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Abstract

Recently, world leaders expressed shock and horror upon hearing of the school shooting that occurred at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut. The main purpose of this article is to gain a better understanding of this new phenomenon and, more specifically, to find answers to two research questions: “Who are the school shooters?” and “What are their motives?” To conduct this study, the “Ecological Framework for Human Development” has been used to study 160 school shootings that occurred worldwide and a custom database was created. Three distinct categories of school shooters have been identified: (i) the “Lost in the Downward Spiral” student; (ii) the “Perfect Student”, and; (iii) the “Social Injustice Collector”. The article presents the first two categories of school shooters and discusses the explanatory power of various theories of aggression.
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1. Introduction

Although school violence has become “a global phenomenon that affects one of the core institutions of modern society to some degree in virtually all nation-states” (Akiba, LeTendre, Baker & Goesling, 2002, p. 830), researchers and policy makers still remain unable to understand and explain ‘how’ and ‘why’ school shootings occur. The previous research on school shootings undertaken by the author dealt with the structural and cultural factors related to schools, educational systems, and communities in which school shootings occurred. In this article, the research focuses on school shooters rather than on the school shooting events themselves. The aim is to gain a better understanding of this new phenomenon and, more specifically, to find answers to two research questions: “Who are the school shooters?” and “What are their motives?”
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This paper is organized into five sections. The brief introductory section is followed by the second section that reviews various theories, recommendations and limitations of previous research dealing with school shootings. The third section presents the research design and the research methods that have been used to conduct this study. The findings are presented and discussed in the fourth section. Three categories of school shooters were identified: (i) the ‘Lost in the Downward Spiral’ student; (ii) the ‘Perfect Student’, and; (iii) the ‘Social Injustice Collector’. The last section presents the conclusions and discusses the explanatory power of social learning theory, of social control theory, and of various ‘motivational’ theories.

2. Sense and nonsense in school shootings: a literature review

According to Geen (2001, p. 1), “science depends on precision and clarity of definitions.” However, despite numerous studies dealing with school shootings and a period of almost 30 years passing since this social phenomenon began to intensify, the terms “school shooting” and “school shooter” still have no clear definition.

Some researchers have defined school shootings as “rampage shootings” (Rocque, 2012; Newman, Fox, Roth, Mehta, & Harding, 2004) that are perpetrated by current or former students on school grounds. Rocque (2012, p. 304) emphasises that these multiple-victim acts of extreme violence share some characteristics with other forms of violence, but that they also possess some unique attributes, such as “the lack of specified individual targets, and the number of deaths involved”. While some researchers share this opinion - according to which victims “appeared to have been chosen at random” (Newman et al., 2004, p. 50) – others propose a typology of school shootings and make a clear distinction between “rampage attacks” and “targeted shootings”. According to Muschert (2007), both “rampage attacks” and “targeted shootings” are perpetrated by a school member (student or employee) or a former member, on school property. However, in the latter case, we are faced with a shooter who targets specific individuals “for real or perceived maltreatment” (Muschert, 2007, p. 62). Dumitr u (2013) emphasises that most school shooters do not appear to be “equal opportunity shooters” who choose their victims at random, but, instead, have specific targets (either teachers or students) on their “hit lists” that they had prepared well in advance. She further argues that, in a number of cases, some of the victims were not initially targeted by the shooter; they were killed or wounded because school shootings produce ‘war casualties’ and some people […] are killed just because they happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Many - but not all- researchers appear to agree on the fact that “school shootings” are defined as such because they occur on school property and not necessarily because they are perpetrated by a student, a former student or a school employee. For instance, some researchers (e.g., Newman et al., 2004, and; Muschert, 2007) include in their definition of “school shootings” situations in which the perpetrator is an outsider who carries out the attack on school property. They define these situations as “school-related mass murders”. According to this definition, the attack perpetrated by an outsider at Dunblane Elementary School in Scotland in 1996 would be a “school shootings event”, whereas the attack that was carried out by a former Ph.D. student at a premiere of a Batman film in Aurora (Colorado) cannot be described as such.

Most researchers agree that school shootings are attacks that are generally planned well in advance and that they are multiple-victim events. According to these views, conflicts between students that arose suddenly and escalated into a fight or an attack without premeditation (gang-related conflicts or other similar situations) and other attacks or deaths that have been termed “school violence events” simply because they occurred on school property (e.g., an act of domestic violence perpetrated on school property) are not, in fact, school shooting events.

However, this is not necessarily the view of the United States Secret Service, which considers both “school shootings” and “other school-based attacks” to be part of a broader category called “incidents of targeted school violence” (United States Secret Service and United States Department of Education, 2004, p. 7). An incident of “targeted school violence” is “any incident where (i) a current student or recent former student attacked someone at his or her school by lethal means (e.g., a gun or knife) and (ii) where the student attacker purposefully chose his or her school as the location of the attack.” Thus, the term “targeted violence” suggests that (a) the school was
intentionally chosen prior to the attack, but not necessarily the victims; (b) the school shooter is necessarily a student or a “recent” former student; (c) an “incident of targeted school violence” is not necessarily a multiple-victim event; (d) the “school-related mass murders” (as this concept is defined in Muschert, 2007) are not included in statistics on “incidents of targeted school violence” provided by these organisations. The correct understanding of this definition is of vital importance to researchers who intend to use data provided in the reports issued by the United States Secret Service and the United States Department of Education to perform a statistical analysis of school shootings.

With regard to the status of research in the field of school violence, Dumitriu (2013) shows that the existing work in the area typically was undertaken by researchers in criminal sociology, psychology, sociology and medicine. Still, in regard to the roles that heredity and environment play in aggression, there is no consensus among researchers from various disciplines and schools of thought.

3. Research Design and Research Methods

For the purpose of this study, a school shooting is defined as a multiple-victim act of extreme violence perpetrated on school premises, generally by a school-related perpetrator who carefully plans the act in advance (Dumitriu, 2013). A custom database with “all known perpetrators” involved in school shootings has been created. Data on school shootings since 1900 were collected from various databases, governmental reports of inquiries into these events, police reports, court records, school records, newspaper articles and archival documents. A total of 160 school shooting events worldwide were identified. These school shootings were perpetrated by 163 shooters. The “Ecological Framework for Human Development” was used to study these events. In the first stage, an analysis of these school shootings was conducted, using Altheide’s (1987) “Ethnographic Content Analysis” method. Then, ten of the 160 school shootings were selected for in-depth qualitative case studies (based on Yin, 2003) and field data were collected in five countries, in which these school shootings occurred, through semi-structured interviews and/or focus-groups.

4. Findings

The frequency of school shootings has been rising since the 1940s and they have spiked in the 1990s. About 20% of the 160 school shootings since 1900 have occurred during the last four years.

Data on school shooters provided by official reports refer only to ‘former’ and ‘current’ students. This approach could explain the findings of the U.S. Secret Service and the U.S. Department of Education (2004, p. 19) who concluded that the attackers “ranged in age from 11 to 21.” The findings of this study show that school shooters are, generally, white males between 11 and 55 years of age. Only 52% of the 163 school shooters were less than 21 years of age. About 72% of all perpetrators were less than 31 years of age (Figure 1). Eight of the 163 perpetrators were women and 11% of them were foreign students or first-generation immigrants (United States, Canada, France and Norway).
Three distinct categories of school shooters (‘profiles’) have been identified (Table 1). This article discusses the findings regarding the shooters in “Group A” (‘profiles’ 1 and 2).

Table 1: Categories of school shooters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>“Group A”: 30 years of age or younger</th>
<th>“Group B”: 31 years of age or older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>Profile 1: the “Lost in the Downward Spiral” student</td>
<td>Profile 2: the “Perfect Student”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooter’s ties with the school</td>
<td>Student or former student; in some cases, outsider</td>
<td>Student or former student (graduate/postgraduate students); school teacher/university professor; school employee; school-related individual; outsider (no apparent ties with the school) Typically, a married man/woman, with children; Some single men in their 30s-early 40s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 School shooters: common characteristics (Group A)

All school shooters in “Group A” (30 years of age or younger) share six common features.

- Family issues

The shooters in “Group A” were white males who grew-up in “typical” middle to upper-middle class families. At first sight, ‘the family’ appears to be – at least, in its origins- a traditional nuclear family of four or five, with both parents working to keep the family financially secure. In many cases, both parents are well educated and have bright professional careers as business owners, company executives, professionals in various fields, educators, lawyers, etc. Some of them work for the government (the Navy/Army/police or other state or government agencies, the national Postal Service or the Railway Company). Nevertheless, by taking a closer look at these so-called close-knit, loving and supporting families, one notices that behind the closed doors of many of the comfortable homes in which these families were living, children were exposed to a subtle form of “domestic
violence” as this concept is defined in the Family Law Amendment (Shared Parental Responsibility) Act of Australia (2006). In many cases, the “father-son” relationship was very tense, because the father had a coercive or a threatening behaviour towards children and/or his spouse, or simply because he was an extremely severe and controlling person. Cases [7], [8], [11], [15], [16], [17] and [19] in Appendix A represent examples of such a situation. In some other cases, a “child abuse and neglect” situation was found. Cases [8], [15], [19], [20], and [21] in Appendix A show some examples of either neglected or abused children. Finally, in some of these latter cases, parents appear to have preferred one child to the others, and the school shooter was not the “preferred child”.

The second common pattern that emerged from the analysis is that parents split up, usually before the shooter reached the age of 15, and then later divorced, although continuing to maintain a good relationship. Cases [1], [6], [7], [9], [11], [12], [14], [15], [17], [21] and [22] in Appendix A are examples of such a situation.

• Health-related issues

The results of this study show that school shootings are not generally perpetrated by individuals who have lifelong histories of mental illness. Nevertheless, about 20% of the school shooters in “Group A” showed symptoms of either an anxiety disorder or a substance use disorder (mainly related to consumption of drugs that stimulate the central nervous system), but information concerning this issue was not always consistent and accurate. Two factors are responsible for this. First, the laws in many of the countries in which the school shooting events occurred (USA, Canada, Germany, Finland, and Australia) protect the privacy of personal health records, including the records of substance use disorders. Second, in many cases (such as [4], [5] and [30] in Appendix A), the mental illness of the perpetrator was diagnosed only during the trial by retrospective assessments by physicians who testified at the inquiries; accordingly, it is difficult to know whether the mental illness that they diagnosed was, in fact, the root of the problems that the subject had faced prior to the shootings or the result of them. In only a few of the 163 cases did the subject suffer from a mental illness that had been diagnosed well before the event. However, even in these cases, the diagnosis (e.g., autistic syndrome disorders such as “selective mutism” and “Asperger’s syndrome”) did not suggest that the student would be a danger to himself or to others. Cases [6], [16], and [17] in Appendix A are examples of such a situation.

It has also been found that some school shooters in “Group A” illegally used some synthetic drugs called anabolic steroids or that these drugs had been administered to them (Heck 2001, p. 12) at some point in time, prior to the tragic event (Appendix A, case [8]). Also, some of them used stimulants like Ritalin (a methylphenidate) or Adderall (an amphetamine) – probably, to get better grades. Researchers have demonstrated that the use of steroids can cause a sudden explosive rage called “roid rage”, mood swings, psychotic symptoms, suicidal thoughts, and can even lead to the onset of an acute schizophrenic episode (Annitto et Layman, 1980).

• Religious beliefs and social and political views

The results of this study show that religious beliefs are not, by themselves, an explanatory variable of school shooters’ motivations. Nevertheless, the broad spectrum of factors in many school shooting situations around the world perpetrated by the shooters in “Group A” (profiles 1 and 2) stand alongside the fine line that runs between people’s religious beliefs in a given society and their social and political views. Cases [8], [10], [11], [21], [24], [25], [26], [27] and [28] in Appendix A support these results.

The teenagers and the young adults who fit profile 1 or profile 2 (Group A) had various opinions on religion. Some of them were described by their peers as “religious teenagers” and were involved in religious groups, while others were “convinced atheists”. Some shooters in this latter group had Nazi beliefs and were obsessed with Hitler and his book, Mein Kampf (e.g., cases [24], [25], [27] and [28] in Appendix A). These extreme views were observed primarily in the cases of the school shootings that took place in the United States. These findings are in
line with those of Pew Research Center (2008, p. 64) that stresses that “religion may, in fact, be playing a more powerful, albeit indirect, role in shaping people’s thinking than many Americans recognize.”

- Easy access to guns

Another common point regarding most school shooters in this age group was their easy access to guns, especially in the US. In most cases, parents were gun collectors and used to hunt with their sons and/or go frequently to gun ranges accompanied by them. The gun culture is de rigueur in these families – especially in the US - and in many cases the school shooters used the family guns to commit their crimes. Cases [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [8], [9], [10], [11], [14], [15], [18], [22] and [23] in Appendix A are examples of such a situation.

However, concluding that the easy access to guns is, by itself, a relevant factor in these attacks would be a very simplistic approach. Researchers and policy makers seem to minimalize the fact that many school shooters were able to make artisanal bombs that they have used in the attack. They also wore military garments and used military accessories (such as gas masks) during the attack. Their appearance and behaviour during the attacks resembled those of soldiers.

- Ties to various organizations

The results of this study revealed that many school shooters who fit profile 1 or profile 2 had been active in the "Boy scouts" at some point in time before the shooting (e.g., cases [6], [9], [10], [11], [23], [24], [26] and [30] in Appendix A). While, according to the Boys Scout Association of America (BSA’s “Scout Statistics”), “only 4 out of 100 boys in the USA will become scouts” this ratio is almost triple among the schools’ shooters in “Group A” about whom this kind of information was available. Although most of the Boy Scouts movement’s principles, values and regulations are perfectly compatible with modern society and have an important role in building the character of our youths and shaping citizenship, it should be noted that its hierarchical and rather rigid organisational structure resembles that of a military organisation. The founder of the Boy Scout movement, Robert Stephenson Smyth Baden-Powell (1857 - 1941) was himself a soldier in the British Army, and the movement was originally intended as a training program for British children with military aspirations (Smith, 2011). Another feature of the movement during its early days was the involvement of the church, and the implication of the church is still important; 70.3% of the scouting units in the US are owned and operated by “faith-based organizations”, while the civic organizations represent only 22%. Only 7.6% of the BSA units are chartered to educational organizations (data available on BSA’s website, 2013).

The results show also that about 25% of the school shooters in this group had at least one of the following ties to the military: (a) he nursed an obsession with guns and the military; (b) when the shooting occurred, he was or had been active in a military organization (Army/Navy/Marine Corps./Air Force/others); (c) at least one of his parents, brothers or sisters worked for the military or was a military veteran at some point - many of them, at the time of the shooting; (d) he applied for a position in the military, but his application was rejected; (e) he appears to have targeted specific students who had at least one of the above mentioned ties to the military. Cases [3], [4], [7], [8], [11], [17], [18], [21], [22], [25], [27], [29] and [30] in Appendix A are some examples of such a situation.

- Cultural influences

While many accounts in the media and reports of inquiry into these school shootings discuss possible ties between violent video games, violent music and school shootings, the results of the present study show that this issue is not common among all school shooters. At best, this issue comes into play in the case of the shooters who fit ‘Profile 1’, but not for those who fit ‘Profile 2’ (Table 2). Moreover, while it is true that school shooters who fit ‘Profile 1’ appear to have been obsessed with some violent video games, it is difficult to conclude that
these video games contributed greatly to shape their violent attitude or influence the way in which they viewed society and, more broadly, the world.

Many of their opinions and some recurrent themes that appeared in their discourses (diaries, written assignments, opinions expressed in front of their peer-groups, etc.) seem to be influenced by (a) some philosophical and/or sociological theories developed mainly in the late 1800s and early 1900s, but also from others, dating back to the 1500s; (b) some scientific theories in mathematics, physics and anthropology, and; (c) some fictional theories proposed by certain successful science fiction authors. Examples of such themes are: religious beliefs and Christian morality (as defined by Nietzsche; 1844-1900); the concept of distributive justice and other theories of justice promoted by the 1980s communitarian theorists; various themes about “good and evil” in Nietzsche’s writings and his approach and contributions to moral and political theory; Thomas Hobbes’s (1588-1679) social contract theory; Darwin’s theory of evolution and the principles of natural selection, and; Galton’s (1822-1911) mathematical theory of inheritance and its implication in the eugenics movement.

It is difficult to say how this specific body of knowledge and the related social and political issues are perceived by different young people at different stages of their lives, and how their perceptions could influence their views about life, society, science, technology, politics, and religion.

4.2 School shooters: specific characteristics (Profiles 1 and 2)

Table 2 shows that, even though all school shooters in “Group A” share six common features, a unique profile of the school shooter in this group does not exist. Of the 163 school shooters, 71 (43.56 %) fit ‘profile 1’ and 22 (13.49%) fit ‘profile 2’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific characteristics</th>
<th>Profile 1: the “Lost in the Downward Spiral” student</th>
<th>Profile 2: the “Perfect Student”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour and relationship with peers</td>
<td>- extremely (almost ‘pathologically’) shy</td>
<td>- a well-socialized individual (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- quiet and extremely polite; kept to himself</td>
<td>- has friends and, generally, normal relationships with girls, but he rarely joins the most “popular” peer-groups in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- no friends and difficult relationships with girls</td>
<td>- always polite and mild-mannered, but also constantly under pressure, trying to perform better at school; perseverance and tenacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- eventually, he/she engages in minor delinquent acts, and/or; attends anger management classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic performance/ individual work performance</td>
<td>- usually, student “in good academic standing” (B/C grades)</td>
<td>- described as an “honours student”; “genius”; “high achiever”; “very intelligent”; “the perfect student”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- exposed to specific stressors and for a long period of time</td>
<td>- obtains numerous honours in scientific competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- just prior to the shooting, declining grades and academic failure; in some cases, he or she is expelled from school (decision perceived as unjust by him)</td>
<td>- has a keen interest in a specific science in which he excels: biology, physics, mathematics, actuarial sciences, sociology, anthropology, or chemistry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific characteristics (continued) | Profile 1: the “Lost in the Downward Spiral” student | Profile 2: the “Perfect Student” |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
### Motives/warning signs

- experiences longstanding bullying at school and/or;  
- is constantly reprimand by a specific teacher and/or a girl or;  
- expulsion perceived as unfair; consequently, growing anger towards his peers/teachers/ school/ community  

- he is not a victim of bulling  
- parents put pressure on him to perform at school  
- some specific factors/events lead to a rapid deterioration of his/her mental state: frequent moves; death of a loved one-usually one parent or his best friend; switching schools just prior to the shooting; others

### Planning the act

- he/she plans the act well in advance; leakage /warning signs  
- some friends are aware of his/her intentions but are in disbelief that this could happen  
- in some cases, he/she makes either implicit or explicit threats  
- “reactive aggression” and specific targets (getting revenge over those who wronged him/her: teachers, school administrators, and students)  

- he suddenly snaps (in many cases, the “planning period” could not be traced back in time)  
- no leakage and very few warning signs, if any  
- in some cases, “instrumental aggression” and no specific targets, and; no reasonable explanation for his act was found

---

### 5. Conclusions, theoretical implications and avenues for future research

This article is the first attempt in the scientific literature to date to present a fact-based typology of school shooters based on qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. Three distinct categories of school shooters have been identified: (i) the “Lost in the Downward Spiral” student; (ii) the “Perfect Student”, and; (iii) the “Social Injustice Collector”. The article presents and discusses the first two categories of school shooters.

There are six categories of factors that are common to perpetrators who fit profile 1 or profile 2. They refer to: (a) some family related issues; (b) some health related issues, which include- but are not limited to- issues related to mental health; (c) some religious beliefs and social and political views; (d) easy access to guns; (e) some ties to various organizations, and; (f) some cultural influences.

Even though these school shooters share six common features, a unique profile of the school shooter in this group (“Group A”) does not exist. Of the 163 school shooters, 71 (43.56 %) fit profile 1 (The “Lost in the Downward Spiral” student) and 22 (13.49%) fit profile 2 (The “Perfect Student”). The results revealed that school shootings are much more complex than are portrayed in most research studies and official reports in the field, and according to which the central character is a “shy student” who had been bullied by some of his peers and whom he shot in an episode of rage. School shootings are in fact multidimensional phenomena that involve various aspects of the social, political and cultural life of our society. Most school shooters had specific social and political views, although their opinions on these issues were influenced by specific views of some of their (a) peers, (b) teachers, (c) leaders of various extracurricular organizations that they joined and; (d) family members. The study of the reciprocal relationship between religion and political psychology merits further consideration to achieve a better understanding of school shootings as a social phenomenon.

A causal relationship between media violence and aggressive behavior seems to play a certain role in school shootings, but this relationship applies only to the first category of perpetrators (the “Lost in the Downward Spiral students”). This study suggests that, instead of making checklists of these videogames, TV programs,
films, and books, researchers should rather draw a larger picture by trying to understand the common views and/or philosophies of life that stand behind all of these sources of information. More research is needed about this subject.

Also, more research is needed to assess the relationship between aggression and the specific drugs that school shooters took either regularly or sporadically and also to study the impact that these drugs - or the abrupt discontinuation of treatment - could have had on their behaviour.

The findings have some theoretical implications. They strongly support the social control theory (Hirschi, 1969) according to which aggression is modulated by the “intensity” of the four bonds that exist between the individual and his environment. Indeed, all school shooters, regardless of the category to which they have been assigned, had very weak bonds to: (a) at least one member of their family, (b) their schools or other organisations and/or (c) society as a whole. Had society, schools, and families intervened to enforce these bonds, many of these school shootings would not have occurred. However, the results of this study do not entirely support the other side of the same theory, according to which aggressive behavior is, exclusively “part of our innate human nature.” They also show that two of the four concepts of Bandura’s Social Learning Theory (1977), namely “differential association” and “reinforcement”, have a mild explanatory power of school shooters’ behaviour. The two others, “definitions”, and “imitation”, appear to have a more important explanatory power.
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Appendix A. School shooting events referred in this article

[1] Erfurt, Germany, 2002; Johann Gutenberg Gymnasium; Robert Steinhaüser (19); former student-expelled just prior to the event; [2] Winnenden, Germany, 2009; Albertville Technical High School; Tim Kretschmer (17); former student (he changed schools); [3] Emsdetten, Germany, 2006; Geschwister Scholl Secondary School; Sebastian Bosse (18); former student; [4] Carmen de Patagones, Argentina, 2004; Islas Malvinas Middle School; Rafael (15; family name not disclosed); student; [5] Springfield, Oregon, USA, 1998; Thurston High School; Kipland Kinkel (15); student; [6] Newtown, USA, 2012; Sandy Hook Elementary School; Adam Lanza (20); former student (homeschooled at the time of the event); [7] Montreal, Canada, 1989; École Polytechnique de Montréal; Marc Lépine (25); school-related individual; [8] Fort Gibson, Oklahoma, 1999; Fort Gibson Middle School; Seth Trickey (13); student; [9] Conyers, Georgia, 1999; Heritage High School; T.J. Solomon (15); student; [10] Heath, Kentucky, 1998; Heath High School, West Paducah; Michael Carneal (14); student; [11] Austin, Texas, 1966; University of Texas; Charles Whitman (25); former student/graduate student; [12] Austin, Texas, 2010; University of Texas; Colton Tooley (19); student; [13] Tuusula, Finland, 2007; Jokela High School; Pekka-Eric Auvinen (18); student; [14] Cold Spring, Minnesota, 2003; Rocori High School; John Jason McLaughlin (15); student (15); [15] Jonesboro, Arkansas 1998; Westside Middle School; Mitchell Johnson (13); student; [15] Jonesboro, Arkansas 1998; Westside Middle School; Mitchell Johnson (13); student; [16] Blacksburg Virginia, 2007; Virginia Tech University; Cho Seung-Hui (23); student; [17] North Illinois, 2008; North Illinois University (NIU); Steven Kazmierczak (27); graduate student at University of Illinois - and former student at NIU; [18] Brampton, Ontario, Canada, 1975; Centennial Secondary School; Michael Slobodian (16); student; [19] Grayson, Kentucky, 1993; The East Carter High School; Scott Pennington (17); student; [20] San Diego, California, 1979; Grover Cleveland Elementary School; Brenda Spencer (16); outsider; [21] Stockton, California, 1989; Stockton Elementary School; Patrick Purdy (25); outsider; [22] Santee, California, 2001; Santana High School; Charles Andrew Williams (15); student; [23] Marinette, Wisconsin, 2010; Marinette High School; Samuel Hengel (15); student; [24] Columbine Valley—a non-incorporated municipality; Jefferson County (Colorado), 1999; Columbine High School; Dylan Klebold (18); student; [25] Jefferson County (Co), 1999; Columbine High School; Eric Harris (18); student; [26] Olean, New York, 1974; Regent school; Anthony Barbaro (17); student; [27] Bad Reichenhall, Germany, 1999; Martin Peyerl (16); outsider; [28] Lansing, Michigan, 1978; Everett High School; Roger Needham (15); student; [29] Montreal, Canada, 2006; Dawson College; Kimveer Gill (25); outsider; [30] Goddard, Kansas, 1985; Goddard Junior High School; James Alan Kearbey (14); student.