

Full Prof. Anna-Maria Getoš Kalac, PhD*
Dalia Pribisalić, Assistant**
Petra Šprem, Assistant***

FIRST FINDINGS FROM THE BALKAN HOMICIDE STUDY: INTRODUCING A GENUINE VIOLENCE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM¹

UDK: 364.632 (497)
DOI: 10.31141/zrpf.2022.59.143.145
Izvorni znanstveni rad
Primljeno: 29. 09. 2021.

The aim of the paper is to introduce a genuine violence classification system. The system has been created using an innovative empirical rather than a mainstream normative approach. It aims to test the possibilities and benefits of conceptualising and understanding violence regardless of its normative constructs which have been created on the basis of legal, abstract, and non-empirical grounds. With a specific focus on physical violence, the here proposed classification system has been designed by using original empirical data from case file analysis, obtained through the Balkan Homicide Study (BHS). Using a qualitative method, 2073 finally adjudicated attempted and completed homicide cases were analysed. As a result, the genuine violence classification system includes 20 types of violence primarily determined by the various contextual backgrounds of the offences and their main triggers, occasionally also considering the location of the offence, the offender's motive and the victim-offender relationship. The ultimate purpose of the introduced genuine violence classification system is to provide a new and innovative approach to violence research, one that might prove to be a useful tool for minimising the impact of differences due to changing legal frameworks through time (e.g., reforms) and amongst different countries. In this sense, it should facilitate and upgrade future (comparative) criminological violence research. The basic terms and types of violence are defined primarily for the purpose of the BHS and should not be understood as axioms generally applicable outside the framework of the study, at least not without further testing and adjustment of the classification system.

Key words: *violence classification, typology of violence, violence phenomenology, Balkan Homicide Study*

* Anna-Maria Getoš Kalac, Full Professor, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Law, Department for Criminal Law, Head of Violence Research Lab (March 1st 2018 – June 17th 2021) and Head of Balkan Criminology

** Dalia Pribisalić, Assistant, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Law, Violence Research Lab

*** Petra Šprem, Assistant, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Law, Violence Research Lab

¹ The research for this publication has been conducted in spring and early summer 2021 by the Violence Research Lab, established within the framework of the project "Croatian Violence Monitor: A Study of the Phenomenology, Etiology, and Prosecution of Delinquent Violence with Focus on Protecting Particularly Vulnerable Groups of Victims" jointly funded by University of Zagreb's Faculty of Law and the Croatian Science Foundation (UIP-05-2017-8876). See: www.violence-lab.eu.

1. INTRODUCTION: CLASSIFYING VIOLENCE – A CHALLENGING STRUGGLE OR AN IMPOSSIBLE VENTURE?

Almost 50 years ago, *Erich Fromm* provided us with an ever relevant, thorough and well-known study into the human impulse for violence (Fromm, 1973). Comparably far less known, yet not less insightful or intriguing are the innovative studies into the human appetite for violence provided by *Wolfgang Sofsky* (1996), *Heinrich Popitz* (1992) and *Trutz von Trotha* (2011; 1997). Countless authors across multiple disciplines (Collins, 1974; French, Teays & Purdy, 1998; Schmidt and Schröder, 2001; Fox, 2002; Nisbett and Cohen, 2018) have struggled with the phenomenon of human violence. Nevertheless, violence, “a horribly interesting reality”,² remains one of the most elusive and most difficult concepts in social sciences (Imbusch, 2005:13) and beyond. At the core of this state of art lies the lack of a generally accepted definition of violence, whereby it appears that defining violence is not an exact science, but rather a matter of personal or disciplinary perspective (Fromm, 1973). The fact remains that violence has no universally accepted definition, whereby its scope has been constantly expanded by introducing new types of violence for the last few decades.³

Studying a phenomenon as complex as violence inevitably requires its (1) conceptualisation, (2) definition and (3) classification. The very nature of every social science requires that one first observes and then attempts to categorise, compare, and classify (Douglas, Burgess, Burgess & Ressler, 1992). Classifying in general is not a simple task, but rather a multifaceted process, with variable elements, unities, contents, and objects to be considered. The following questions are important in terms of classifying violence: (i) Where does criminology stand with violence classification in general? and (ii) Have criminologists managed to form categories of violence that contain enough phenomenological similarities, while respecting the diversity of each case? A review of the relevant literature reveals that criminologists are commonly clinging to a mainstream normative and criminal law classification of violence.⁴ This seems to be a consequence of criminology’s and criminologist’s strong embeddedness at law faculties and the disciplinary close interconnection to criminal (procedural) law, at least in this and most other regions of the world,⁵ as well as criminology’s problem-defined nature, in contrast to a perspective-defined quality.⁶ There have however been valuable attempts to

² The phrase originates from Paul Farmer’s inaugural address at the College de France, entitled “A Horribly Interesting Reality”, see: www.nettime.org/Lists-Archives/nettime-I-OIII/msg00082.html.

³ There is a clear trend towards indefinitely stretching the term violence, up to the point where almost everything is labelled as violence: “When almost everything is violence, then ultimately almost nothing is violence.” (Meyer, 2002:959).

⁴ For an in-depth argumentation with numerous examples see: Getoš Kalac and Šprem (2020) and Getoš Kalac (2021a)

⁵ See in more detail on criminology’s position in Croatia, the region and globally in Getoš (2014; 2011; 2009).

⁶ On criminology’s problem-defined quality and its inherent transdisciplinary nature see: Getoš Kalac (2020).

classify violence as a criminological reality rather than a criminal law construct.⁷ Such efforts are important, especially considering the fact that *normative* criminal law classifications of violence are not necessarily functional when it comes to *empirical* criminology. Due to the different function of criminal law (in comparison to criminology) classifications which strictly rely only on normative concepts are not a sensible reflection of the phenomenological reality of violence, but rather an abstract conceptualisation that is necessary in order to achieve the purposes of criminal law.⁸ From a criminological point of view, classifying violence should aim toward a better understanding of the ‘*hows*’ and ‘*whys*’ of violence and thus enable violence research to focus on the actual reality of violence, rather than its teleological normative conceptualisation.⁹

2. THEORETICAL OR EMPIRICAL APPROACH TO VIOLENCE CLASSIFICATIONS

Classifications are means of categorising subject matters into groups that aim to simplify “social reality by identifying homogenous groups of violence different from other clusters of crime behaviours” (Miethe, McCorkle & Listwan, 2006:1). Creating a classification system of violence can be conducted in two ways. First, by building a purely theoretical classification of violence (*theoretical approach*). Second, by taking empirical findings from actual violence cases and detecting patterns and clusters of reoccurring features (*empirical approach*).

By using the theoretical approach as a criterion for classification, one can divide violence into its basic elements using a deductive method. Some forms and variations are likely to remain constant, while others can change in their qualitative and quantitative dimensions (Hitmeyer and Hagan, 2005:10). The three (3) common stable elements of every violence act are the offender, the victim and the violent act. Any of the mentioned elements can be used as a criterion for further classification. When focusing on the offender one can use sex (*e.g.*, male violence), age (*e.g.*,

⁷ The most elaborate classifications can be found in subtypes of violence, such as partner violence. See for example: Johnson (2010), Kelly and Johnson (2008), Stare and Fernando (2014), Crossman (2019), Mennicke (2019), *etc.*

⁸ “Most criminological or empirical violence research related to the criminal justice sector have been doing the opposite by stretching and shrinking the subject and scope of criminological interest until it finally fit criminal law constructs and classifications. It would appear that the (unconscious) main research question has not been “what is violence and how does it present itself in reality?”, but rather “what normative perceptions of reality might be considered actual (lethal) violence and how can criminological violence-realities best be tailored to fit into normative violence-constructs?” (Getoš Kalac and Bezić, 2019:12-13)

⁹ Criminological research is often characterized by an uncritical transposition of legal terms, institutes and concepts that lack detailed insights into their specific purpose or their actual meaning within criminal law. Thus, the complementarity of criminal law institutes with the empirical requirements needed for a sensible criminological study of violence remains questionable (at best). A necessary prerequisite for a holistic, authentic and rational exploration of violence as a social phenomenon rather than a legal category is to either translate criminal law concepts into criminological language or to create an original and authentic concept of violence. See in more detail: Getoš and Šprem, 2020.

teen violence), or motive (*e.g.*, money driven violence) as the basis for further classification. Similar criteria can be applied for the victim or the violent act itself. There is also the possibility of focusing on the offender-victim relationship (*e.g.*, stranger violence), thus combining two elements of the violent act and using them as means for classification. Clearly, this approach ultimately produces too many and too various criteria without a solid empirical perception of violence, making the demarcation line hopelessly blurred.

It would appear that creating an empirically founded genuine violence classification needs to meet certain conditions of transparency, simplicity, reliability, consistency and verifiability. This means that (i) each type should be inclusive, but not too broad; (ii) each type should have its own specific features or combination of features, distinguishing it from other types; and (iii) the criteria for such a classification should be rooted in empirical findings rather than pre-set ideas and/or concepts. The classification system presented in this paper aims to fulfil these conditions by exploring an empirical approach in creating a new violence classification system rooted in actual real-life violence cases.¹⁰

3. GENUINE VIOLENCE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

The following elaborations pertain to steps taken in order to design an innovative and genuinely criminological violence classification system. Due to the scope of this paper, not all individual features of the process will be presented in full detail – the focus will be put on those aspects that are more difficult to differentiate due to their complexity.¹¹ Regardless of the ongoing trend in current violence research to expand the concept of what violence is (almost indefinitely), the classification system presented through this paper is based on an undisputable core scope of violence.¹² For the purpose of this paper violence is defined as “any intentional physical harming or killing of another person”. With that in mind, both completed and attempted homicide cases should to be taken into consideration.

2073 cases of attempted and completed homicides from the BHS database were analysed. This qualitative method was necessary to detect possible patterns and key features within each of the violence incidents in order to identify various violence types and eventually design an appropriate classification system. Thus, by using

¹⁰ The case file descriptions used were obtained from the BHS data collection. In 2016, the Max Planck Partner Group for Balkan Criminology conducted an empirical study on homicide in six South-Eastern European countries: Croatia, Hungary, Kosovo, North Macedonia, Romania and Slovenia. The study analysed completed and attempted homicide offences through a thorough examination of full national samples (with the exception of Romania where a regional sample was drawn) of prosecution and court case files for a three-to-five-year period. The study was concluded in 2018 while accounting for a total sample of 2073 analysed cases.

¹¹ A full description of the entire classification system can be found in Getoš Kalac (2021a) available as an open access publication at <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-74494-6> and on www.balkan-criminology.eu/research-focuses/current-projects/balkan-homicide-study/

¹² See in more detail Getoš Kalac (2021b:514-517).

a qualitative method it was possible to distinguish and exclude cases which do not contain any true acts of physical violence, even though they may have been normatively classified as (attempted) homicide. These 76 cases pertained to (mostly) false reports (e.g., ex-husband reported his ex-wife for killing her grandmother 20 years ago, but the investigation showed that the victim died of natural causes) or offences that do not entail homicidal violence (e.g., the offender came up to his wife in the street and started shaking her until a witnesses stopped him).

Throughout the analysis several features emerged as most relevant: the **situational context** of the case, closely followed by the **main trigger**. These features were deemed most relevant when it comes to, not only creating specific types of violence, but also subsequently a better understanding of the key characteristics of each type. The **victim-offender relationship** and the offender's (main) **motive** were taken into consideration only occasionally and will therefore be presented briefly. The main purpose of observing the victim-offender relationship type was to distinguish stranger violence from non-stranger violence, as well as to analyse non-stranger violence according to two different sub-categories of relationship. The first sub-category within non-stranger violence refers to domestic relationships, and includes intimate partners, children, parents, siblings and relatives (both blood related and in-laws). The second sub-category refers to non-domestic relationships and it includes neighbours, work-relationships and acquaintances/friends. As simple discerning the relationship between the victim and the offender was, the offender's motive was often anything but easy or straightforward. Violent incidents are complex events with changing dynamics and motivations, and the true motive of the offender *tempore criminis* is something (potentially) known exclusively to the offender. Oftentimes it is likely that more than one motive played a role in the offender's decision and in the majority of cases it is not possible to determine a valid and reliable primary motive in terms of an empirical fact. However, if enough "circumstantial" evidence is available, e.g. the offender bringing a bag and firearm with himself to a bank, it is safe to assume that the offender's main motive probably was greed. The goal of our classification system was to distinguish between two basic categories: motive being **unclear** or **clear** (greed, jealousy, revenge, hate, (self)defence, vigilantism, lack of care and on request being the possible options for a clear motive).¹³ In case of multiple motives, the most dominant one was taken into consideration, and if not possible to do so, the motive was deemed unclear.

The main purpose of the classification system, however, was to create a genuine violence taxonomy that does not rely purely on normative constructs, and thus can provide a new way to observe violence in its empirical form. Discerning the type of violence primarily relied on the situational context of the case and/or the main trigger for the violent act. The **situational context** refers to the "big picture", the situation in which the violent act occurred in (e.g., 'bar violence' refers to a party environment that includes a larger number of people in one public or semi-private place, with the majority of attendees being under the influence of alcohol, where an

¹³ See in more detail: www.balkan-criminology.eu/bhs-typology/

uplifting atmosphere is to be expected). The **trigger** aspect refers to the main reason the offence occurred and what the offender's main motive for committing the act was (e.g., 'thievery violence' include different offences of violence that was primarily motivated by greed). Some violence types highly depend on the type of **victim-offender relationship** (i.e., neighbours in 'neighbourhood violence' or the offender and the victim being the landlord and the tenant in 'renting violence'). The main goal was, however, to discern violence types that contain enough phenomenological similarities, while preserving the diversity of each case group. The complete list of violence types, observed victim-offender relationships and offender's motive can be seen in Fig.1 below.

Type	Relationship	Motive
Other private	Intimate partners	Unclear
Other public		
"Bar"	Child	Greed
Thievery		
Separation	Parent	Jealousy
Neighbourhood		
Work-related	Sibling	Revenge
Infanticide		
Institutional	Relative	Hate
Discrimination		
Inheritance	Neighbour	(Self)defence
Hooliganism		
Enforcement	Work-relationship	Vigilantism
Blood feuds		
Renting disputes	Friends/acquaintances	Lack of care
Against police		
By police	Strangers	On request
Sex-market		
Drug related		
Professional killings		

Fig. 1. BHS violence types, victim-offender relationships and offender's motive

Two of the detected violence types present broader categories than the rest, with the location of (attempted) homicide being the dominant relevant feature: 'other private' and 'other public' violence. Namely, all other 18 types of violence could also be categorised as either 'other private' or 'other public', if not for more specific information about the case (e.g., The victim and the offender started to fight in a restaurant because of a money debt. Without information about the motive behind the attack, this case would be classified as 'other public' for its location. Because of the information that the conflict broke out over a money debt, however, it falls under 'enforcement violence'). The other 18 types do not rely on the mere location of the offence as much, but are rather specified by the combination of situational context, main trigger, offender's motive and victim-offender relationship. Out of the 18 violence types, some are dominantly defined by the offender's motive (e.g., 'thievery violence' or 'enforcement violence'), some by a combination of the motive and victim-offender relationship (e.g., 'inheritance violence' and 'renting violence'),

some solely by the victim-offender relationship (*e.g.*, ‘infanticide violence’) and others by the contextual background behind the offence (*e.g.*, ‘discrimination violence’ and ‘separation violence’). Discerning the types of violence was not without difficulty. Although some like ‘infanticide violence’ were clear in every case due to them having only one criterion to fulfil (a mother attacking her new born baby within one month of birth), others were occasionally categorised only after a long discussion between the researchers. The goal was, however, to create violence types that are objective and, more importantly, reliable. For that purpose, it was necessary to test the classification system.

4. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND THE SYSTEM’S LIMITATIONS

One of the most important goals for the authors while creating this classification system was ensuring its reliability and consistency. The following paragraphs deal with steps taken in order to ensure these features, while transparently providing for the main advantages this system provides as well as its main limitations.

The reliability of the system was tested by engaging an external researcher. In order to achieve the highest level of possible objectivity, the chosen external researcher had a non-legal disciplinary background and no previous contact with the BHS. He was provided only with the short case descriptions and the BHS typology¹⁴. His task was to classify all the cases in one of the 20 violence types, as well as discern the victim-offender relationship and offender’s motive using the instructions provided in the typology. The highest discrepancy was found in discerning offender’s motive (19%) and type of violence (16%) while the discrepancy in victim-offender relationship (8.4%) was lower. These results are not unexpected when one takes into consideration the nature of each variable. While the relationship between the victim and the offender is mostly straightforward, a motive behind the offence and the type of violence the offence falls under is far more complex to determine. Nevertheless, because of the total match of 91.3% between all of the observed features, it is safe to conclude that the system does fulfil the condition of reliability.

When looking into the discrepancies in more detail, when it comes to the motive, it can be observed that differences were often a result of the external researcher’s tendency to declare the motive as ‘unclear’ rather than “picking the wrong one”. In other words, the external researcher would declare the motive as unclear whenever there was even a slight doubt which (dominant) motive might truly be behind the offence. This, leads to the question which method is more correct, especially considering the fact that the offender’s motive *tempore criminis* is (potentially) truly known only to the offender. Is this feature under the influence of the author’s criminological background that provides them with a higher sense of security when

¹⁴ Getoš Kalac (2021a: 44-45). See the detailed typology here: www.balkan-criminology.eu/bhs-typology/

discerning the motive, while someone with a different disciplinary background might be more hesitant, or is the discrepancy simply caused by the high complexity of the feature itself? The case is similar when it comes to the type of violence, where the external researcher had a higher tendency to declare an offence as either 'other private' or 'other public', rather than classifying it as one of the more specific types. A higher discrepancy within the offender's motive was also found between discerning between 'vigilantism' and 'revenge', which could indicate the need to revise the criteria for these two motives in order to prevent potential confusion in the future, and ensure even higher reliability of the classification system. Lastly, the motive was deemed 'unclear' in two different scenarios; (i) if it was impossible to discern what the offender's motive was, and (ii) if there were multiple motives with none of them appearing as the dominant one. Upon revision, it was concluded that in order to be able to tell whether the offender's motive in each type of violence is truly too unclear or simply too complex, this variable should be split in two sub-categories for future analyses.

As for the overall prevalence of each motive in the BHS, the offender's motive was deemed as 'unclear' in nearly half of the cases (47%), which provides further proof of how difficult the task is. When focusing solely on the clear motives, 'revenge' is the most commonly found one (27%). The question arises if this is due to revenge truly being the most common motive for (attempted) homicides, or the fact that its definition is broad so it can manifest in different types of cases (*e.g.*, husband killing his wife because she cheated on him; the offender attacking the victim because he was late with his payment; the offender, being under the influence, "snapping" and killing the victim because he pushed him in the club) or if it is easiest to recognise. When it comes to the victim-offender relationships, the most prevalent of relationships by far is the "friends/acquaintances" category (37%), with this category alone pertaining to nearly the same number of cases as the broader category "domestic" victim-offender relationships (40%). Although this could be caused by there simply being more offences committed between friends and/or acquaintances, it is more likely due to two other reasons. Firstly, the "friends/acquaintances" category is somewhat broader than the other included in this system and therefore it is "easier to fall into". Secondly, the short descriptions on which this system are based on were written *before* the researchers knew all the types of relationships that will be observed, so it is possible that some of these relationships are in fact other "non-domestic" relationships such as neighbours or colleagues, but the data provided in the short descriptions simply did not contain that information. A similar thing can be found in violence types, with the two broader categories 'other private' (37%) and 'other public' (26%) being the most dominant of the types. This is mostly caused by there simply not being enough information to safely categorise an offence into one of the more specific violence types. Other than that, 'bar violence' (8%), 'thievery violence' (7%) and 'separation violence' (7%) were the most commonly found one.¹⁵

¹⁵ For an in-depth analysis into the prevalence of all the violence types, as well as all the other observed features, see Getoš Kalac (2021).

This brings us to the main limitation of the introduced classification system: the source data being case file *descriptions*. Because there wasn't a detailed instruction given to over 50 researchers across the countries involved in the BHS study on how exactly to fill in the open variable of the case description, the descriptions vary significantly depending on how detailed each researcher wanted to describe the case, and what information they deemed important to mention. While some descriptions had all the relevant and needed information to discern the type of violence as well as all the other features, other descriptions required the authors to "fill in the picture" by going through the database in order to understand what transpired. Because of this, the issue of missing data arose,¹⁶ and some of the features were harder to discern (*i.e.*, without a case description it was more or less impossible to discern the offender's motive). However, only around 100 case files contained no description at all, and required all the information to be re-constructed from other variables in the database, while the vast majority of cases did include the necessary information. Nevertheless, in order to prevent the issue of missing data as much as possible, future research would benefit from obtaining the needed information directly from cases files, rather than from short descriptions. Other than this, there is yet more research needed in regards to solving the issue of multiple victims and/or offenders within each case. Because of the way the system is constructed, the issue arises when having to multiply some incident characteristics in order to capture all the needed data for each victim/offender within one offence.¹⁷ It would seem that it is impossible to accurately represent all of the available information inside one database, so it is advisable to decide beforehand what the main focus of one's research is and to choose the main counting unit (case, offender or victim) accordingly, as done with the BHS (main counting unit: case)

The briefly presented genuine violence classification system provides a new way to categorise cases based on their violence type which is characterised by objective, reliable and clear features. A challenge remains as to how to create a system which can capture and rank analysed cases by their level of violence and/or homicidality.¹⁸ This challenge seems to be rooted in the high subjectivity of determining what is "more violent". Should the primary focus be on the number of wounds inflicted upon the victim, or the painfulness and suffering of the victim (which in itself depends on countless factors), or the disproportion between the offender's and the victim's strength, or the vulnerability of the victim (e.g. child, women, elderly person etc.), or the (un)justifiability the offence (*e.g.*, a father avenging his dead son opposed to a businessman killing his rival in order to gain money) etc.? Although the aim of the here presented classification system was not to determine which type or which

¹⁶ For a more detailed description of how this issue was dealt with, and how it affected the interpretation of certain results see: Getoš Kalac (2021).

¹⁷ An offence where one offender kills three victims would need three different entries into the database for each of the victims; their characteristics, possible different relationships each of them had with the offender, different motives the offender had for each victim and so on. In order to capture all of that, the data would show three different cases and artificially enlarge the number of cases.

¹⁸ Getoš Kalac (2021a:101-103).

act of violence is more violent than another, clearly this is the next big step violence research will need to take. In order to do so, a genuine violence classification is needed and the presented one will hopefully add to setting the stage for addressing the highly intriguing next big question of actually “measuring” violence and/or homicidality.

5. CONCLUSION

There is little doubt that criminology has so far done a rather poor job in conceptualising, defining and classifying violence in a manner that would fit the empirical imperative of criminology’s research instrumentarium. This shortcoming is mainly to be attributed to criminology’s close connection to criminal law and criminologists’ frequent disciplinary (and institutional) rooting in and around purely normative subjects. It is challenging to disregard decades of legal training and fundamental normative disciplinary paradigms, but in the current age of transdisciplinarity there seems little if any other sensible approach towards criminologically conceptualising, defining and classifying violence. In a first attempt to do so, we intentionally tried to disregard normative constructs and teleological concepts of capturing and measuring violence, by focusing on actual (attempted) homicide cases and their phenomenological realities. Although only a first attempt in creating a genuinely criminological and thus empirical violence classification system, the here presented first findings demonstrate the many benefits of such an approach, just as they highlight all the challenges and struggles it entails. Obviously, there are no two same cases of homicide, just as there are no exact two cases of any offence for that matter. However, the classification of a violent incident as a violence type of “bar violence” entails far more meaningful and knowledge producing information, than the mere normative classification of the same incident as an attempted aggravated murder for example. When looking at any country’s violent crime situation using available (official) violent crime statistics, there is little knowledge to be gained beyond incidence, prevalence and trends of homicides, which presents a highly complex mixture of phenomenologically (and most likely etiologically) extremely different acts of violence. Same goes for many other ‘normative’ categories of crime (*e.g.*, property crime, sexual crime, economic crime etc.) which would greatly profit from an innovative and empirically base approach that aims at producing real insights that go beyond the superficial “counting” of criminal offences. In that sense criminologists as well as (criminal justice) practitioners, but also researchers and experts from numerous (and seemingly distant) disciplines are called upon to revisit and challenge our common understanding of (violent) crime as merely a criminal offence in order to provide new approaches and much more meaningful methodologies for its investigation.

LITERATURE

1. Aebi, M.F. and Linde, A. (2016). *Long-Term Trends in Crime: Continuity and change*. In: Knepper, P. and Johansen, A., (editors). *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Crime and Criminal Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 57-87.
2. Collins, R. (1974). *Three faces of cruelty: Towards a comparative sociology of violence*. *Theory and Society*, 1(4), 415-440. DOI: 10.1007/BF00160802
3. Douglas, J.E., Burgess, A.W., Burgess, A.G. & Ressler, R.K. (1992). *Crime Classification Manual: A Standard System for Investigating and Classifying Violent Crime 3rd Edition*. Lexington Books/Macmillan.
4. Fox, V.C. (2002). *Historical perspectives on violence against women*. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 4(1), 15-34. Available at: <https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol4/iss1/2/>
5. French, S.G., Teays, W. & Purdy, L.M. (editors). (1998). *Violence against women: Philosophical perspectives*. New York: Cornell University Press.
6. Fromm, E. (1973). *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
7. Getoš Kalac, A. (2021a). *Violence in the Balkans: First findings from the Balkan Homicide Study*. Berlin: Springer International Publishing. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-74494-6. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-74494-6>
8. Getoš Kalac, A. (2021b). *(Cyber) Bullying by Faceless Bureaucracy in Research Funding: A Case Study from the Balkans*. In: Haferkamp, R., Kilchling, M., Kinzig, J., Oberwittler, D. & Wößner, G. (editors). *Unterwegs in Kriminologie und Strafrecht – Exploring the World of Crime and Criminology*. Festschrift für Hans-Jörg Albrecht. Berlin; Freiburg, Duncker & Humblot in coop. with Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften e.V., 511-540. DOI: 10.3790/978-3-428-58251-8
9. Getoš Kalac, A. (2020). *Guilt, Dangerousness and Liability in the Era of Pre-Crime – the Role of Criminology? To Adapt, or to Die, that is the Question!*. *Monatschrift für Kriminologie und Strafrechtsreform*, 103(3), 198-207. DOI:10.1515/mks-2020-2054.
10. Getoš Kalac, A. (2014). *Mapping the Criminological Landscape of the Balkans*. In: Getoš Kalac, A., Albrecht, H. & Kilchling, M. (editors). *Mapping the Criminological Landscape of the Balkans. A Survey on Criminology and Crime with an Expedition into the Criminal Landscape of the Balkans*. Berlin: Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law, 23-55.
11. Getoš, A. (2011). *Kriminologie in Kroatien - Institutionalisierung und Entwicklungen von 1906 bis zur Gegenwart*. *Monatschrift für Kriminologie und Strafrechtsreform*, 94 (3), 213-221.
12. Getoš, A. (2009). *Mjesto i uloga kriminologije i viktimologije u Hrvatskoj i u međunarodnom kontekstu*. U: Turković, K., Maršavelski, A. & Roksandić Vidlička, S. (urednici). *Liber Amicorum Zvonimir Šeparović: Od kaznenog prava do viktimologije*. Zbornik radova u čast 80. rođendana profesora emeritusa Zvonimira Šeparovića. Zagreb: Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 119-140.

13. Getoš Kalac, A. and Bezić, R. (2019). *Criminological Violence Research: Ideas, Challenges, Concepts, Solutions (Violence Lab manuals)*. Unpublished manual.
14. Getoš Kalac, A. and Šprem, P. (2020). *Kaznenopravno i kriminološko poimanje 'delinkventnog' nasilja u Hrvatskoj*. Godišnjak Akademije pravnih znanosti Hrvatske = Croatian Academy of legal sciences yearbook, 11(1), 119-132. DOI:10.32984/gapzh.11.1.7.
15. Imbusch, P. (2005). *The concept of violence*. In: Heitmeyer, W. and Hagan, J. (editors). *International Handbook of Violence Research*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 13-39.
16. Meyer, T. (2002). *Political Cultural Studies and Violence*. In: Heitmeyer, W. and Hagan, J. (editors). *International Handbook of Violence Research*. Dordrecht: Springer. 957-972. DOI: 10.1007/978-0-306-48039-3_48
17. Miethe T.D., McCorkle R.C., Listwan S.J. (2006). *Crime profiles: The anatomy of dangerous persons, places, and situations*. 3rd ed. California: Roxbury Publishing Company. in: Boxall H., Rosevear L. and Payne, J. (2015). *Domestic violence typologies: What value to practice?*. Trends & issues in crime and criminal justice no. 494. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
18. Nisbett, R. E. and Cohen, D. (2018). *Culture Of Honor: The Psychology Of Violence In The South*. New York: Routledge.
19. Popitz, H. (1992). *Phänomene der Macht*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr
20. Schmidt, B. and Schröder, I. (2001). *Anthropology of violence and conflict*. London: Psychology Press.
21. Sofsky, W. (1996). *Traktat über die Gewalt*. Frankfurt: Fischer Verlag.
22. Trotha, T.v. and Rösel, J. (2011). *On Cruelty*. Köln: R. Köppe.
23. Trotha, T. v. (editor) (1997). *Soziologie der Gewalt*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag

PRVI REZULTATI ISTRAŽIVANJA „BALKAN HOMICIDE STUDY“: PREDSTAVLJANJE AUTENTIČNOG SUSTAVA KLASIFIKACIJE NASILJA

Cilj rada bio je predstaviti novostvoreni autentični sustav klasifikacije nasilja. Sustav je kreiran korištenjem inovativnog empirijskog pristupa umjesto ustaljenog normativnog pristupa. Cilj je rada istražiti mogućnosti i prednosti konceptualizacije i razumijevanja nasilja izvan postojećih normativnih okvira uvjetovanih pravnom, odnosno apstraktnom logikom. Usmjerivši se isključivo na fizičko nasilje, sustav klasifikacije, predstavljen u ovom radu, napravljen je na osnovi analize izvornih podataka prikupljenih kroz Balkan Homicide Study (BHS). Kvalitativnom metodom analize kratkih opisa slučajeva obrađene su 2073 pravomoćne presude pokušaja i dovršenih ubojstava. Posljedično, autentični sustav klasifikacije nasilja sadrži 20 tipova nasilja određenih ponajviše širim kontekstom kaznenog djela te primarnim okidačem, uzimajući povremeno u obzir i lokaciju počinjenja, motiv počinitelja, te odnos između žrtve i počinitelja. Svrha predstavljenog sustava jest ponuditi inovativni pristup istraživanju nasilja koji se neće oslanjati isključivo na normativnu konceptualizaciju nasilja, već će ublažiti nedostatke aktualnih istraživanja prouzročeni opetovanim izmjenama zakona ili pak činjenicom da se zakonodavni okviri razlikuju od zemlje do zemlje. Na ovaj način, mogla bi se olakšati međunarodna kriminološka istraživanja nasilja u budućnosti. Termini i tipovi nasilja definirani su isključivo za potrebe BHS-a te ih ne treba koristiti kao opće aksiome primjenjive izvan okvira predmetnog istraživanja, bar ne bez daljnjeg testiranja i adaptacije klasifikacijskog sustava.

Ključne riječi: *klasifikacija nasilja, tipologija nasilja, fenomenologija nasilja, Balkan Homicide Study*