayed increases in violence rates from the 1990s onwards (Weiss, Santos, Testa, & Kumar, 2016). These outlier nations are partly responsible for the fluctuations observed in homicide rates over time.

The more erratic character of UN homicide trends may be driven by temporal fluctuations, particularly in outlier nations. For example, for El Salvador, the UN reported a homicide rate of 142.7 per 100,000 in 1995, while the WHO reported a rate of 45.3 per 100,000. El Salvador suffered from Civil War during the 1980s, a period characterised by a marked rise in violence. Even after the end of the Civil War in the 1990s, the homicide rate remained the highest in the world, possibly due to the normalization of violence after the period of high instability that was brought about with the Civil War (Bourgois, 2001).

Though the recorded homicide rate is higher in the UN data than in the WHO data, general trends between the two sources are generally quite similar, suggesting that either source could be appropriate for investigating long-term fluctuations in homicide rates. The question that remains unanswered is whether the two sources of data produce the same inferential results. These findings are presented in the following sections.

Trend analysis enables us to visually examine homicide trends. The purpose of this analysis is to assess whether homicide rates generally follow similar patterns over time across the two different data sources, and to identify temporal fluctuations and outliers. This analysis is descriptive in nature. The analyses in the following sections investigate issues of reliability and validity across the two sources of homicide data.

Reliability of World Health Organization and United Nations homicide data

Table 2 shows the weighted least squares regression models predicting UN and WHO homicide rates (n=48). The models appear to produce similar results. Poverty is a slightly stronger predictor in the UN model than in the WHO model. Conversely, the effects of quality of governance are stronger in the WHO model when compared with the UN model. It is important to note that indicators are similar in strength and direction, and the small differences observed in coefficients between the two models are relatively marginal. In terms of model fit, there are more evident dissimilarities. The UN model has a lower Root Mean-Square Error (RMSE= .58) than the WHO model (RMSE= .73). A lower Root MSE indicates a better fit, suggesting that the UN model is more accurate and has less error.

[Table 2 near here]

In short, while the trends in Figure 1 showed that UN homicide rates were higher and had a larger standard deviation when compared with WHO rates, the regression analysis suggests that the UN data produce a more accurate model. Bennett and Lynch (1990) found that although there were limited discrepancies between the two sources, the UN data displayed the most irregular data points (Huang, 2001; Rubin et al., 2008) This is slightly inconsistent with the findings of this study. We found that WHO data have more temporal stability, and are therefore more suitable for longitudinal investigations. Conversely, the UN data lend to more accurate cross-sectional statistical models..

Investigating the influence on unclassified deaths in WHO homicide trends

Figure 2 presents World Health Organization homicide trends, with and without the inclusion of unclassified deaths (i.e., Events of Undetermined Intent, or EUI). The trends are largely similar, suggesting that a substantial portion of unclassified deaths are likely to be homicides. However, the homicide rate trend is more erratic when including unclassified deaths. The country with the most variability is South Africa. South Africa's rate fluctuates between 108.5 in 1998 to 13.0 in 2010, showing a steady decrease during this period. South Africa has employed the same mortality reporting procedures since the mid-1990s, but *South Africa Statistics* has noted that external causes of death (accidents, suicides, homicide) have a high degree of misclassification. The agency has urged analysts to interpret the data with caution (*Mortality and causes of death in South Africa, 2014: Findings from death notification,* 2014) as "many forensic pathologists in South Africa prefer not to indicate the manner of death for injuries on the DNF [Death Notification Form], resulting in relatively high proportions of undetermined external causes" (Burger et al., 2012, p. 310). In short, rates of unclassified deaths do not generally display extreme fluctuations, with the exception of

homicide data from South Africa, which appear to be less valid and should perhaps be excluded from cross-national studies.

[Figure 2 near here]

Validity of World Health Organization homicide data

Table 3 presents an OLS regression analysis investigating the predictors of WHO homicide rates, with the inclusion of unclassified deaths. Results are largely similar to the WHO model without unclassified deaths (see second column of Table 2), though some variables have weaker coefficients (e.g., poverty and quality of governance). If it was presumed that the unclassified deaths largely consisted of non-homicide incidents (i.e., accidents and suicides), results would be markedly different from the WHO model without unclassified deaths (Table 2). The weaker strength of some of the coefficients may be a result of the fact that inevitably, some of the deaths consist of accidents and suicides. Nevertheless, we know from prior literature that homicide and suicide rates tend to produce quite different results, and that their predictors may be inversely related (e.g., Lee & Pridmore, 2014). The error is lower when including unclassified deaths (RMSE= .48), and thus more accurate, than in the WHO homicide model that excludes unclassified deaths (Table 2).

Of course, it is highly implausible that the combined rate of WHO and unclassified deaths consists solely of homicides, given what the previous literature has reported regarding the 'true' distribution of unclassified deaths (Andreev et al., 2015; Björkenstam et al., 2014; Värnik et al., 2009). Unclassified deaths are a central component of the discussion on the validity of homicide data from public health sources. These preliminary findings warrant further replication and suggest that studies using WHO homicide, accident or suicide data

should replicate their analyses with the inclusion of a combined rate that integrates unclassified deaths.

Discussion

Summary of findings

There is an ongoing debate about which source provides the most reliable homicide data. Bennett and Lynch's (1990) important study found small differences between WHO and UN data. The WHO homicide data was more reliable due to inconsistencies in the UN data, but researchers have continued to use the UN data for cross-national analyses. This paper set out to examine the reliability and validity of homicide data from the United Nations and the World Health Organization. The first research question investigated the reliability of homicide data, and trends between 1995 and 2012 were compared between the two sources. The trends were largely parallel but the UN homicide rates were systematically higher than the WHO rates. In addition, applying the reliability standard suggested by Lappi-Seppälä and Lehti (2014; i.e., that homicide data can be regarded as reliable if variations do not exceed 10% from one decade to another), the WHO data was found to be more reliable than the UN data, with less than 10% variation in the homicide rate across the observation period. The fluctuations in the UN data may be driven by outlier nations, such as El Salvador. Measurement error at all stages of the data collection procedure may also impact reliability across sources; these sources of error include instrumentation error, recorder error, and respondent error (see Bennett & Lynch, 1990, for a more detailed discussion). Findings from this study indicate that the WHO data are most appropriate for longitudinal analyses of cross-national homicide data.

The second research question examined the reliability of cross-sectional UN and WHO data by comparing the influence of well-known correlates of cross-national homicide

rates across the two sources. The results from these multivariate models were largely similar. The coefficients were in the same direction, though they were slightly stronger in the UN model. The Root Mean Square Error, which measures accuracy of the model, was the lowest for the UN model, suggesting that UN data provided the most robust results based on the selected indicators. However, the differences were slight, suggesting that researchers can use either source depending on the aims of the study and methodological concerns (e.g., sample size, the inclusion of nations from varying levels of development, etc.). For cross-sectional analyses with larger and more diverse samples, UN data are preferable because of greater completeness and robust statistical outcomes. The small differences in the strength of the coefficients may be due to the fact that the two sources include different types of homicides; the UN data only include intentional homicides (and attempts), while the WHO data also include unintentional homicides. In addition, the UN data only exclude infanticides, whereas the WHO data exclude a number of other types of homicides (e.g., war deaths, assisted suicide, etc.).

Finally, the validity of the WHO homicide data was tested in two steps: by comparing trends, and conducting a multivariate analysis to compare findings with and without the inclusion of unclassified deaths in the measure of homicide. The trends were largely similar with and without unclassified deaths, suggesting stability in both rates. The multivariate analysis showed that the inclusion of unclassified deaths produced coefficients that varied in the same direction as analyses excluding these unknown events, but with slightly reduced strength. The model including unclassified deaths was found to have less error. While it is clear that not all unclassified deaths consist of homicides, the similarity in findings suggests that a significant proportion of unclassified deaths are likely to be homicides.

Implications of the findings

What can be done to minimize measurement error in the collection of homicide data? Measurement error mainly stems from definitions of homicide, and data reporting mechanisms. Bennett and Lynch (1990) called for more consistent definitions of homicide across different sources, which would facilitate cross-national comparisons. One of the main challenges in adopting more uniform definitions relates to the different nature of the organizations that collect the data. The WHO collect health data, and are used for monitoring global health trends, whereas the UN data are collected for the purpose of advancing criminal justice systems and policies. Despite these different purposes, it is not unreasonable to strive for more consistent definitions. After all, the WHO operates within the UN and both organizations share many common goals.

The second issue pertaining to measurement error relates to data reporting and completeness, which are related concerns. Huang and Wellford (1989) noted that because the UN and the WHO did not make data reporting compulsory, data are often incomplete. Bhalla et al. (2010) reported that only 28% of countries in the world had complete national death registration data for the years reviewed in their study. Unsurprisingly, wealthier nations tend to have more complete data when compared with developing nations. Many countries in turmoil because of war, political upheaval, or high poverty levels are unlikely to have the required infrastructure to prioritize robust data collection systems.

While each nation is responsible for ensuring the quality and completeness of its data, more global awareness about the costs of violence is needed in order to encourage nations to prioritize rigorous data collection efforts. For instance, *Homicide Monitor*, a project managed by the Igarape Institute, maintains an accessible website with cross-national homicide datasets from the UN. The website also includes visualization tools. *Homicide Monitor* aims to inform about the scope and consequences of lethal violence in the world, and to identity ways in which violence can be minimized ("Homicide Monitor," 2017). In another, smaller-

scale effort to improve the accessibility and quality homicide data, *the European Homicide Monitor (EHM),* a database of shared homicide data from Sweden, Finland, and the Netherlands, combines comprehensive cross-national homicide data in one source ("The European Homicide Monitor," n.d.). More efforts of this nature are needed in order to increase cognizance about the importance of collecting valid and reliable homicide data.

Due to cross-national data limitations, it is not possible to reclassify deaths to the appropriate mortality category, as other scholars have done with national data, (i.e., Andreev et al., 2015) in order to show the influence of unclassified deaths on the WHO data. Researchers are unable to carry out these types of investigations because data are not as detailed as those included in Andreev et al's (2015) study. It is generally acknowledged that there is a negative association between cross-national suicide and homicide rates and that their covariates tend to vary in opposite directions (Bando & Lester, 2014; Lee & Pridmore, 2014; Stoupel et al., 2005), though recent research has found that this association varies by region (Fountoulakis & Gonda, 2017). Based on this premise, if unclassified deaths mostly consisted of suicides or accidents, we would expect to observe opposite trends in results with and without the inclusion of unclassified deaths. This was not the case; we observed largely similar results between the two analyses, and the model with unclassified deaths was characterized by less error. These observations have led us to conclude that it may be wise to include unclassified deaths in measurements of cross-national homicide.

This study shares similar limitations to other cross-national empirical studies. The analyses were somewhat restricted by the availability of data as well as missing data, which limited the analysis to an 18-year observation period. Methodologically sophisticated studies of homicide data reliability and validity have included more extensive ranges of years. For example, studies evaluating American data have included at least 30 years (Ansari & He, 2012; Berg & Lauritsen, 2015). There is a trend of increased cooperation of nations in

collecting data (Koeppel et al., 2015) and with time, more rigorous longitudinal analyses can be carried out.

In order to gain better knowledge about the reliability and validity of cross-national homicide data, it is important for future research to conduct ongoing investigations of homicide trends, drawing on emerging and relevant variables, a diverse sample of nations reflecting varying levels of development, and up-to-date data. The analyses carried out in this study included some of the strongest predictors of homicide rates identified in prior research. Our study, like all cross-national studies of homicide, was limited to countries that have available and complete homicide data, resulting in a relatively small number of nations. A smaller sample size inevitably limits the number of covariates that can be included in statistical analyses. As such, the choice of variables to be included in the analyses had to be careful and selective. This is a challenge confronted by all researchers who engage in cross-national comparisons. In addition, it is particularly important to monitor developments in homicide data collection efforts in regions that have been traditionally excluded from cross-national comparisons, such as many African nations. Finally, nearly three decades have passed since the publication of Bennett and Lynch's (1990) important study. The reliability and validity of cross-national homicide data should be investigated at more regular intervals.

To conclude, WHO data are more suitable for longitudinal analyses because these data are more stable and reliable over time. However, despite consistently higher homicide rates than the WHO, the UN data produce statistical models with less error. Our findings partly support those of Bennett and Lynch (1990) and suggest that the UN data are preferable for cross-sectional analyses. When using the WHO data for longitudinal investigations, analyses should be replicated with unclassified deaths. As argued in suicide research, it is good practice to replicate analyses with unclassified deaths for more robust results

(Björkenstam et al., 2014). In fact, "…scholars interested in the structural covariates of homicide and suicide rates seem largely unaware of this category and do not account for it in their analyses, which may threaten the validity of these studies (Andreev et al., 2015, p. 13)." Given that a non-negligible number of unclassified deaths are likely to be homicides, our findings suggest that it may be worthwhile to include these events in the homicide category rather than to exclude them.

The drive for reliable and valid homicide data is fueled by the need for rigorous research that will enable scholars and policy-makers to understand the processes and dynamics of violence in a wide array of societies. The implications are crucial, particularly in the context of growing globalization. Studies of this nature enable researchers to evaluate the effectiveness of different criminal justice systems, and to influence policies and practices that inform efforts to prevent lethal violence (Bennett, 2004). We welcome more research to develop the knowledge base on the reliability and validity of homicide data, particularly with the inclusion of nations that are traditionally excluded from cross-national analyses.

References

Altheimer, I. (2008). Social support, ethnic heterogeneity, and homicide: A cross-national approach. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *36*(2), 103–114.

Andreev, E., Shkolnikov, V. M., Pridemore, W. A., & Nikitina, S. Y. (2015). A method for reclassifying cause of death in cases categorized as "event of undetermined intent." *Population Health Metrics*, *13*, 23.

Ansari, S., & He, N. (2012). Convergence Revisited: A Multi-Definition, Multi-Method Analysis of the UCR and the NCVS Crime Series (1973-2008). *Justice Quarterly*, *32*(1), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2012.718355

Bando, D. H., & Lester, D. (2014). An ecological study on suicide and homicide in Brazil/Estudo ecologico sobre suicidio e homicidio no Brasil.(articulo en ingles). *Ciencia & Saude Coletiva*, *19*(4), 1179.

Barclay, G. (2000). The comparability of data on convictions and sanctions: Are international comparisons possible? *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, *8*(1), 13–26.

Baumer, E. P., & Wolff, K. T. (2014). The breadth and causes of contemporary cross-national homicide trends. *Crime & Justice (Chicago, Ill)*, *43*, 231–287.

Bennett, R. R. (2004). Comparative criminology and criminal justice research: The state of our knowledge. *Justice Quarterly*, *21*(1), 1–21.

Bennett, R. R., & Lynch, J. P. (1990). Does a Difference Make a Difference? Comparing Cross-National Crime Indicators *. *Criminology*, *28*(1), 153–181.

Berg, M. T., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2015). Telling a Similar Story Twice? NCVS/UCR Convergence in Serious Violent Crime Rates in Rural, Suburban, and Urban Places (1973–2010). *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *32*(1), 61–87.

Bhalla, K., Harrison, J. E., Shahraz, S., & Fingerhut, L. A. (2010). Availability and quality of cause-of-death data for estimating the global burden of injuries. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, *88*(11), 831–838c.

Björkenstam, C., Johansson, L.-A., Nordström, P., Thiblin, I., Fugelstad, A., Hallqvist, J., & Ljung, R. (2014). Suicide or undetermined intent? A register-based study of signs of misclassification. *Population Health Metrics*, *12*, 11.

Bourgois, P. (2001). The Power of Violence in War and Peace Post-Cold War Lessons from El Salvador. *Ethnography*, *2*(1), 5–34.

Burger, E. H., Groenewald, P., Bradshaw, D., Ward, A. M., Yudkin, P. L., & Volmink, J. (2012). Validation study of cause of death statistics in Cape Town, South Africa, found poor agreement. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *65*(3), 309–316.

Cao, L., & Zhang, Y. (2015). Governance and Regional Variation of Homicide Rates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *61*(1), 25–45.

Chamlin, M. B., & Cochran, J. K. (2006). Economic inequality, legitimacy, and cross-national homicide rates. *Homicide Studies*, *10*(4), 231–252.

Chon, D. S. (2011). The impact of population heterogeneity and income inequality on homicide rates: A cross-national assessment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.

Chu, D. C., & Tusalem, R. F. (2013). The role of the state on cross-national homicide rates. *International Criminal Justice Review*, *23*(3), 252–279.

Dasandi, N. (2013). *Poverty in an unequal world: a quantitative structural analysis of the effects of inequality between and within countries on world poverty, 1980-2007*. UCL (University College London). Retrieved from http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1400393/

Eisner, M. (2008). Modernity strikes back? A historical perspective on the latest increase in interpersonal violence (1960–1990). *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, *2*(2), 288–316.

Elgar, F. J., & Aitken, N. (2011). Income inequality, trust and homicide in 33 countries. *The European Journal of Public Health*, *21*(2), 241–246.

Fountoulakis, K. N., & Gonda, X. (2017). Differential correlation of suicide and homicide rates according to geographical areas: A study with population-level data. *Psychiatry Research*, *249*, 167–171.

Homicide Monitor. (2017). Retrieved June 8, 2017, from https://homicide.igarape.org.br/

Howard, G. J., Newman, G., & Pridemore, W. A. (2000). Theory, method, and data in comparative criminology. *Criminal Justice*, *4*(4), 139–211.

Hu, G., & Mamady, K. (2014). Impact of changes in specificity of data recording on cause-specific injury mortality in the United States, 1999-2010.(Report). *BMC Public Health*, *14*(1).

Koeppel, M. D. H., Rhineberger-Dunn, G. M., & Mack, K. Y. (2015). Cross-national homicide: a review of the current literature. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, *39*(1), 47–85.

Krahn, H., Hartnagel, T. F., & Gartrell, J. W. (1986). Income inequality and homicide rates: Cross-national data and criminological theories. *Criminology*, *24*(2), 269–294.

LaFree, G. (1999). A summary and review of cross-national comparative studies of homicide. *Homicide: A Sourcebook of Social Research*, 125–145.

Lappi-Seppälä, T., & Lehti, M. (2014). Cross-Comparative Perspectives on Global Homicide Trends. *Crime and Justice*, *43*(1), 135–230.

Lauritsen, J. L., Rezey, M. L., & Heimer, K. (2015). When Choice of Data Matters: Analyses of U.S. Crime Trends, 1973–2012. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *32*(3), 335–355.

Lee, A. Y., & Pridmore, S. (2014). Emerging correlations between measures of population well-being, suicide and homicide: a look at global and Australian data. *Australasian Psychiatry*, *22*(2), 112–117.

Levchak, P. J. (2015). Extending the Anomie Tradition An Assessment of the Impact of Trade Measures on Cross-National Homicide Rates. *Homicide Studies*, *19*(4), 384–400.

Liem, M. C., & Pridemore, W. A. (2011). *Handbook of European homicide research: patterns, explanations, and country studies*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Loftin, C., & McDowall, D. (2010). The use of official records to measure crime and delinquency. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *26*(4), 527–532.

Lynch, J. P., & Addington, L. A. (2006). *Understanding Crime Statistics: Revisiting the Divergence of the NCVS and the UCR*. Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, J. P., & Pridemore, W. A. (2011). Crime in international perspective. *Crime and Public Policy*, 5–52.

Marshall, I. H., & Block, C. R. (2004). Maximizing the Availability of Cross-National Data on Homicide. *Homicide Studies*, *8*(3), 267–310. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767904265455

McClendon, M. J. (2002). *Multiple regression and causal analysis*. Waveland Press.

McDowall, D., & Loftin, C. (2007). What is convergence, and what do we know about it. *Understanding Crime Statistics: Revisiting the Divergence of the NCVS and UCR. Cambridge University Press, UK*, 93–124.

Messner, S. F., Raffalovich, L. E., & Sutton, G. M. (2010). Poverty, infant mortality, and homicide rates in cross-national perpsective: Assessments of criterion and construct validity. *Criminology; an Interdisciplinary Journal*, *48*(2), 509.

Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (1997). Political Restraint of the Market and Levels of Criminal Homicide: A Cross-National Application of Institutional Anomie Theory. *Social Forces*, *75*(4), 1393–1416.

Mortality and causes of death in South Africa, 2014: Findings from death notification. (2014). Statistics South Africa.

Neter, J., Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., & Wasserman, W. (1996). *Applied linear statistical models* (Vol. 4). Irwin Chicago. Retrieved from https://mubert.marshall.edu/bert/syllabi/32862015011408990509712 2.pdf

Neumayer, E. (2003). Good policy can lower violent crime: Evidence from a cross-national panel of homicide rates, 1980–97. *Journal of Peace Research*, *40*(6), 619–640.

Nivette, A. E. (2011). Cross-national predictors of crime: A meta-analysis. *Homicide Studies*, *15*(2), 103–131.

Nivette, A. E., & Eisner, M. (2013). Do legitimate polities have fewer homicides? A cross-national analysis. *Homicide Studies*, *17*(1), 3–26.

O'Carroll, P. W. (1989). A consideration of the validity and reliability of suicide mortality data. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, *19*(1), 1–16.

Ouimet, M. (2012). A World of Homicides The Effect of Economic Development, Income Inequality, and Excess Infant Mortality on the Homicide Rate for 165 Countries in 2010. *Homicide Studies*, *16*(3), 238–258.

Ouimet, M., & Montmagny-Grenier, C. (2014). "Homicide and Violence—International and Cross-National Research" The Construct Validity of the Results Generated by the World Homicide Survey. *International Criminal Justice Review*, *24*(3), 222–234.

Pridemore, W. A. (2011). Poverty matters: A reassessment of the inequality–homicide relationship in cross-national studies. *British Journal of Criminology*, *51*(5), 739–772.

Pridemore, W. A., & Chamlin, M. B. (2006). A time-series analysis of the impact of heavy drinking on homicide and suicide mortality in Russia, 1956–2002*. *Addiction*, *101*(12), 1719–1729.

Prinsloo, M., Matzopoulos, R., Laubscher, R., Myers, J., & Bradshaw, D. (2016). Validating homicide rates in the Western Cape Province, South Africa: Findings from the 2009 Injury Mortality Survey. *South African Medical Journal*, *106*(2), 193–195.

Rogers, M. L., & Pridemore, W. A. (2016). The (Null) Effects of Percent Young on 15 to 24 Age-Specific and Male- and Female-Specific Cross-National Homicide Rates. *Homicide Studies*, *20*(3), 257–292.

Rubin, M. M., Culp, R., Mameli, P., & Walker, M. (2008). Using Cross-National Studies to Illuminate the Crime Problem One Less Data Source Left Standing. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *24*(1), 50–68.

Schaible, L. M. (2012). Overcoming the Neglect of Social Process in Cross-National and Comparative Criminology. *Sociology Compass*, *6*(10), 793–807.

Smit, P. R., de Jong, R. R., & Bijleveld, C. C. (2012). Homicide data in Europe: definitions, sources, and statistics. In *Handbook of European homicide research* (pp. 5–23). Springer.

Stoupel, E., Kalëdienë, R., Petrauskiene, J., Starkuviene, S., Abramson, E., Israelevich, P., & Sulkes, J. (2005). Suicide-Homicide Temporal Interrelationship, Links with Other Fatalities, and Environmental Physical Activity. *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, *26*(2), 85–89.

Sun, I. Y., Chu, D. C., & Sung, H.-E. (2010). A Cross-National Analysis of the Mediating Effect of Economic Deprivation on Crime. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, *6*(1), 15–32.

The European Homicide Monitor: How does it work and how may it benefit the understanding of femicide cases? (PDF Download Available). (n.d.). Retrieved June 8, 2017, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298722967_The_European_Homicide_Monitor_How_does_it_work_and_how_may_it_benefit_the_understanding_of_femicide_cases

Trent, C. L., & Pridemore, W. A. (2012). A review of the cross-national empirical literature on social structure and homicide. In *Handbook of European Homicide Research* (pp. 111–135). Springer.

UNODC: Global Study on Homicide. (2013). Retrieved October 22, 2016, from https://www.unodc.org/gsh/

UNODC Statistics Online. (n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2017, from https://data.unodc.org/

U.S Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2014). *The nation's two measures of homicide*.

Värnik, P., Sisask, M., Värnik, A., Yur'yev, A., Kõlves, K., Leppik, L., … Wasserman, D. (2009). Massive increase in injury deaths of undetermined intent in ex-USSR Baltic and Slavic countries: Hidden suicides? *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494809354360

Weiss, D. B., Santos, M. R., Testa, A., & Kumar, S. (2016). The 1990s Homicide Decline: A Western World or International Phenomenon? A Research Note. *Homicide Studies*, *20*(4), 321–334.

WHO- CoDQL - Cause of Death Query online. (n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2017, from http://apps.who.int/healthinfo/statistics/mortality/causeofdeath_query/

WHO Mortality Database. (n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2017, from http://apps.who.int/healthinfo/statistics/mortality/whodpms/

Wiersema, B., Loftin, C., & McDowall, D. (2000). A comparison of supplementary homicide reports and national vital statistics system homicide estimates for US counties. *Homicide Studies*, *4*(4), 317–340.

Wolf, A., Gray, R., & Fazel, S. (2014). Violence as a public health problem: an ecological study of 169 countries. *Social Science & Medicine*, *104*, 220–227.

World Health Organization. (2014). *Global status report on violence prevention 2014*. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/status_report/2014/en/