

Social Importance of Recognizing the Victimization for Mothers of School Shooters

by

Ryan W. Partington, M.A Candidate

A Thesis Submitted to the

School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Criminology

Master of Arts in Criminology

The Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities

University of Ontario Institute of Technology

Oshawa, Ontario, Canada

January 2019

© Ryan W. Partington, 2019

THESIS EXAMINATION INFORMATION

Submitted by: **Ryan W. Partington**

Master of Arts in Criminology

Thesis title:

Social Importance of Recognizing the Victimization for Mothers of School Shooters

An oral defense of this thesis took place on [November 22nd 2018](#) in front of the following examining committee:

Examining Committee:

Chair of Examining Committee	Christopher O'Connor, Ph.D.
Research Supervisor	Steven Downing, Ph.D.
Research Co-supervisor	Carla Cesaroni, Ph.D.
Examining Committee Member	Judith Grant, Ph.D.
External Examiner	Tyler Frederick, Ph.D, UOIT

The above committee determined that the thesis is acceptable in form and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field covered by the thesis was demonstrated by the candidate during an oral examination. A signed copy of the Certificate of Approval is available from the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

Abstract

This paper presents various topics that contribute to understanding Sue Klebold, Monique Lépine, Terri Roberts, Laurel Harper, and Parvinder Sandhu as secondary victims of school shooting homicides. With the application of Becker's (1963) labelling theory, there is an opportunity to examine the potential ramifications these secondary victims suffer as the result of the shootings, in addition to examining if they are subjected to social labels. By studying secondary victims of crime and the labels imposed on them, this study may be able to understand why such individuals suffer from mental illness and/or sociological drawbacks. The results of this study indicate that the social labelling of secondary victims is a social reaction to the victim's behaviour and relationship with the offender. These victims are more likely to suffer from anxiety disorders such as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Keywords: Secondary Victims; Mothers of School Shooters; School Shootings; Labelling Theory; Social Labels

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis consists of original work of which I have authored. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I authorize the University of Ontario Institute of Technology to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research. I further authorize University of Ontario Institute of Technology to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research. I understand that my thesis will be made electronically available to the public.

Ryan W. Partington

Acknowledgements

To this day, I have always strived and received excellence for my effort in academia in my post-secondary education; as I wish to reach my highest potential as an individual. With the continuous support and endless amount of love from my family and a select few, I was able to persevere and overcome an enormous amount of adversity. With the help of my supervisors and my committee I was able to finalize, defend, and submit my Master's Thesis. My supervisors and my committee members are not just professors, they are true educators and an asset to the University.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 2.1: Secondary Victimization

Chapter 2.2: History of Victimization

Chapter 2.3: Labelling Theory

Chapter 2.4: Labels Applied to Secondary Victim

Chapter 2.5: Effects Secondary Victims Experience from the Event

Chapter 2.6: Mother Blaming—A Feminist Critique

CHAPTER 3: CASE STUDY—A MOTHERS STORY

Chapter 3.1: Sue Klebold

Chapter 3.2: Monique Lépine

Chapter 3.3: Terri Roberts

Chapter 3.4: Parvinder Sandhu

Chapter 3.5: Laurel Harper

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY—A CONTENT ANALYSIS

CHAPTER 5: PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Chapter 5.1: The Effects Secondary Victims Experience from the Event

Chapter 5.2: Labels Applied to Secondary Victims

Chapter 5.2.1: Outsiders—Their interaction with the public and their families

Chapter 5.2.1.1: *Outsiders—Their interaction with the public.*

Chapter 5.2.1.2: *Outsiders—Their interaction with their families.*

Chapter 5.2.2: Unworthy victims

Chapter 5.2.3: Their deviant status—mother blaming

Chapter 5.2.4: Their deviant status—imposed by the police

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Chapter 6.1: Overall Results

Chapter 6.2: Limitations

Chapter 6.3: Discussion

Chapter 6.4: Conclusion

CHAPTER 7: REFERENCES

Chapter 1: Introduction

School shootings can leave behind a significant number of victims as a result of the deaths and violence associated with the incident (Melendez, Lichtenstein, & Dolliver, 2016; Mulvey & Cauffman, 2001). Recent scholarly literature has focused on many aspects of victimization surrounding school shootings. The majority of studies published in the last 10 years examine the primary victims of school shootings. However, few studies have examined secondary victimization with respect to observing a criminal event (Kenney, 2002).

Secondary victimization usually refers to what happens to the families, friends, and acquaintances of a primary victim, though it can also apply to the witnesses of the crime. In the case of a school shooting, secondary victims include individuals inside the school or families at home who may not have been directly involved, though they are still victims. After the event, the families, friends, and acquaintances are at a higher risk of suffering from a mental illness as a result of the event (Elklit & Kurdahl, 2013). Although school shooters and primary victims have been studied empirically, there are few studies that examine the secondary victims of school shootings through the application of labelling theory.

In studies of school shootings, the families of the gunmen — families that have also been affected by complete dismay and loss — are usually left behind. The secondary victims of school shootings often go unnoticed and thus remain understudied in comparison to the primary victims and the offenders (Meloy, Hempel, Mohandie, Shiva, & Gray, 2001). Howard Becker's (1963/1991) original concept of labelling theory applies to offenders: these individuals are socially labelled as deviant outsiders by an act or behaviour that violates a criminal law or social norm. (Cullen, Agnew & Wilcox, 2011). Though Becker's (1963/1991) original concept of

labelling theory is sound, offenders are not the only individuals subjected to social labels. Victims of a crime(s), are sometimes also labelled as outsiders; as such, modern-day criminologists apply victimology to labelling theory in order to fill in the gaps (Cullen, Agnew, & Wilcox, 2011).

In this paper, I examine Becker's (1963/1991) theoretical understanding of labelling individuals, using the results of a constructed content analysis of five mothers to examine if labelling theory can be applied to secondary victims of school shooting homicides. By using labelling theory, I can try to determine if there are certain labels the public has placed on the mothers, rather than only looking at the perpetrator(s). Moreover, I will utilize feminist critiques to understand if the mothers of school shooters are the only parents blamed by the public, and if so, why that is the case.

I present three research questions within this thesis:

- a. Can we classify the mothers of perpetrators as secondary victims?
- b. Are the mothers of perpetrators treated as victims by those around them and what other labels are applied to them?
- c. What factors shape the treatment of those mothers and the labels applied to them?

These questions will be applied to five mothers: Sue Klebold, Monique Lépine, Terri Roberts, Laurel Harper, and Parvinder Sandhu, who I will argue are secondary victims of school shooting homicides (Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008, Roberts, 2015; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006). Additionally, in this study I will examine if there are potential social labelling ramifications to secondary victims as the result of the event, or if the effects are related to their labels. A secondary victim can experience ramifications similar to those suffered by a primary victim from the initial event.

By studying secondary victims of crime and the labels placed on them, we may be able to better understand why an individual might suffer from a mental illness and experience sociological drawbacks as a result of having the experience of witnessing a murder.

These questions will be addressed through a content analysis utilizing the theoretical understanding of labelling theory and feminist critiques of five (5) mothers of school shooters in Canada and the United States.

In Chapter Two, I will commence the examination of current scholarly literature concerning the history of victimization, victimology, and secondary victims of homicide, by which means I will examine the labels to which secondary victims are subjected; the experiences to which secondary victims of school shootings are exposed; and feminist critiques which may explain why society has placed blame on the mothers of school shooters. This review of the scholarly literature will form the basis of the theoretical framework of this research paper. Within this chapter, I examine Becker's (1963/1991) labelling theory to understand if it can be applied to secondary victims of school shooting homicides. Here, I attempt to determine if there are certain labels the public have placed on the mothers.

Chapter Three examines the case studies—by providing a content analysis for examining the five (5) mothers. This chapter will present the case studies of the five mothers: Sue Klebold, Monique Lépine, Terri Roberts, Laurel Harper, and Parvinder Sandhu and the events that transpired which left them among the victims of their sons' actions. Chapter four examines the methodology. Here, I will explain in detail how the results were determined, collected and transcribed.

Chapter Five organizes the results of this study in two headings: category one, *the labels applied to secondary victims*; and category two, *the effects secondary victims experience from the event*. Within these two sections, each mother provides illuminating

circumstances where they have been categorized under Becker's (1963/1991) notice of deviance. The results are listed as: Outsiders, based on the interaction with family and friends; Unworthy victims; Deviant status, stigmatized by the public, the police and mother blaming.

Finally, Chapter Six will examine the overall results, providing a summary of the themes and labels, recognizing the limitations of this paper. First, I will provide a summary of the results and discuss whether or not applying labelling theory to secondary victims is plausible. Next, I will outline the potential limitations within the current literature that exists, and the consequent limitations to my research paper. Prior to the closing statements, I will provide a discussion of current feminist critiques of why mothers of school shooting homicide perpetrators have been subjected to blame.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Recent scholarly literature has focused on a contemporary view on victimization, moving away from examining offenders to studying victims. Scholars have narrowed in on victimology, extending victim status to secondary victims, and even as far as the community, known as tertiary victims (Frieze, Hymer, & Greenberg, 1985). The initial movement from studying criminology to victimology has provided an opportunity to research the external aspects of victimization. This expansion in the discipline of victimology provides us with the opportunity to extend the research scope to examine all eras of victimization (Viano, 1992). Within this chapter I will provide a theoretical framework in order to grasp the social importance of recognizing the victimization of mothers of school shooters.

Chapter 2.1: History of Victimization

In order to examine the importance of recognizing the victimization of mothers of school shooters, it would be prudent to understand the social construction of the term ‘victim.’ Prior to the current social construction of the term ‘victim,’ the word dates back to ancient cultural rituals, where the concept of a victim was created for the notion of the sacrifice. Karemen (2007) notes that the original meaning of the term victim was used for individual or animal that was killed during a ceremony to appease a supernatural power or deity. From that, the term ‘victim’ has been linked to external terms such as crime; creating a historical application. Furedi (2007) argues that the term victim became “the conciseness of being at risk,” thoroughly translated by (Walklate, 2006) as “the victim identity” of individuals who, over time, were subjected to wrongdoing. Walklate (2006),

asserts that the connection between victimhood and risk can be ignored in the context of crime; however, that tends not to be the case. The public focuses on the connection between victimhood, the term victim; and crime. The application of the term 'victim' is only seen by the public once an individual has been subjected to a crime. Dignan and Maguire (2005) suggest that the application of the term 'victim' has become intertwined with the concept crime over the years. Though the term is still open to interpretation, the minds of the twenty-first century have associated victimhood with crime and the study of victimology.

Prior to examining victimhood, social scientists in the early 1900s focused exclusively on the study of crime and criminals. At the time the discipline came into formation, there was a rise in international "victim movements" (Mawby & Walklate, 1994, p. 7), with the intention of bringing about social change. There have been many attempts to map out the framework of victimology since the creation of the discipline. For the purpose of this study, I will be using Mawby and Walklate's (1994) international perspective surrounding the framework of victimology. Victimology, the scientific examination of the physical, emotional and financial abuse, individuals suffer by means of criminal activity, became a discipline during the 1940s and 1950s. Until that time, criminologists focused on those who violated the law, whilst searching for potential solutions to crime; few studies suggested the importance of examining victims (Karemen, 2007; Mawby & Walklate, 1994).

By the 1970s, victimology became a recognized area of study with international organizations and professional academic journals. Textbooks regularly refer to Hans von Hentig and Benjamin Mendelsohn as the founding fathers of victimology (Morosawa,

2005; Rock, 1993). von Hentig and Mendelsohn offered differing perspectives on victimology (Karemen, 2007; Mawby & Walklate, 1994). Hans von Hentig is considered to be a famous author and early pioneer for his scientific contribution. von Hentig (1948) studied victim-proneness: the tendency of people to 'become a victim' based on their typology, such as: gender, age and ability. Benjamin Mendelsohn's presentation in Bucharest in 1947 has been argued to have been the first place the term 'victimology' was noted (Kirchhoff, 2010). Mendelsohn (1963) examined the victim's culpability, taking into consideration their responsibility for the event. Mendelsohn (1963) categorized victims from "completely innocent" (Mawby & Walklate, 1994, p.8) to "most guilty victim" (Mawby & Walklate, 1994, p. 8; Mendelsohn, 1963).

Since the 1970s, social and academic victim advocacy has flourished, and victimology has become an international discipline studied by an increasing number of researchers (Lehner-Zimmerer, 2011). Current victimologists and scholars investigate the victim's plight: their impact, injuries or losses that had been inflicted by an offender. In addition, victimologists examine the social contribution of victimology, such as the public's social, political and economic reaction to the victim's plight. In order to understand a victim's plight and the social contributions, victimologists became eager to understand the degree of seriousness of their harm; which led to a new outlook on victimology and the classification of a victim's status (Karemen, 2007). A victim can be a primary or initial victim – the individual directly affected by the incident; a secondary victim – an individual indirectly affected by the event or a witness to it; or a tertiary victim – an individual affected externally, such as a member of the community (Wallace & Roberson, 1998). A victim can be viewed by others as worthy or unworthy. This

perception is based on the victim's behaviour and attitude after the initial event. A good victim can be related to if that individual seems to be worthy of public sympathy or is not grieving extensively, while an unworthy victim is perceived as unrelatable and unworthy of public sympathy (Kenney, 2002). Current literature surrounding victimology has focused on the impact the criminal event has on the victims and the community in order to provide a better foundation to understand the complexities of victimization (Viano, 1992). As Karem (2007) noted, current interest within victimology involves victimologists examining the circumstances of victims. The victim's additional statuses, such as a secondary victimization, have become a progressive outlook on victimization.

The legal and social construct around the definitions of victim and victimization are vast. For the purposes of this study, I will be utilizing Quinney's (1972) construction of a victim. Quinney (1972) argues that someone or something must be perceived as a victim in order for the social and legal construction of a crime to take place. Quinney (1972) asserts that the perception of a victim precedes the definition of an act to be criminal. If a victim is not imagined, a criminal law would not be created, nor would it be enforced. An individual may be a victim of an incident, an accident, an event, or a series of events. In most cases, we see victims as individuals who have been directly hurt (Quinney, 1972). If a murder or school shooting were to occur, we would tend to only see as victims those who were directly involved, such as those who were killed, shot, or wounded in the school. In an event such as this, however, a victim can also be a direct witness or a family member of the offender.

Victimologists have extended three classifications of a victim: a victim can be a primary or initial victim, the individual directly affected by the incident; a secondary victim is an individual indirectly affected by, or having, witnessed the event; and a tertiary victim is an

individual affected externally, such as a member of the community (Wallace & Roberson, 1998). A victim can be viewed by others as worthy or unworthy. This perception is based on the victim's behaviour and attitude after the initial event. A worthy victim can be related to if that individual seems to be worthy of public sympathy or is not grieving extensively, and unworthy victim is perceived as unrelatable and unworthy of public sympathy (Kenney, 2002; Karemén, 2007).

The study of victimization has extended to include three different categories of victimhood, and further research needs to be conducted in order to examine the importance of recognizing secondary victimization. For the purpose of this paper, I will argue for the importance of recognizing the victimization of mothers of school shooters, who can be considered to be secondary victims, subject to similar, if not the same, social reactions labeling them as offenders. Following, will be a discussion of what we mean by "secondary victims." Then I will discuss labelling theory and how it may apply to secondary victims, in this case, mothers of shooters. Finally, I will provide an extensive overview of the current scholarly literature with respect to feminist stances on the social expectations of mothers, the inequality of mothers, and maternal employment with respect to the causation of youth delinquency.

Chapter 2.2: Secondary Victimization

As mentioned above, secondary victimization was derived from victimologists examining primary victimization: the cases of individuals who have been directly victimized (Wallace & Roberson, 1998). Victimologists began to shift their studies to the social contributors to victims, such as the public's social, political and economic reactions to a victim. By studying the social contributors of victimhood, victimologists became eager to understand the degree of seriousness behind their harm. By examining the degree of seriousness, victimologists found a new outlook on victimology and created the classification for three levels of a victim's status: primary victim, secondary victim and tertiary victim (Wallace & Roberson, 1998; Karemén, 2007). The classification of a secondary victim became apparent after the realization that individuals who bear witness to an event may become traumatized and thus are victims of that event as well (Mancusi, 2010). Shoham, Knepper and Kett (2010) define secondary victimization as "the result from victimization or the consequences of victimization extending to another party, so distinguishing the status of primary victim, secondary victim, tertiary victim, or indirect victim" (p.219).

After traumatising events such as the First World War, the Second World War, conflicts in the Middle East and 9/11, individuals who were not directly involved, including veterans, emergency personnel, families, and witnesses, experienced trauma in relation to the event(s) from their indirect victim status (Figley, 2013; Boscarino, Figley & Adams, 2004). Holstein and Miller (1990) argue that secondary victimization is linked to the military's euphemism of collateral damage, as it refers to the unintended consequences of warfare, such as the deaths of civilians that were indirect targets. At the time, secondary victims were understudied and unrepresented within Western society and the scholarly literature. In the 1970s, government-sponsored victimization surveys became integral to the collection of information in regards to the

victimization process. While collecting the data, researchers found that many individuals had been victimized at some point in their lives, yet not all were primary victims; this led to the academic interest in secondary victimization. Thirty years after the initial release of the victimization survey in the United States, researchers began to extend the scope of victimology to create new classifications. Emerging areas of study within victimology include secondary victimization, social services, and restorative justice; these topics have become major influences within victimology (Boscarino et al., 2004; Figley, 2013).

Holstein and Miller (1990) assert that a victim's status provides "interpretive instructions," advising others "how they should understand persons, circumstances, and behaviors under consideration" (p.107). Current studies indicate that secondary victims process different circumstances and behaviors in comparison to those of a primary victim (Figley, 2013; Boscarino, Figley & Adams 2004; Mancusi, 2010; Shoham, Knepper & Kett, 2010; Wallace & Roberson, 1998). Knepper and Kett (2010) argue that three groups hold a legitimate claim of "secondary victim:" the kin of the primary victim(s); the kin of the offender(s); and members of society who are affected by association to the event and not by direct attachment to the primary victim(s). For the purpose of this study, I will be examining the kin of offender(s) and the families of the gunmen as secondary victims. Studies on the families of offenders have gone back as far as 40 years, in which researchers examined the families of prisoners and the factors causing difficulties in their everyday lives, including: stress on the family; financial issues and social stigma (Codd, 2008; Comfort, 2008; Knepper & Kett, 2010).

Chapter 2.3: Labelling Theory

To understand if there are specific labels that victims are subjected to and if these labels have affected them personally, it is necessary to turn to scientific theory as an explanation to further explore and understand victimology. In certain cases, victims and secondary victims such as the families of the accused, have been blamed for their actions, or the actions of others. In some cases, victims have been subjected to public mistreatment based on their victim circumstance (Kenney, 2002; Melendez, Lichtenstein and Dolliver, 2016). As certain instances of cases of victim blaming are present within scholarly literature, it is important to analyze secondary victimization within a theoretical framework based on an examination of labeling and perception. Framing an examination of the mothers of school shooters through the theoretical approach of labeling theory may provide an understanding as to why these secondary victims have experienced labeling or social mistreatment. As such, this study is framed by the application of labelling theory and the fundamental concepts of deviance. By applying labeling theory to an additional population other than offenders, I can develop an explanation as to why individuals are classified through labels of deviance.

Howard Becker (1963/1991) coined the term, “labelling theory.” Becker argued that deviance is socially constructed, rather than being a social reaction or an objective reality. Deviance is created by society; social groups can create deviance because their rules and dynamics create the infractions that constitute deviance and then apply those rules to particular groups by labelling them as deviant (Cullen, Agnew, & Wilcox, 2011). Becker’s (1963/1991) original concept of the labelling theory has been challenged by modern-day criminologists to fit modernized concepts; these challenges have filled the gaps in his labelling theory and ultimately perfected it (Cullen, Agnew, & Wilcox, 2011).

Cullen, Agnew, and Wilcox (2011) note that Becker's (1963/1991) original concept defined crime as a behaviour that violates a criminal law. Theorists have extended labelling theory to the study of victimology. By using labelling theory, researchers can try to understand the labels the public have placed on the victim(s) of a crime, rather than narrowly examining an individual behaviour that violates a criminal law or regulation. There are survivors of certain crimes that society undoubtedly sees as a victim(s), such as the case where an individual was murdered, raped, or attacked. The general public does not usually question the status or motives of a primary victim (Klebold, 2016). Some individuals have avoided being labelled as victims, instead taking on the role of deviants. A prime example would be the family of an accused individual; certain cases allow the accused's family to absorb the victim status while others will not.

Sue Klebold (2016), Monique Lépine (2008), Terri Roberts (2015), Parvinder Sandhu and Laurel Harper (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) have been the victims of their sons' actions at Columbine High School; École Polytechnique; Nickel Mines Amish school house; Dawson College; and Umpqua community college, respectively. Instead of viewing these women as victims or survivors of their sons' mass shootings, a significant number of individuals within the public saw them as accomplices involved in the attacks (Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008; Roberts, 2015; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). These mothers are an excellent example of how a victim can be socially construed as a deviant. Labelling theory can be used to explain the devaluation and stigmatization of secondary victims such as these women, whose status as victim was diverted to that of deviant. For example, these women, as the result of mother blaming, have gained the deviant label "bad mother" (Cullen,

Agnew, & Wilcox, 2011). We do not see certain victims as the ‘victim’; rather, we judge them, and suggest they had played a more sinister role in the crime.

The mothers and families of school shooters have been socially constructed as deviant or unworthy. The maltreatment these mothers suffer includes subjecting them to labels such as “mother of a monster” and “bad parent” (Lépine, 2008, p. 18); these labels were socially constructed with the help of modern-day media outlets. In some cases, these socially-constructed labels will stay with the victims for life. Becker (1963/1991) asserts that being identified as deviant does indicate any deviant qualities, but is rather best explained as the result of being defined as such.

If we are defining certain victims as deviant, what type of victims are we creating? By viewing these mothers as victims and as deviant, we treat them as unworthy victims (Kenny, 2002). Applying this idea of labelling victims as unworthy, we can argue that such victims can be categorized under what Becker (1963/1991) calls “falsely deviant” (p. 20); victims who are perceived as deviant while exhibiting obedient behaviour. The assumption that a victim can be unworthy is based on the public’s opinion of the crime, including the severity of the crime and the victim’s relationship with the accused. Even though they are victims, Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006) continue to act in a socially acceptable manner, they can be viewed as the “mothers of monsters” (Lépine, 2008, p. 18). Some members of the public have based their perception of Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Sandhu, and Harper (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) upon the gravity of the events and the relationships they had with the shooters. Individuals in the community have accused them of involvement in the crimes on multiple occasions.

The concept of a “false deviant” (Becker, 1963/1991, p. 21) or an “unworthy” victim (Kenney, 2002, p. 242) can be applied to any crime. Knepper and Kett (2010), interpret Lemert’s (1951) work on secondary victimization, noting that a secondary victim’s status is linked to the social reaction to the primary victim(s). The link to the primary victim’s social reaction can become central to the social identity of the secondary victim, which may become associated to the actions of the offender and thus, creates the conception of “secondary deviance” (p. 222). If the public only views a victim in a negative way, a victim who only displays positive attributes can have his or her motives, and status as a victim questioned. This outlook can potentially apply a new label on secondary victim of a school shooting (Becker, 1963/1991).

Further application of labelling theory can help us examine the potential ramifications and effects the victims will endure after a crime. Will the secondary victims of the crime be satisfied with the label of a victim? Are the potential psychological risks that a secondary victim will face similar to those facing the primary surviving victim, and if so, will there be additional labels placed upon these victims based upon their medical diagnosis? Labelling theory can facilitate the examination of how victims of crime can be twisted into being labelled as deviant.

Becker (1963/1991) argues that deviants are individuals within a society who fail to obey the group norms, such as social expectations. Once the social expectations of members of a group are established, members of that group have the opportunity to determine whether a person has violated the rules and social expectations, and thus has become deviant (Becker, 1963/1991). Society has placed social expectations on women, specifically mothers (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Dillaway, & Paré, 2008, Karmen, 2012). Women have been expected to stay home and tend to their homes and raise their children, while their husbands, the men, provide for their families. This gender role may be antiquated (Mason, K. O., & Bumpass, 1975), but it remains a

social expectation today. Consequently, women break social barriers and become career instead of family-oriented are, as Becker (1963/1991) asserts, deviant; social outsiders (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Dillaway, & Paré, 2008, Karmen, 2012). As women, Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) Roberts (2015), Sandhu and Harper (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) were already viewed as deviants prior to their sons' crimes because they were working mothers in the twenty-first century (Becker, 1963/1991, Burgess, & Borgida, 1999; Dillaway, & Paré, 2008, Karmen, 2012).

Chapter 2.4: Labels Applied to Secondary Victims

Kenney (2002) examines how labelling is applied to secondary victims based on social reactions, public sympathy, victim behaviour, and secondary victims' adjustment to their secondary victim identities. Kenney's (2002) qualitative study examines members of families of murderers and their victims. Kenney's (2002) examination of the social reaction towards a secondary victim divides the results into family, friends, acquaintances, strangers, and the community. The conclusion for family and friends indicates that secondary victims close to the deceased were provided with support and sympathetic behaviour. Families and friends of the victim(s) were more easily offered sympathy, which was implicitly based on the legitimacy of their claim and relationship to the primary victim. The family and friends who responded to the sympathy in a positive manner were seen as attempting to accommodate the survivors' emotions rather than being labelled as deviant. Victims with no support felt alone and/or were given unhelpful responses. Victims who had few supports in place indicated that they were exposed to inappropriate attention or harassment, avoidance, lack of communication, and family conflict. Kenney (2002) concludes that secondary victims who had a lack of support felt as if it was because individuals did not know how to react to victims. In some cases, victims felt they had been stigmatized as emotionally deviant because of their inappropriate behaviour in public, which was a result of their grieving.

Some secondary victims had been stigmatized as deviant because the perpetrator was a family member. These individuals felt as if they were to blame and reported being viewed as if they were accomplices. In the case where the primary victim was murdered, Kenney (2002) suggests that the idea of sympathy had lessened, resulting in their treatment as unworthy by acquaintances, strangers, and the community. In respect to the public, Kenney (2002) indicates

they felt as if they had enough support. The lack of care and attention shown them may be the result of their distance from the primary victim.

Kenney (2002) conducted a study on secondary victims of homicide. While Kenney (2002) only used secondary victims of homicide as respondents, their motives and the circumstances of the homicides were not provided. The respondents were not randomly chosen from the population, as the researchers needed respondents who could relate to a murder, and nothing else. Kenney (2002) did not conduct a random sample study to avoid any potential bias towards certain groups or subgroups of individuals.

We expect and understand that a secondary victim may be uncomfortable with being labelled as a deviant. It was not identified if the secondary victim was unhappy with their secondary victim label (Kenney, 2002). Kenney's (2002) results did not examine if a secondary victim perceived him/herself as a primary victim. Kenney's (2002) results suggest controversy with respects to the social labels and social reactions on victims rather than their internal reaction to their victim label. Perhaps additional research can be conducted on the victim's internalization and controversy over a secondary victim status, and how they view themselves as a victim.

Melendez, et al. (2016) conducted a study that examined the mothers of mass murders in order to understand if these women have been subjected to public blame after the attacks at Columbine high school and Sandy Hook elementary school. The authors assert that the families of the Columbine and Sandy Hook shooters were publicly blamed for how they raised their sons. The mothers of the perpetrators were portrayed as failures due to their sons' actions (Melendez et al., 2016). Melendez et al. (2016) took a theoretical approach to understand the nature of the public's responses to the mothers of the Columbine and Sandy Hook shooters as posted on social media sites to perform a content analysis.

Melendez et al. (2016) analyzed thousands of public comments and posts on the internet related to the mass shootings at Columbine and Sandy Hook. After the initial examination of the comments and posts, Melendez et al. (2016) isolated 300 comments related to fault, and placed each comment in one of five categories: fault, family blame, family sympathy, mother and fathers. Melendez's et al. (2016) analysis for the shooter of the Columbine family, it showed that "fault" received 42.5% of the blame; while the Sandy Hook Newtown's family's "fault" received 57.7% of the blame. In the case of the Columbine shooting, 25 of the comments that were assigned to family blame, 13 of those were generalized. However, the remaining 12 posts assigned the sole responsibility and blame to Susan Klebold, the mother of the shooter, while no one assigned blame to Tom Klebold, the father of the shooter. Thus, 48% (12) of the blame was assigned to the mother, and 0% (0) was assigned to the father. Melendez's et al. (2016) results of Newtown aligned with their Columbine results. With 71 responses categorized as "family blame," 7 were generalized, while 64 responses assigned sole blame and responsibility to Nancy Lanza, the mother of the shooter, while no blame was assigned to Peter Lanza, the father of the shooter. Thus, 91% (12) of the blame was assigned to the mother, and 0% (0) was assigned to the father. Out of the 96 responses categorized as "family blame," for both Columbine and New Town, not one response referred to the father and blame.

Chapter 2.5: Effects Secondary Victims Experience from the Event

To understand the emotional experiences and bereavement process of secondary victims, Morrall, Hazelton, and Shackleton (2011) examined the impacts that homicides from a school shooting have on the families, friends, and acquaintances of the primary victims. These authors assert that homicide causes a great deal of emotional distress on the victims and affects the victims' families, friends, and close acquaintances. Morrall et al. (2011) argue that secondary victims receive little to no specialist support from health professionals.

Jordan (2003) attempts to understand what victims of school shootings experience as a result of their trauma and recovery, and the effect the shootings have on their families. Jordan (2003) tries to identify victims' cognitive, psychological, and behavioural responses, while observing if victims and their families are experiencing any psychological needs. Jordan (2003) argues that catastrophic school shootings have long-term effects on both the victims and their families. The severity and length of the ramifications of events will be dependent on the individual's internal resources, such as problem solving, resilience, past experiences, exposure to violence, spiritual beliefs, and psychological and physical health.

Further, Morrall et al. (2011) demonstrate that secondary victimization applies to the families, friends, and acquaintances of the primary victim. The authors claim that secondary victimization may also be applied to criminal perpetrators if they suffer from mental illness. These perpetrators may be killers, but they can also be victims of mental illness which led to the criminal act. The perpetrators' families, friends, and acquaintances are considered secondary victims as well.

Experiencing emotional distress as the result of witnessing a school shooting is normal. The victims may experience severe personal suffering caused by the crime. The severity of

personal suffering can be linked to the witnesses' attachment to and value of the primary victim, as well as his/her cultural background. Morrall et al. (2011) conclude that there are common stages of bereavement that include denial, anxiety, depression, shock, confusion, isolation, helplessness, blame, guilt, fear, grief, a sense of emptiness, and vengeance. A secondary victim may suffer from severe bereavement or posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) as a result of his/her victim experience. The term 'devastation' has been linked to the majority of families, friends, and acquaintances of the primary homicide victim. Experiencing devastation has been applied to individuals who did not know the primary victim. These strangers experienced devastation as a sense of guilt, as they were unable to prevent the victimization.

Finally, some victims have experienced psychological distress, reporting that many areas of their normal lives were disrupted by guilt when they previously felt happiness in their lives (Morrall et al., 2011). Victims have experienced cognitive, psychological, and behavioural issues as a result of the school shootings. The victims' psychological responses include confusion, irritability, anger, numbing, frustration, guilt, depression, anxiety, helplessness, and unpredictability. A victim's emotional state can change over time based on his/her support system and emotional strength. The psychological needs reported were a persistent need for safety, trust, intimacy, and control in their lives (Jordan, 2003).

Acquaintances, strangers, and community members reported having support networks available to them as a form of community assistance. These individuals may not have known the primary victim as the family and friends did, yet other individuals still provided them with support and sympathy. Morrall et al. (2011) note that school shootings are heavily publicized by the media.; as a consequence, some community members have reported that the media coverage

damaged their community. Perhaps it was seen to damage their reputation as a safe community (Morrall et al., 2011).

Morrall et al. (2011) argue that PTSD does not apply when secondary and tertiary victims are involved with a school shooting, as they may not have been present during the attack. In part, the symptomology of PTSD does not apply to secondary victims of homicide. This does not coincide with the definition of secondary victim, and as such, Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), cannot suffer from PTSD. Regardless of the symptomology, health professionals regularly diagnose secondary victims of school shooting homicides with PTSD; perhaps this is a mere oversight on their part. However, the diagnosis of PTSD can be applied to frontline personnel as this aligns with the symptomology and characteristics of PTSD presented by Jordan (2003). Perhaps additional research needs to be conducted in regards to the application of PTSD and secondary victimization.

The study presented by Jordan (2003) extends its limitations on to this study, as Jordan's (2003) respondents were not randomly selected. It was the intention of the researchers to gain information and ask exact questions of secondary victims only. The respondents were chosen based on their secondary status resulting from different school shootings. The locations of the school shootings were primarily populated in the suburbs with white middle-class individuals. Therefore, Jordan's (2003) results are skewed by the lack of cultural and socio-economic factors under consideration.

Chapter 2.6: Mother Blaming—A Feminist Critique

The evolutionally perspective on gender and culture is an influential topic in 21st-century feminist research (Renzetti & Curran, 1999; Melendez et al., 2016; Lee, Colditz, Berkman, & Kawachi, 2003). The social and cultural status of women and mothers has been linked to the Man the Hunter theory—the fallacious idea that social inequality attached to femininity and masculinity in modern Westernized industrial societies is based on the reality of the prehistoric past (Renzetti & Curran, 1999). Man the Hunter theory maintains the idea that the contemporary Western conception of gender was formulated on the prehistoric notion that women were dependent on men for food and protection while they maintained the “burdens of pregnancy” (Renzetti & Curran, 1999, p.54). Man the Hunter theory implies, wrongly, that women are primarily responsible for child care as a sort of natural, and even evolutionary fact. In conjunction with notion that women were used for procreation, they were charged with the duties of maintaining their home and caring for their offspring, women are burdened with the sole responsibility of raising their children. (Renzetti & Curran, 1999; Melendez et al., 2016; Lee, Colditz, Berkman, & Kawachi, 2003). Historically, and inaccurately supported, women are viewed as responsible for the raising of their children, and a such become responsible for their actions.

Man the Hunter theory has supported inequality based on our evolutionally perspective that has influenced the social, economic and political response to women on account of their role as sole caregivers. Man the Hunter theory is a clear example that indicates gender inequality of how modern Westernized industrial societies are susceptible to making women responsible for the actions of their children. Feminist scholars have debunked the role of women in the Man the Hunter theory: arguing that women were actively involved within their communities, dating back

to the prehistoric era. Hunter Gatherer theory, by contrast, suggests women were providers for their families, and a division of labour between men and women was necessary for survival. Matriarchs are the head of the family in many communities and cultures (Renzetti & Curran, 1999; Cohen, & Somerville, 1990; Suryadi, 2009). Nodding (1998) asserts that motherhood is a basic relation and should not be seen as a role within society. Subjecting women to the Victorian roles of mothering undermines their individuality, which may lead to an unequal social predisposition against mothers.

Feminist perspectives within criminology are relatively new; feminism began to gain an influence in the social sciences in the 1960s (Heidensohn, 1968; Heidensohn, 2012). Since the rise in feminist criminology, feminist scholars on a global level have provided research on gender and crime which has been internationally influential. International agencies such as the United Nations have collected data from scholarly research for the comparison of rates of crime such as sexual assault, trafficking for sexual purposes and domestic violence. The collected data has provided information that recognized women can be perpetrators and victims (Heidensohn, 2012). The contribution of feminist criminology has been the development of feminist perspectives on the understanding of women as victims, including women's experiences in the criminal courts, domestic violence, women in the work force and gender roles (Heidensohn, 2012; Renzetti & Curran, 1999; Cohen, & Somerville, 1990; Suryadi, 2009; Nodding, 1998).

Women in the twenty-first century have experienced an immense amount of social and gender equality. This is particularly true for women who hold full-time jobs while raising dependent children (Pickett, 2017; Dillaway & Paré, 2008). Women are still faced with adversity and inequality even though they are considered to be equal to men in most parts of the Westernized world (Okin, 2013). Gender inequality and sexism against women has been strongly

correlated with the increasing presence of women in the work force. Women who work are often seen as abandoning their dependent children without a stay-at-home mother and as a result, they are blamed for their children's indiscretions and delinquency (Pickett, 2017; Dillaway & Paré, 2008; Blair-Loy, 2009).

Pickett (2017) took a feminist approach to examine the blame subjected on maternal employment as a root cause of youthful offending and delinquency. The author took a quantitative approach in order to understand if there was an increase in delinquency in households with employed mothers. Using data from registered American voters ($N = 10,144$), Pickett (2017) was able to examine the public's current views on maternal employment promotes juvenile delinquency. Similarly, Kafka (2008) conducted a study surrounding the authority of motherhood and the increasing belief that the United States was at the onset of a juvenile delinquency crisis dating back to 1950's. During the 1950's women held authoritative positions over children; for the most part, women were the caregivers for their children at home, or held an occupation that utilized their maternal instinct, like that of an educator. Kafka (2008) attempts to examine the widespread belief that inadequate mothering causes youth delinquency. The author argues juvenile crime and social deviance in the educational system increased in the post war era due to the increasing presence of women in the workforce, even in maternal positions.

Pickett's (2017) results suggest that only a small minority of Americans blamed maternal employment for juvenile crime. The results do, however, indicate that employment, gender, religion, political stance and education are significant predictors in determining the public's view on whether or not maternal employment promotes juvenile delinquency. Pickett's (2017) findings were that individuals who hold a full-time position are significantly less likely to believe that maternal employment causes juvenile crime and delinquency. Males were 49% more likely

than females to believe that maternal employment causes youthful offending and delinquency. Individuals who experienced religious re-birth were significantly more likely to believe that maternal employment causes juvenile crime and delinquency, though no specific faith was mentioned. Conservatism was significantly more likely to influence the belief that maternal employment causes juvenile crime and delinquency. Individuals with a higher level of education were significantly less likely to believe maternal employment causes juvenile crime and delinquency.

The implications of Pickett's (2017) findings suggest that, overall, mothers are blamed for maternal employment when they fail to provide their children with adequate moral instruction. The social implications of this notion include the suggestion that mothers who are unable to provide their children with adequate moral regimens, 'must' have their children removed in order to provide them with "moral training" (p.274). Pickett (2017) found that only 12% of American citizens blamed maternal employment on juvenile crime and delinquency. Finally, Pickett (2017) assert views of the criminogenic consequences of maternal employment are contingent on three factors: an individual's gender role; socialization to equal rights; and hostility towards cultural practices.

Kafka (2008) examined if policy makers and social commentators had directly or indirectly blamed mothers for the notion that the post-1950 period was characterized by a crisis-level increase in youth crime. By doing so, Kafka (2008) argues that these policy makers minimized economic and structural explanations as to why there may be an increase in youth delinquency among disenfranchised minority youth in the United States. During the 1950s, educators characterized difficult children as suffering from social, emotional or psychological disorders that developed at home, thus blaming mothers for their difficult

children. Yet, educational systems have also been seen as the root cause of the same problems educators argue came from the child's home, in the sense that schools can themselves cause the very same social issues mothers and fathers may inflict, such as not providing the child with the attention he or she requires. A teacher could very well inflict psychological, emotional and social issues similar to an overwhelmed or incompetent mother. Blaming mothers of children deemed difficult by their teachers serves to justify the growing issue surrounding youth delinquency in the classroom while rationalizing away the fact that a disproportionate number of those youth were from a low economic status or minority homes. The overall results of Kafka's (2008) study suggest that educational segregation that was the foundation of gender ideology and racism in the 1950s. Kafka's (2008) study provides an understanding of social processes and problems that have shaped the way educators and policy makers justify educational structures, practices and policies, that in turn have been blamed on deficiencies of maternal parenting.

Dillaway and Paré (2008) conducted a study to examine the social implications of mothers who hold a full-time position compared to stay-at-home mothers. Dillaway and Paré (2008) suggest there are social implications on how the public refers to each class of mother. A stay-at-home mother has been referred to as a "full time" mother who prioritizes her children as first and. By comparison, a working mother is "part time," only acting as caregiver a few hours a day when she returns home, and thus does not prioritize her children; women who choose to perform paid work were often referred to as "antihome" (p.446). As Dillaway and Paré (2008) note, the public may view working mothers as paying less attention to their dependant children, and thus neglectful in nature, regardless of the lack of evidence to support such an inference. Though these claims are broadly subjective and argumentative; some research, such as Garbarino and Haslam's (2005) study, has argued that parents who are not actively involved in their children's

school programs may cause their children to be “lost” (p.447) and violent, or to adopt the typology of a school shooter (Langman, 2009). Working mothers are often viewed as feminists who choose paid work outside of their homes. They can be seen as “lesser mothers” (Dillaway & Paré, 2008, p.446), and this, some current studies attempt to prove, is one of the root causes for why their children become aggressive school shooters (Langman, 2009).

Dillaway and Paré (2008) argue that there are negative connotations to both working mothering and stay-at-home mothering. This is part of a personal and cultural discourse that reaches into family’s lives and identities. Similarly, dominant ideologies praise the role of the father as a male who should go out and provide for his family rather than a take on the role of caregiver. Dillaway and Paré (2008) note that the construction of a mother caregiver versus a father caregiver, is oversimplified compared to the complexities of paid work and parenting, which does not allow for individuality or circumstances.

Zimmerman, Aberle, Krafchick and Harvey (2008) examined the social expectations of motherhood within Western societies by deconstructing the ideal mother. The authors note that working mothers have been blamed for numerous social problems while many of the social issues around working families have been ignored. Zimmerman et al (2008) describe the notion of the “Mommy Wars” (p. 203), working mothers pitted socially against stay-at-home mothers to determine the best option for raising and caring for their children without causing any social, cognitive or psychological impairment as the result of their maternal status. The authors assert that contrasting views on mothers have only diverted attention away from the actual social problems surrounding working parents and raising children. Thus, western society blames mothers for their children’s negative discretions rather than examining current social problems such as gender and racial equality, affordable health care, quality

childcare, the roles of a father, roles in parenting, media effects, fair wages and benefits, and family dynamics.

Supporting Dillaway and Paré's (2008) conclusions on maternal employment, Zimmerman et al. (2008) argue that maternal employment is a current cultural and political debate in the Western world. Zimmerman et al. (2008) argue that, universally, the media portrays an average mother as a white affluent heterosexual who harms her children by not staying at home. Research for the past 50 years indicates otherwise, and Zimmerman et al. (2008) concluded their study by suggesting that maternal employment is more beneficial to all parties involved, noting that daughters of employed mothers achieve higher academic success, and greater occupational commitment in more non-traditional career choices. Furthermore, employed mothers tend to be less depressed and have higher morale than stay-at home mothers (Hoffman & Youngblade, 1999). The positive well-being of employed working class mothers is associated with positive parenting styles, involved fathers, and higher academic and social achievement by their children.

Though the research indicates full-time maternal employment has a positive effect on family outcomes, research on the effects of maternal employment on children of employed single mothers is scarce and the statistics are predominately of African-American communities. Despite the outcomes of maternal employment, employed mothers are still responsible for the majority of childcare, and they are in turn blamed for the actions of their children. As literature on maternal employment of single mothers are scarce, this paper should provide a benefit in examining two mothers, Monique Lépine and Laurel Harper, both employed full time single mothers with confirmed mass murders as their children (Lépine, 2008; Healy, McIntire & Turkewitz, 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). However, the feminist approach by Zimmerman et al (2008), Dillaway and Paré (2008),

Kafka (2008) and Pickett, (2017) lacks the critique on the social blame subjected on both maternal and paternal caregivers; rather, they focused on just maternal blame.

Jackson and Mannix (2004) provide a qualitative feminist approach to examine mother blaming as a narrative. Jackson and Mannix (2004) argue that blaming mothers complicates the complex responsibilities that comprise mothering. The authors attempt to gain insight into the nature of mother blaming, the effects mother blaming has on these women and the implications of providing support to these women. The result from Jackson and Mannix's (2004) narratives on mother blaming aligns with previous research that reveals persistent discourse of mother blaming.

Out of the 125 studied examined, Jackson and Mannix (2004) identified 72 ramifications that were attributed to mother blaming, including tantrums, fetishism, frigidity, incest, schizophrenia, transsexualism, and delinquency. None of the studies examined by Jackson and Mannix (2004) provided a positive outlook towards mothers and their children, and fathers were blamed whenever mothers were not.

Jackson and Mannix's (2004) analysis of mother blaming found the discourse surrounding mothers so negative they were even blamed if the child was abused by someone in the home who was not their mother. It was seen that a good mother would have known their child was being abused and had the power to have stopped the abuse. Additional discourse emerging from the literature portrays mothers of abused children as being failures in their maternal and marriage roles. Mothers of perpetrators were subject to blame on account of perceptions they did not sufficiently provide their children with a nurturing environment. If the perpetrators commit parricide, mothers were blamed, and in some cases, it was suggested some kind of abuse had taken place when the child was raised. Even where the fathers were

killed by their children, their mothers were seen a culpable or blamed for being helpless, weak and passive.

The mothers of school shooters, specifically Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) Roberts (2015), Sandhu Laurel Harper (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) are highly educated employed women with full time positions in the work force. I will examine the full-time careers and parenting styles of each mother, and the extent to which they have been subject to deviant labeling. The following sections I provide an overview of each mother's case study. Then, I discuss the methodology used within this paper and how it may apply to secondary victims, in this case, mothers of shooters. Finally, I will provide an extensive overview of results and data of this research paper.

Chapter 3: Case Study—a Mother’s Story

To provide a general background on some secondary victims, the autobiographies of Sue Klebold, Monique Lépine and Terri Roberts were analyzed, while news reports and interviews were examined for Parvinder Sandhu and Laurel Harper in order to provide a case study on these women’s status as secondary victims. The authors and mother’s testimonies provide insight as to how they had been labelled and treated as victims. Though these autobiographies and interviews are not scholarly literature, the data collected by analyzing these authors’ testimonies will provide an understanding as to what some victims go through once a label has been imposed on them (Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017).

Chapter 3.1: Sue Klebold

Sue Klebold is the mother of Dylan Klebold, one of the two shooters who targeted Columbine High School in Columbine, Colorado, on April 20, 1999. The event left 15 individuals dead; 13 were the primary victims and two were the shooters. This particular event shocked the world, and thus victimized a large number of individuals (Klebold, 2016). Sue Klebold experienced a tremendous amount of pain, suffering and victimization. After killing five individuals Dylan Klebold shot and killed himself, meaning that Sue Klebold lost her son to suicide the day of the massacre. Sue Klebold was left with support from her husband Tom, and her oldest son, Byron. Sue and Tom Klebold were devoted parents to both children, though their oldest son Byron required more attention on account his substance abuse to marijuana in his late teens.

Sue Klebold blames herself for not noticing what Dylan had been going through. Sue Klebold asserts that Dylan was a normal teenage boy who loved to read, play baseball and spend time with his family and friends. After the massacre, Sue Klebold became aware that Dylan was a victim of bullying while he attended Columbine High School as a student. Sue Klebold was not aware that Dylan was suffering with depression in silence, or that he had been prescribed antidepressants and was consuming heavy amounts of alcohol to ease his symptoms. Sue Klebold saw her family as a regular American household. Before the shooting, Dylan had found his own apartment and a new job, while Dylan was getting ready to attend postsecondary education. Both Sue and Tom Klebold held stable careers in order to provide for their children; Tom Klebold worked from home while Sue Klebold worked at a community college in downtown Denver, Colorado. It was not until April 20th, 1999, when their lives would change forever and Sue Klebold became a secondary victim of a school shooting homicide.

Chapter 3.2: Monique Lépine

Monique Lépine is the mother of Marc Lépine, the shooter at École Polytechnique in Montreal, Quebec, on December 6, 1989. This massacre left 14 young women dead before Marc Lépine turned his gun on himself. The shooting left behind hundreds of victims, including Lépine (Lépine, 2008). Monique Lépine was a career orientated mother working as registered nurse in Quebec, Canada. Shortly after the birth of her son and daughter, Marc and Nadia, Monique divorced her husband, alleging domestic abuse. As a single mother, Monique Lépine was forced to send her children to stay with friends and family in order to go to work. Monique Lépine only saw her children on the weekends until they were able to take care of themselves. Monique Lépine considered Marc to be a regular young adult who enjoyed his movies, friends

and books; she was unaware that Marc was angry with her as a mother, disliked women, longed for love and hated his sister.

While Marc and Nadia were growing up, Monique Lépine brought different men to her apartment for sexual encounters (Lépine, 2008). After her divorce, Monique Lépine described her love life as complex; she dated a lot and took part in adultery and fornication with married men. At the time, Monique Lépine did not pay much attention to how her children would react to different men entering their lives. Monique Lépine believes that her promiscuity may be the link to how Marc viewed women. Seven years after the École Polytechnique massacre, Monique Lépine's daughter, Nadia, passed away from a drug overdose; she was unable to cope with what her brother, Marc, had done. As a woman of God, Monique Lépine took to her faith and turned to her religious community for support and strength (Lépine, 2008).

Chapter 3.3: Terri Roberts

Terri Roberts is the mother of Charlie Roberts, the shooter who entered the Nickel Mines Amish school house in Lancaster, Pennsylvania on October 2nd 2006 and shot ten young girls, killing five. Terri and her Husband, Chuck Roberts, lived a quiet life in the countryside in a predominately Amish community. Though the Roberts family were not Amish, many of their close neighbours, friends and clients were. Terri Roberts and her husband have four sons: their oldest son, Charlie; their second son, Josh; their third son, Zach; and their youngest son, Jon. In addition, they had eleven grandchildren and four daughters-in-law (Roberts, 2015). Terri and Chuck Roberts thought their life was going according to their plan, Terri Roberts worked a full-time job, while her husband, a retired police officer, ran his own business. Their sons, who had homes and families of their own, stayed in contact and attended church with their mother when

they could. Terri Roberts was unaware that her son was suffering from severe depression and hatred after Charlie and his wife Marie, suffered the loss of their two daughters through two miscarriages. On October 2nd 2006, Charlie Roberts saw his two oldest children off to school, and told his wife he had a work appointment he needed to attend. Leaving his wife and youngest child, Roberts drove to the school house. Once a twenty-year old teacher granted him access, Roberts forced the teacher, the older female students and all the male students out of the building, leaving behind the younger female students. Charlie Roberts then began shooting, leaving behind a suicide note addressed to his family. Terri Roberts still tries to grapple with the news of her son and the devastation of a school shooting homicide caused by her son Charlie, who had never committed a crime, and who held a stable job to support his wife and three children. Terri Roberts became a secondary victim when her son took the lives of five innocent girls in the Nickle Mine Amish school house (Roberts, 2015).

Chapter 3.4: Parvinder Sandhu

Parvinder Sandhu is the mother of Kimveer Gill, the shooter who entered Dawson College, D'enseignement Général et Professionnel in Montreal, Canada, On September 13th, 2006 and began shooting, injuring 16 individuals and killing one female student before taking his own life (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006). Prior to the shooting, Sandhu and her husband Gurinder Gill immigrated from India to start a new life, where they had three children, Kimveer Gill and their twin boys. Parvinder Sandhu asserts that Kimveer Gill had a regular childhood and enjoyed watching *Mr. Dress Up*, *Sesame Street*, *The Flintstones* and playing with blocks and toys. Parvinder Sandhu notes that Kimveer Gill was advanced as child: he began to speak and walk at a young age and took on the responsibilities of older brother as a toddler. Parvinder

Sandhu was upset to see that her son, Kimveer Gill, was not advancing as an adult: he could not hold down a job, he had issues with women, suffered severe mood changes, and began to drink heavily. Parvinder Sandhu was not aware that Kimveer Gill was suffering from depression and was obsessed with guns and violence, although she believes this may have been the reason why he went on a shooting spree.

Chapter 3.5: Laurel Harper

Laurel Harper is the mother of Christopher Harper-Mercer, the man who entered Umpqua community college in Portland, Oregon on October 1st, 2015 with an arsenal of guns and injured eight individuals and killed nine before encountering with the police and killing himself (Healy, McIntire & Turkewitz, 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). Laurel Harper was a single mother and the sole provider for her son. Working as a Registered Practical Nurse, Laurel Harper devoted the majority of her time to her son, who she claims had Asperger syndrome, a developmental disorder on the Autism spectrum (Healy et al, 2015). In her spare time, Laurel Harper used her account and influence on Yahoo Answers to help others with medical questions, and also to bring awareness to Autism and Asperger Syndrome. Laurel Harper claims that she was unaware of the personal stress her son was going through because she considered it to be symptoms of his Autism. She was, however, aware that he was obsessed with firearms and ammunition. Laurel Harper shared this obsession, claimed that most issues can be resolved with a firearm, and publicly supported the rights to own and carry any and all firearms. At 26 years of age, Christopher Harper-Mercer was a recluse who had difficulties with Asperger syndrome, and stayed close to his apartment, which was owned by his mother, before she became a secondary victim.

Chapter 4: Methodology—a Content Analysis

To understand the labels and ramifications that mothers of school shooting homicide perpetrators experience, a content analysis was utilized to quantify large amounts of secondary data, and to bridge similar themes and concepts within the literature. In this paper I examine available public resources, including the autobiographies of Sue Klebold, *A Mother's Reckoning: Living in the Aftermath of Tragedy* (2016); Monique Lépine, *Aftermath*; (2008) and Terri Roberts, *Forgiven: The Amish School Shooting, a Mother's Love, and a Story of Remarkable Grace* (2015).

Not all mothers of school shooters are able to write an autobiography in relation to the effects of the shootings. Their stories can be found in articles such as the Canadian Broadcast Company's (CBC) *Dawson victim's family rejects meeting with shooter's mom* (CBC, 2007); The Globe and Mail's *Kimveer Gill*; the Montreal Gazette's *KIMVEER GILL family, friends grieve a 'gentle soul'—and ask themselves what went wrong I those final months and 'I wish we would have known'* (Montreal Gazette, 2006), were utilized to analyze Parvinder Sandhu's story. For Laurel Harper's story, the articles: *The New York Times Oregon killers Mother Wrote of Troubled Son and Gun Rights* (Healy et al., 2015); *Los Angeles Times here I am, 26, with no friends, no job, no girlfriend: Shooters manifesto offers cues to 2015 Oregon College rampage* (Castillo & Watts, 2015); and *CNN's organ shooters mom made online posts about son guns and Asperger's* were analyzed (Castillo & Watts, 2015).

The respondents Sue Klebold, Monique Lépine, and Terri Roberts were chosen because they had written autobiographies readily-available in local bookstores in which they describe their victim experience. Each respondent was well-known as the mother of a school shooter whose son committed suicide after the event. In order to expand on my research, I needed additional respondents; as such, I examined supplementary school shootings in both Canada and

the United States. The additional cases of mothers of school shooters had to include their victim experience. In addition, the respondent's sons had to be deceased in order to secure consistency and accuracy throughout this study. Based on these restrictions, I was able to utilize Parvinder Sandhu and Laurel Harper's victim experiences, as portrayed in news media.

The authors' autobiographies and media interviews provide an examination of these mothers' lives before and after their son's shootings. In this study, I incorporate articles that provide a theoretical understanding of a victim's status by examining the possible outcomes that directly or indirectly affect their lives. By doing so, we can understand the potential negative or positive ramifications of being labelled as a victim, whether they transpired immediately, or years after.

Researchers and scholars attempt to provide accurate information on a victim's experience based on a school shooting homicide (Morrall et al., 2011). For the purpose of providing a thorough and detailed research paper, in this study, I analyze some of the existing scholarly literature pertaining to survivors of school shooting homicides. The literature included in this study examines why labels are placed on secondary victims of school shooting homicides. The secondary data provides a glimpse into how victims have dealt with, and are dealing with, their current labels, and how it has affected them as individuals. With the use of Klebold's (2016), Lépine's (2008) and Roberts's (2015) autobiographies and the news reports and interviews with Parvinder Sandhu and Laurel Harper (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), I was able to bridge similar themes and concepts within the literature on their victim status and their labels to which they were subjected. By doing so, I was able to conclude whether or not the mothers held sole blame and responsibility for their son's actions, or if the fathers had also been the subject of parental blame. By examining what victims have endured, I was able to examine if these individuals have

experienced specific ramifications after the shootings and labels the public has subjected a victim to.

After analyzing each autobiography and news report about the mothers, I was able to find similar themes between them that aligned with Becker's (1963/1991) notion surrounding deviance: each mother was subjected to labeling and negative and positive effects from the shootings. Once the data was collected, the statements described in Klebold's (2016), Lépine's (2008), Roberts's (2015) autobiographies and in Sandhu's and Harper's testimonies in the media were transferred verbatim and entered into a word processor, Microsoft Word. The data collected were based on what Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Sandhu and Harper had to say in regards to the public viewed their victim experiences (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). Each mother presented testimonies and experiences in their autobiographies and interviews that had the public question their motives and status. These five victims testified to being labeled by the public and enduring specific ramifications based on their circumstances after their sons became murderers. I was able to create two groups: their labels and their effects from the event. These women provided clear examples of labeling and enduring specific ramifications. Because their experiences were described in such depth and detail, I provided five subcategories under the labeling category so that I was able to organize their detailed experiences under the labels they experienced.

The data were categorized into two headings: category one, *the effects secondary victims experience from the event*; and category two, *the labels applied to secondary victims*. Within these two categories, the data was further condensed for optimum results. The subcategories under category two, *the labels applied to secondary victims*, were listed as: the interaction with their families and the public; their grieving labels; and their deviant status that examined mother blaming, and their interaction with the police. Once the data were collected, they were analyzed

and compared to the current data from previous scholarly literature to test if the application of Becker's (1963/1991) labelling theory was plausible.

This research builds upon and fills in the gaps on the limited research that currently exists. The intention of this study is to determine correlations between the personal responses the victims have endured since the initial event. Subsequently, I hope to explain the possible ramifications that result from their labels. In the following section, I will provide an extensive overview of the results and data of this research.

Chapter 5: Presentation of the Data

Chapter 5.1: The Effects Secondary Victims Experience from the Event

The secondary victims of school shooting homicides have sociological, psychological, and cognitive complications (Morrall et al., 2011). Regardless of the victim's status, an individual who becomes a victim of a traumatic event is at increased risk for anxiety disorders. Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) was a diagnosis Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) experienced. It is common for individuals suffering from PTSD to experience persistent symptoms, including, hypersomnia, insomnia, irritability, anger, hypervigilance, and inability to finish tasks (Morrall et al., 2011). Sue Klebold, Monique Lépine and Terri Roberts experienced PTSD in the form of insomnia, irritability with others, and the inability to attend work (Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008; Roberts, 2015).

In addition to PTSD, the results suggest that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), were exposed to the event and suffered from behavioural, psychological, and cognitive complications, which aligns with Jordan's (2003) and Morrall et al.'s (2011) research. As a result of behavioral complications, Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) were at higher risk of suffering from relationship problems, disruption of intimacy, divorce, destructive behaviour, higher rates of domestic violence, suicidal tendencies, avoidance, and over- or under-reacting to specific situations (Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008; Roberts, 2015; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017). Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) have experienced relationship problems with their significant others. Sue Klebold (2016) and her husband, Tom, divorced after 43 years of marriage. They were unable to handle the stress of what their son had done. Monique Lépine

(2008) has had multiple sexual partners but has been unable to find “true love” (p. 95) in her life; suggesting this was a result of her son’s actions. These cognitive responses can be seen in the form of short-term memory loss, a change in their personal values and beliefs, and lacking a sense of security in the world around them. Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) are religious women, after the massacres each questioned their belief system and their personal value as parents. The psychological reaction from all five (5) mothers included feelings of helplessness, fear, and constant worrying that the event would be replicated. Monique Lépine was in constant fear that her son would return from the dead and kill her (Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008; Jordan, 2003; Morrall et al., 2011).

In addition to experiencing behavioural, psychological, and cognitive complications, four (4) of the mothers: Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) reported having been affected by physical complications related to stress, such as headaches, nausea, intestinal issues, weight loss, and breast cancer. Sandhu was suffering from breast cancer during the event, Roberts had been in remission but experienced a recurrence of her breast cancer after the shooting and Sue Klebold was diagnosed with breast cancer after the Columbine shooting (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017; Roberts, 2015; Klebold, 2016). In conjunction with experiencing emotional and physical distress, the victims have been labelled as emotionally deviant, which aligns with Becker’s (1963/1991) deviant behaviour theory. Negative public social reaction and subjection to new labels has resulted in further distress and self-destructive behaviour for these mothers and their families (Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008; Jordan, 2003; Morrall et al., 2011).

Chapter 5.2: Labels Applied to Secondary Victims

The results from the content analysis indicate that secondary victims of school shooting homicides face a public reaction and response. There are significant results in respect to how secondary victims acknowledge and respond to their labels. Furthermore, the results indicate that the mothers of school shooters are subjected to labelling as deviants and as unworthy victims, and are thus blamed for their sons' actions.

Chapter 5.2.1: Outsiders—Their interaction with the public and their families.

Chapter 5.2.1.1: *Outsiders—Their interaction with the public.* The public has a positive outlook towards secondary victims of school shooting homicides (Klebold, 2016; Kenney, 2002). Secondary victims usually receive a sympathetic social response from close friends and strangers of the primary victims. Secondary victims have reported access to helpful resources such as emotional support, visitation, delegation of responsibilities, communication with others, and the ability for others to acknowledge and understand subtle social cues for when they need support (Kenney, 2002).

Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) describe their situation after returning home on the night of their sons' massacres. Klebold's (2016), Lépine's (2008), and Roberts' (2015) stories align with Kenney's (2002) results of a sympathetic social response. The results from Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) suggest that their families experienced a sympathetic social response from strangers. Sue Klebold and her husband Tom were unable to return home the night of their son's shooting. Instead, they were forced to ask friends to take

them in. As the Klebolds fled their home without notice, their friends wanted to show their support, as Sue Klebold (2016) describes:

Even before we left Dawn and Ruth's, our long-time friends and neighbors closed ranks around us. The newspaper ran a photograph of our friends hanging a poster on the gate at the front of our driveway: Sue and Tom, we love you, we're here for you, CALL US. The sight of those familiar, dear faces felt like a radio free Europe message transmitted across enemy lines. The memory of so many kindnesses both large and small humbles me to this day. (p. 48)

Monique Lépine (2008) was also forced to go into hiding after her son's shooting at École Polytechnique. Monique Lépine (2008) was forced to ask her pastor, a friend, if she could stay with him, as she notes:

The man I had woken with my phone call only minutes earlier stood calmly next to his wife in the front hallway of their home, both of them wrapped in their dressing gowns. He took me in his arms and hugged me close, saying in the compassionate tone of voice: "Poor Monique!" (p. 15)

The testimonies from Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) suggest that they knew they were going to face hostility and mistreatment from members of the public if they stayed home. Though they were met with support from some of their friends, Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) attempted to remove themselves from the public eye after the shootings.

Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) later reported experiencing incredible emotional support and understanding from few acquaintances and strangers just days after the shootings.

Klebold (2016) recalls an incident when a complete stranger ran towards her to provide emotional support:

As it happened, I had nothing to worry about. The petite woman threw her arms around me. She told me she had raised boys, and she knew how unbelievably stupid they can be. It was a sentiment many, many mothers would share with me over the years. Though I towered over her, I let her hold me while I sobbed, soaking both of us with many tears. Later I realized I didn't even know her name. That woman was not the only person to show her generosity. (p. 47)

Lépine (2008) had also experienced support from complete strangers after the shooting. Shortly after the École Polytechnique massacre, she received a call from Quebec's Minister of Justice, Gil Rémillard. A complete stranger to Lépine, Gil Rémillard offered her his support, as she describes:

In a calm, reassuring voice, he advised me not to carry the entire burden of this tragedy on my own shoulders. "Madame, you must not hold yourself solely responsible for this." He also said that I, too, was a victim of this crime: in fact, he was the only one to say so at the time. These words of support gave me a renewed strength, even as I felt a fresh surge of emotion. Before I hung up, on the verge of tears, I made a single request: "I beg you, please tell the victims' families that I ask for their forgiveness on behalf of my son." (p. 26)

Like Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) also described remarkable interactions with strangers, the family of the primary victims within Amish community. During the funeral procession of Terri Roberts's (2015) son, Charlie Roberts, the Amish community and the families of the primary victims intervened to protect the Roberts family during their final goodbye to their son. Demonstrating complete compassion and forgiveness, the Amish community blocked news reporters from intruding on Charlie Roberts' funeral. Terri Roberts (2015) described the incident:

We are still following my son's casket what another miracle unfolded. It was not a surprise. We were alerted the evening before at that we could expect it. But that such a thing could even occur was in itself a miracle of forgiveness and grace. From behind a long, white shed emerged a group of at least thirty black-clad Amish, the men in their tall, wide-brimmed hats, the women in white bonnets. As we reach the gravesite next to the pink heart-shaped tombstone of Charlie's own firstborn, Elise Victoria, the group fanned out into the Crescent between the gravesite and the road turn backs offering a solid wall of black to the media cameras beyond the security barricade. (p.129)

Further support for the Roberts family was shown by complete strangers of the victims, as Terri Roberts (2015) notes:

More than a hundred cards came from the Amish families. The most precious mail we received was a handbook that held letter and hand-drawn pictures from family members adults and children—of the Amish community from across the Strasburg areas. The letters showered us with encouragement and love. That book remains one of the most treasured possessions. (p.150)

The results from the testimonies of Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) do not indicate the presence of social hostility. These women instead became self-established outsiders who intentionally hid themselves away out of fear of percussion from the public. Although Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), and Roberts assert they were faced with social opposition at times, they also experienced a significant amount of compassion from strangers and friends, regardless of their outsider status. In addition to support and even understanding, in some cases strangers provided them with reasoning and rationalization for their sons' actions.

The results from the news reports for Laurel Harper indicated that only one individual spoke kindly of her and her son, Christopher Harper-Mercer, while other individuals interviewed by the reporters spoke poorly about their interactions with her (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). Healy et al. (2015) noted in the article *Oregon Killer's Mother Wrote of Troubled Son and Gun Rights*, that Laurel Harper's neighbour spoke kindly of her:

The young woman's mother, who immigrated from the Philippines, said that she had shared Filipino meals with Ms. Harper, and that Ms. Harper had taught her how to drive. She wrote a letter of support when Ms. Harper was applying for a \$1,500 scholarship to continue her nursing studies. The family still has Ms. Harper's thank you card. (p.5)

Though the comment from Laurel Harper's neighbour was not overly personal, it is a kind sentiment that came at a time when most media outlets accused Harper of being a bad mother (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017).

Parvinder Sandhu also experienced a sympathetic social response from friends and strangers. Sandhu notes that she received hundreds of cards, letters of support and condolences from complete strangers after her son Kimveer Gill, went on a rampage. Sandhu told the

Montreal Gazette (2006) that she received one particular letter from Ute Schmidt, a German exchange student who knew Kimveer Gill. In the letter, Schmidt told Sandhu that: “Your son was actually one big reason why I like Canada/Quebec so much” (pg.4). Schmidt went on to say that “It was him who made up words that sounded German so he would be able to talk to me in my mother tongue” (p.4). Insinuating that Gill made her feel welcome, Schmidt described their interactions “He’d tell funny stories and was patient when I couldn’t always come up with words in English. He’d tell me to say it in German and maybe the word would be similar in French or English” (Montreal Gazette, 2006, p.4).

Chapter 5.2.1.2: *Outsiders—Their interaction with their families.* This section will argue that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper and Sandhu experienced a greater sympathetic response from complete strangers than from their families, who were also suffering as secondary victims. As a result of the shootings, Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) experienced family dysfunction: their immediate family members were unable to support one another; they simply lacked the capacity as a family unit.

Strangers—those who did not know the primary victim—were more receptive to the secondary victims’ needs as they were not overcome by grief by the loss of their relationship with the deceased (Kenney, 2002). The findings from Lépine (2008) suggest she experienced more support from strangers within her community and church than she did from her family. Lépine’s daughter, Nadia, was unable to provide her mother with any form of emotional support as she was grieving in a self-destructive manner for what her brother had done:

I finally found out why she could not get her life together. Nadia admitted that she was hooked on cocaine and heroin. I had suspected as much for some time but had pushed those suspicions to the back of my mind. She told me that she took drugs to numb herself, to dull the dreadful guilty feeling that, somehow, she could have prevented her brother’s death and the death of all those women. (p. 58)

Much like Nadia, victims who held a close relationship with the deceased became reclusive as part of their grieving process, (Lépine, 2008; Jordan, 2003). If victims are unwilling to show compassion towards or cease all communication with other victims, complex dynamics such as self-destructive behaviour can arise in their personal lives (Kenney, 2002; Jordan, 2003). Unable to cope with what her brother had done, Nadia stopped all communication with her mother and friends, became reclusive, took intravenous drugs and fell into a coma. As her mother describes it:

When I walked into her room I was shocked by what I saw: she lay there, seemingly lifeless, with tubes running out of her in a respirator artificially filling her lungs with oxygen. The regular beeping of the heart monitor beside her bed was the only sign that life still burned within her. I moved closer, noticing how the harsh hospital light bleeds all colour from her face, clinched in a grimace of pain. She was thin, so very thin: her five-foot frame must've weighed scarcely 90 pounds! As a nurse, I should've been accustomed to impersonal medical paraphernalia surrounding her, but the sight of those tubes going into her forearms, already riddled with needle marks from her years of cocaine and heroin addiction, affected me deeply. A wall clock marked the precious seconds: Her time was running out. (Lépine, 2008, p. 66)

Secondary victims are prone to isolate themselves from the public when they are grieving. Jordan (2008) suggests that this is a normal process. However, the self-inflicted destructive behaviour from Nadia Lépine made it increasingly difficult for Monique Lépine to experience emotional support from her family (Lépine, 2008).

Distancing oneself for an extended period of time is a behavioural issue which Monique Lépine's daughter had experienced (Jordan, 2003; Lépine, 2008). Monique Lépine (2008) may not have experienced behavioural issues as severely as her daughter, but neither did she know how to deal with what her son had done. Her self-isolation affected her emotional state and personal life:

The effort of making these final arrangements used up all my remaining strength. Exhausted, I took refuge at home in my apartment and refused to leave once again, I abandoned my job. Nothing and nobody could get through to me. (Lépine, 2008, p. 69)

Lépine (2008) suggests her family was unable to provide her with any form of emotional support after the loss of her son in the shooting. As such, Lépine (2008) experienced more support from friends and complete strangers than she did from her family.

The findings of this paper further suggest that after the Columbine shooting, Klebold (2016) received support from her work colleagues and individuals she did not know. However, Sue and her husband Tom were unable to find common ground in their marriage due to the loss of their son, Dylan. Klebold (2016), notes that she and Tom were not grieving in the same way, which further disconnected them as a couple:

The isolation was terrible. My anxiety levels were sky-high, and I felt very disconnected. We were not in communication with the Harris's. The only person in the world who might have been able to understand what I was going through was Tom, but the divide that had sprung up between us in the earliest days after the tragedy continued to widen. This is not unusual, of course. Although the statistics you heard about the likelihood of divorce after the death of a child are probably inflated, most marriages do suffer immense disruption. One often-cited reason, is that women did grieve the loss differently: men tend to grieve the loss of a person the child would have become, while women tend to grieve the child they were. (p.121)

Klebold (2016) asserts that she and Tom were in fact grieving differently. Tom mourned who Dylan would have become, while Sue mourned who he had been. By grieving in isolation, Klebold (2016) and Tom had damaged their marriage, and preferred to be apart rather than together. Unable to support each other during their self-isolation, Sue and Tom divorced after forty-three years of marriage. As Klebold (2016) describes the effects of her and her husband's grief:

As the years passed, the distance between Tom and me continued to widen, leaving us with almost no common ground and no way to build a bridge back to each other. In 2014, after 43 years of marriage, we decided to part ways—a decision I can only make after I

realized that the thought of staying in a relationship made me feel more stress than the idea of leaving. We ended our marriage to save our friendship, and I believe we will always care for each other. I'm grateful for that. (p.271)

Klebold's (2016) recollection of the events suggests her family was unable to provide her with a sufficient amount of support after the loss of her son in the shooting. As such Klebold (2016) experienced more support from friends and complete strangers than she did from her family.

Similar to Lépine (2008), the findings of Terri Roberts (2015) suggest that she and her family experienced difficulty reciprocating family support. Roberts (2015) and her husband Chuck faced the destructive behaviour of their surviving children, including their youngest son Zach. The Roberts family was honoured with a significant amount of support from across the county, including from their neighbours, coworkers, church members, the Amish community, and the families of the primary victims. After the funerals for all the primary victims, the Roberts family planned the funeral of their son Charlie. While their close friends and family agreed to attend, their middle son Zach was unable to cope with what his brother had done and refused to attend his brother's funeral. Roberts (2015) describes the phone call when she informed Zach about the funeral:

When I told him, I'd let him know the service arrangements as soon as I knew, he responded vehemently: "I will not be coming to my brother's funeral. I hate him for what he's done—to those girls, to our family. I will not honor him by being present!" I cried and pleaded, but it only intensified Zach's resolve. Before the call ended it was obvious no amount of begging from his mother was to change his heart and mind. I was heartbroken. (p.49)

After the funeral, and the stress of Charlie's death took a toll on Terri Roberts (2015) and her husband, Chuck. Chuck broke down and suffered from severe depression and began to grieve differently. Roberts was more outspoken and cried aloud, while Chuck, who held a close relationship with his son, internalized his grief, blamed himself and became clinically depressed

and reclusive. Though they did not divorce, the marriage was struggling as the result of Chuck's revulsive grieving. As described by Terri Roberts:

Beyond the influx of visitors, our phone had not stopped ringing all day. Among the callers were police officers with whom my husband had worked with for so many years. They were calling to express support and encouragement, but my husband could not even take their calls. The shame and embarrassment were to great. His palpable grief and pain were as inconsolable as the biblical King David's mourning of the death of his own traitorous son, Absalom, and I knew my husband's heart held the same agonizing cry: [Charlie]! My son, my son [Charlie]! If only I had died instead of you—O [Charlie], my son, my son!" My heart broke for my husband that there was nothing I could do to ease his pain. (p.50-51)

Roberts' (2015) recollection of the events suggest that her family was unable to provide her with a sufficient amount of support after the loss of her son in the shooting. As such, Roberts (2015) experienced more support from friends and complete strangers than she did from her family.

An analysis of the findings on the news articles about and interviews with Laurel Harper and Parvinder Sandhu concludes that their sons were not known by neighbours, victims or the public. Members of the public were not receptive to Harper or Sandhu's needs (Gill CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). Not one individual is recorded to have provided Harper or Sandhu with any form of support after the shooting (Gill CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017).

The results of each mother's grief show some negative social response from their family, yet the public viewed Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) to have legitimate claims as victims due to their relationship with the sons. These results align with Kenney's (2002) notion that secondary victims have a legitimate claim to sympathy. Strangers were seen to provide support to these mothers in order to console them, while their families were unable to provide them with support. In addition to their legitimate claim as victims, Klebold (2016),

Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) each provide context on how they experienced complex family dynamics.

Klebold's (2016), Lépine's (2008), Roberts's (2015), Harper's (Healy et al., 2015) and Sandhu's (Montreal Gazette, 2006) stories align with Kenney's (2002) conclusion that strangers are far better than family members at providing emotional support to victims. Klebold's (2016), Lépine's (2008), and Roberts's (2015) testimonies suggest that strangers provided better emotional support and compassion as they were not "blocked" (p. 253) by their personal grief of knowing the shooter, as their families did. Roberts's (2015) interaction with strangers and community members show significant results in respect to the positive interaction with the families of the primary victims. However, the results do not suggest that Harper's (Healy et al., 2015) and Sandhu's (Montreal Gazette, 2006) families provided less support than strangers. Klebold's (2016), Lépine's (2008), Roberts's (2015) and Sandhu's (Montreal Gazette, 2006) experiences with the public suggest that their circumstances do not align with Melendez' (2016) suggestion that mothers of school shooters are significantly more likely to be blamed for their sons' actions.

Out of five (5) of the mothers, all five (5) experienced a sympathetic social response from friends and strangers. The experiences of all five (5) of the mothers confirm Kenney's (2002) notion that secondary victims have access to helpful resources such as emotional support, visitation, delegation of responsibilities, communication with others, and the ability for others to acknowledge and understand subtle social cues for when they need support. As such, the mothers' statuses as victims is validated and seen to hold a legitimate claim to sympathy after the passing of their sons.

Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015) did experience less emotional support from their families than they did in comparison to strangers, and as a result, complex family dynamics arose. Out of five (5) of the mothers, three (3): Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) had experienced difficulty in reciprocating or receiving family support, and instead received support from strangers who were more receptive to their needs because they were not themselves overcome by grief from the loss of a relationship with the deceased. The families of Klebold (2016) Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) suffered as secondary victims, unable to grieve with their families. Thus, three (3) of the mothers were unable to receive sufficient family support and experienced a rise in complex family dynamics due to the emotional grief from the shooting, while two (2) of the mothers were unable to receive any type of support and became outsiders in the majority of their social circles. Two (2) out of five (5) of the mothers, Harper and Sandhu, did not report reciprocating or receiving significant family support, and did not receive support from strangers as they were not receptive to their needs. Thus three (3) out of five (5) of the mothers would align with Kenney's (2002) notion that secondary victims have a legitimate claim to sympathy by strangers and the public; while two (2) out of five (5), are not seen to hold a legitimate claim to sympathy. Klebold (2016) Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) experienced difficulty in reciprocating or receiving family support, it is interpreted within this study that their families have also suffered as the result of the events, and as such, can be considered secondary victims of the school shooting. As a result of these shootings, Klebold (2016) Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) experienced family dysfunction: the family members lacked the capacity as a family unit to support each other as a result of their secondary victim status; an unexpected result.

Chapter 5.2.2: Unworthy victims—This section will argue that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Harper and Sandhu (Gill CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) experienced being socially stigmatized by individuals who viewed their grief as inappropriate (Kenny, 2002). In some cases, these mothers, as secondary victims, were labelled as unworthy and even deviant due to their social interaction with others. Rather than secondary victims reporting to have had access to helpful resources such as emotional support, visitation, delegation of responsibilities, communication with others, and the ability for others to acknowledge and understand subtle social cues for when they need support, these mothers were subjected to harassment and blame.

Many secondary victims will experience emotional agony over the fact that their loved one is gone. If the victims grieve in what other individuals see as an abnormal way, they can be perceived as emotionally deviant and unworthy (Becker, 1963/1991; Jordan, 2003). Lépine (2008) notes her daughter's friends began treating Nadia as a deviant and unworthy of sympathy during her grieving process. One of Nadia's friends saw her only as drug addict rather than as a victim, saying:

I told her she wasn't getting a penny out of me. Nadia broke down and said she couldn't go on living this way, that she was going to commit suicide. So, I told her: stop talking about it and go do it, then! (p. 68)

A victim may experience psychological issues based on how others view them. These victims can also experience a constant need for approval while grieving. Nadia experienced psychological distress in the form of suicidal thoughts. However, her friends and family only took into consideration that she was using drugs, a regret Lépine (2008) holds after viewing her daughter as unworthy (Kenney, 2002; Jordan, 2003; Morrall et al., 2011).

Secondary victims feel the need to comfort others by filtering what they have to say, or when to say it (Kenney, 2002). For instance, the results of Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008)

suggest they learned that other individuals preferred a grieving victim who was calm. They were also forced to push people away because their victim experience was more complex than others', or to avoid talking about the incident to avoid uncomfortable encounters (Klebold, 2016; Kenney, 2002). Klebold (2016) notes that she wanted to attend a support group, but she did not want to make others uncomfortable. Her lawyer preferred if she did not join a support group as her grieving might have affected their legal proceedings:

I was desperate to be among people who would listen and sympathize and not judge, but I cannot imagine walking into a room filled with strangers and talking about what Dylan and Eric had done. More to the point, as Gary Lozow had pointed out, if our lawsuits went to trial, another support group participant might have to serve as a witness. I felt I had caused enough damage already. (p. 121)

This is indicative of placing a new label on the secondary victim as unworthy based on how the public viewed her grief as inappropriate based on the complexity of her status and her relationship to the offender, her son. In addition to the shooting and the loss of the primary victims, secondary victims were labelled and stigmatized based on their story, which corresponds with Becker's (1963/1991) understanding of the process of labelling individuals as deviant.

In addition to being labelled as unworthy victims, some secondary victims feel as if they were stigmatized and labelled as a deviant. In some cases, Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) felt stigmatized as deviant and felt as if they had been discredited as victims due to their relationships with their sons. After the Columbine massacre, Klebold (20016) noted that "Tom and I were the chief suspects. Those boys could only have learned hate like that in their homes" (p. 245), suggesting that the Klebold family were all deviant individuals whose parenting was to blame.

The results from Harper (Healy et al., 2015) and Sandhu (Montreal Gazette, 2006) suggest they also were labeled as unworthy. After the death of her son, Harper was seen speaking to the police outside her apartment. Harper's neighbours did not report her as suffering from any form of grief, nor was she visually suffering in a reclusive manner. One neighbour told *The New*

York Times that “She was still in denial of it” further stating that “she just handled it like nurse would—like it was another person’s life” (Anderson, 2017, p.5).

The results from Sandhu suggest that her grief was viewed as unworthy and deviant. She was judged socially for interrupting the grieving families of the victims and questioning the police about integrity for how her son was killed (Montreal Gazette, 2006). As a way to grieve, Sandhu wanted to apologize to the victim’s family. As she told *CBC*, she wanted them to “forgive my son,” going on to say “I apologize to everybody at Dawson college, who ever suffered and got injured, especially De Sousa’s parents and the family” (CBC, 2007, p.1). However, the families did not wish to hear what she had to say, nor did the public. They saw her as partially to blame for being aware of her son’s fascination with guns (Montreal Gazette, 2006). The result from Harper’s and Sandhu’s interviews (Gill CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), align with Dillaway and Paré (2008), Zimmerman (2008), Kafka (2008) Pickett (2017) and Melendaze et al. (2016). Harper was in fact viewed as unworthy for the way she was grieving for her son, implying she was handling her son’s death more like a nurse than like a mother (Dillaway & Paré, 2008; Zimmerman, 2008). Sandhu’s grief for her son was discredited and she was blamed by the media for her son’s actions, thus aligning with Kafka (2008) and Pickett’s (2017) notion that mothers of delinquents are blamed by the public and media.

Few victims have indicated they were subjected to a new label because the offender was a member of their family or had been living in their home (Kenny, 2002). This perceived notion that secondary victims can be labelled as deviant based on their circumstances aligns with Klebold’s and Lépine’s narratives and Harper’s and Sandhu’s interviews (Gill CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) about their past experiences (Kenney, 2002; Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008). It also suggests that secondary

deviance (Lemert, 1951) and secondary emotional deviance (Thoits, 1990; Lemert, 1951) align with Klebold's and Lépine's experiences and Harper's and Sandhu's interviews (Gill CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). This notion that a victim can be seen as deviant insinuates that a victim is unworthy and implies that the perception of a victim is socially constructed by views on whether the victim's qualities are worthy or unworthy.

Becker's (1963/1991) suggestion that an individual can be labelled as falsely deviant can also apply to a victim of a school shooting homicide (Becker, 1963/1991; Kenney 2002). Being labelled and stigmatized as deviant or unworthy can have lasting effects on an individual's mental health, which may cause an individual to experience further psychological distress (Jordan, 2003).

Out of five (5) of the mothers, four (4): Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) Harper and Sandhu interviews (Gill CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), experienced events where they were stigmatized due to their grief. Thus, four (4) out of five (5) of the mothers were socially stigmatized as emotionally deviant by individuals who viewed their grief as inappropriate, while one (1) out of five (5) of the mothers was not. The results of this section show that socially-constructed 'normal' mothers and families who did not appear deviant were seen as more wholesome and seemed to receive significantly more sympathy and support from the general public.

Chapter 5.2.3: Their deviant status—mother blaming. This section will argue that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), experienced events where they were stigmatized and blamed as mothers.

Based on the research of Zimmerman et al. (2008), Dillaway and Paré (2008), Kafka (2008), and Pickett (2017) on maternal blame and children's delinquency, it is expected that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), will be blamed for their sons' actions. Furthermore, it is expected that Lépine (2008) and Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) will be assigned sole blame for their sons' actions, because they are single mothers.

Kenny's (2002) notion that secondary victims have been subjected to deviant labels based on their biological relationship and living arrangements with the accused can be further understood by examining the social blame experienced by these five respondents. The results of this paper indicate a significant relationship between mother blaming and Klebold's (2016) autobiography. Klebold (2016) asserts that she and her family were the center of the blame after the Columbine shooting. Almost immediately after the shooting, demands by the media and the public to learn why the shooting had occurred become overwhelming to Klebold (2016). The media and public were quick to blame her: "Tom and I were the chief suspects," as "those boys could have only learned hate like that in their homes" (p.245).

Klebold (2016) noted that "People blamed video games, movies, music, bullying, access to guns, unarmed teachers, the absence of prayer in schools, secular humanism, psychiatric medication. Mostly, though, they blamed us" (p.95), as Klebold (2016) was faced with questions like "HOW COULD YOU NOT KNOW??!" (p. 97). As Klebold (2016) also notes, religious

groups blamed her, claiming “A lack family values was to blame, shouted the religious right” (Klebold, 2016, p. 242). Klebold (2016) tried to avoid the public after the shooting, even avoiding any unwanted attention at work. After she returned to work she was forced to hide in order to avoid blame:

I met with a staffer in the human resources department to make arrangements for my privacy and safety. I was amazed that she spoke about the accommodations as if my experience had been an ordinary setback, like a chronic illness or parents with Alzheimer’s. We asked the receptionist to screen my calls, and to erase my schedule from the whiteboard. Administrator offered me her office so I can make personal calls behind a closed door. I slid my nameplate from on my cubicle wall away in my desk drawer. (p. 113-114)

Klebold feared returning to work, and not just for her feelings of shame. She worried she would break down from grief and not be able to hold herself together. Many of her coworkers were accommodating and saw her need for support, but not all; some blamed her as a parent, as she notes:

When I said my name, he stared into my face with intensity. When our team members complimented his ability to keep so many machines in good working order, he said, “well, you get to know the machines. After a while, it’s like being a good parent.” At that, he turned away from the person who’d asked the question so he could make a searing eye contact with me. “When you’re a good parent, you just sort of know what your kids are up to” (p.118).

When returning home from work each night, Klebold (2016) changed the radio station if the shooting was mentioned; she could not avoid the blame:

“Those parents are disgusting,” One person seethed on the talk radio broadcast I accidentally heard while changing radio stations in my car. People thought we should be jailed, hunted like animals, tortured, shot. I still can’t look at the comments sections of articles about Columbine. (p.99)

Klebold’s (2016) statements are indicative of mother blaming and suggest she was labelled and socially stigmatized as deviant (Becker, 1963/1991; Kenney 2002). The results from Klebold (2016) align with Pickett’s (2017) and Kafka’s (2008) results which assert that the public will blame the mothers of delinquent children. However, the public did not assign sole blame on Sue

Klebold. They blamed both parents for their son's actions in the Columbine shooting. As such, the results do not align with the Melendez et al. (2016) findings as both the Klebold parents were publicly blamed, and not just the mother.

Terri Roberts and her husband Chuck received hundreds of cards and letters from strangers across the nation after the death of her son Charlie. The majority of the letters were about support and forgiveness. However, Terri Roberts describes becoming subjected to blame:

An ongoing blessing during all of this continued to pour in; by now I had a huge basket of cards and letters from people all over the country. While none expressed hostility, some questioned how we missed Charlie's mental issues (p. 149-150)

Roberts (2015) described a similar interaction to Klebold's (2016) recollection of mother blaming while returning back to work. Terri Roberts explained that some individuals could not bear to be around her after the shooting, thinking her son's shooting may have been her fault.

Roberts (2015) describes an interaction with a co-worker after she returned to work:

At my old job, colleagues were for the most part kind and welcoming, careful not to bring up recent events in my presence. But a co-worker in my department had been a first responder at the schoolhouse. She was struggling from posttraumatic stress syndrome, she requested reassignment to another department where she wouldn't have to encounter me, and eventually resigned from our place of employment. (p.135)

Roberts (2015) statements are indicative of mother blaming and suggest she was being labelled and socially stigmatized as deviant (Becker, 1963/1991; Kenney 2002). Similar to Klebold (2016), the results from Roberts' (2015) experience align with Pickett's (2017) and Kafka's (2008) findings that the public will blame the mothers of delinquent children. However, the public did not put sole blame on Terri Roberts, they blamed both parents for their son's actions in the Amish school house shooting. As such, the results do not align with Melendez et al. (2016) as both the Roberts parents were publicly blamed, and not just the mother.

After the École Polytechnique massacre, Lépine (2008) was the center of public harassment and blame, which was shared throughout dozens of media outlets across Canada and the United States. Monique Lépine remained silent to the media for years, as a way of staying hidden and out of the news. After 20 years without speaking to the media, Lépine (2008) decided to break her silence on September 14, 2006 after the Dawson College shooting. Lépine (2008) describes why she avoided speaking to the media for 20 years:

I never would have thought that one day I would address six hundred thousand people at once. For many years I had thought it better to remain anonymous for fear of being condemned by public opinion or of provoking outrage for the victim's families' lives. I frequently saw them on TV, cameras thrust in their faces and bombarded with questions by journalists. How did they manage to remain calm under such circumstances? I vowed I would never subject myself to such treatment or allow the media to put me on the display like a circus. (p. 119)

To celebrate the anniversary of the École Polytechnique massacre on December 6th, the families of the victims gathered together to remember those they lost. Lépine (2008) was informed of the ceremony as a number of victims requested her presence. However, the majority of victims and their families prohibited her attendance:

They told me that, over the past few years, the victims' relatives gathered annually on December 6 to commemorate the massacre, some expressed the desire to have me join. But others will not hear it. Pierre remarked, "everyone grieves his or her own way. Our way may surprise people. We feel it takes time, but people should use that time to heal, not embittered." (123-124)

Lépine's (2008) statements are indicative of mother blaming and suggest being labelled and socially stigmatized as deviant (Becker, 1963/1991; Kenney 2002). The results from Lépine (2008) align with Pickett's (2017) and Kafka's (2008) findings, which assert that the public will hold sole blame on the mothers of delinquent children for their actions. As such, the results align with Melendez et al. (2016) as the media and the public assigned sole blame to Monique Lépine for her son's actions in the École Polytechnique shooting, because she was a single mother; blame was not assigned to her living ex-husband.

Finally, the results indicate that Harper and Sandhu were subjected to blame and criticism (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006). *The New York Times*, *The Los Angeles Times* and *CNN* did not provide sympathetic reports of Harper. The news outlets focused on Harper's shared love for guns with her son and suggested she was to blame for the shooting (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). *The New York Times* notes that Laurel Harper loved guns:

In an online forum, answering a question about state gun laws several years ago, Ms. Harper took a jab at "lame states" that impose limits on keeping loaded firearms in the home, and noted that she had AR-15 and AK-47 semiautomatic rifles, along with a Glock handgun. She also indicated that her son, who lived with her, was well versed in guns, citing him as her source of information on gun laws, saying he "has much knowledge in this field." (Healy et al., 2015, p.2)

The New York Times went on to say that Laurel Harper shared her love with guns with her son:

Neighbors in Southern California have said that Ms. Harper and her son would go to shooting ranges together, something Ms. Harper seemed to confirm in one of her online posts. She talked about the importance of firearms safety and said she learned a lot through target shooting, expressing little patience with unprepared gun owners: "When I'm at the range, I cringe every time the 'wannabes' show up." (Healy et al., 2015, p.3)

The reports from the *CBC* and *The Montreal Gazette* on Sandhu focused on how she was unable to acknowledge that her son was suffering from depression and had a fascination with guns and ammunition (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006). In one of Sandhu's statements to the press, she acknowledges her ignorance about depression and what her son was going through. Prior to this acknowledgement, Sandhu was blamed for not being aware that her son was suffering from depression even though she was not aware he had been prescribed anti-depressants or that he was obsessed with guns and violence. Sandhu informed reporters: "One of my biggest regrets" (Montreal Gazette, 2006, p.1), was signing permission for her son to obtain a gun permit (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006). Sandhu spoke on the radio stating that she wanted to apologize to the victims, but the father of De Sousa, the primary victim, told reporters "that won't happen,"

because they blamed her as a mother (CBC, 2007, p.1). Finally, after the shooting at Dawson's college, the public began to look for a scapegoat for their blame and hatred, as Lewkowicz (2017) describes in *The Globe and Mail*:

By some inside out logic, the media, society, friends and former acquaintances have all turned Mr. Gill into a victim. The blame game has taken a centre stage and suddenly, and erroneously, it takes a village to raise a killer. (p.1)

Sandhu and her husband, Gurbinder Gill, were blamed publicly for how they raised their son:

The next scapegoat were his grieving parents and his younger twin brothers. His parents were too strict, some hinted. Bashir Hussain, the executive director of the Alliance of South Asian Communities, blamed harsh discipline that might promote violence and lead to alienation. Perhaps, his parents were just too blind and uninvolved. (p.2)

Lewkowicz, (2017) then goes on to describe how the public blamed their parenting as ignorant:

How could Gurbinder Gill and Parvinder Sandhu not have known what their son was doing, isolated in the basement and addicted to violent computer games? They should have seen the warning signs. They should have snooped more, read his handwritten diary and on-line blogs, and been generally more aware of his dark mood and activities. (p.2)

Harper's (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu's (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) statements are indicative of mother blaming and suggest being labelled and socially stigmatized as deviant (Becker, 1963/1991; Kenney 2002). The results from Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) align with Pickett's (2017) and Kafka's (2008) findings, which assert that the public ascribes sole blame to the mothers of delinquent children. Similar to Lépine (2008), the data from Harper's (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) interviews align with Melendez et al. (2016), as the media and the public assigned sole blame to Harper as a single mother, for her son's actions in the Umpqua community college shooting, and no blame was ascribed to her surviving husband. The results from Sandhu's (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017)

interviews do not align with Melendez et al. (2016), as the media and the public did not assign sole blame to the mother only; blame was expressed towards both of Kimveer Gill's parents.

As expected, Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), were blamed for their sons' actions. Furthermore, Lépine (2008) and Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), were assigned sole blame for their sons' actions as single mothers. However, an unexpected result was determined by Klebold's (2016), Roberts's (2015), and Sandhu's (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) testimonies. All three mothers were assigned blamed alongside their husbands, contradicting the roles of a father predicted in Pickett (2017) study. Pickett's (2017) research did, however, coincide with certain results of this paper; suggesting that single mothers are assigned sole blame on the mothers of delinquent children, while ignoring the role of the absent father. It was expected that Lépine (2008) and Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), would have been blamed for the actions of their sons. Zimmerman et al (2008), Dillaway and Paré (2008), Kafka (2008) and Pickett (2017) note that blame for children's negative discretions in Westernized cultures tends to be ascribed to mothers as they are socially and culturally viewed as responsible for how they raise their children, regardless of whether or not they do so within the context of a two-parent household. The results of this paper do not align with the findings of Melendez et al. (2016), as the media and the public did not assign blame solely to Klebold (2016), Roberts (2015) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017).

Out of five (5) of the mothers, five (5): Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007;

Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), experienced events where they were stigmatized and blamed as mothers. Thus, five (5) out of five (5) of the mothers were socially stigmatized and labelled as deviant by individuals who held them responsible for their sons' shootings. As was found in Section 5.2.2, above, this section finds that the socially-constructed 'normal' mothers and the families that seemed more wholesome and identifiable received significantly more sympathy and support from the general public.

Chapter 5.2.4: Their deviant status—imposed by the police. This section will argue that Klebold (2016) Roberts (2015), Lépine (2008) and Harper (Anderson, 2017) experienced events where they and their families, were seen as deviant by law enforcement personnel. Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006) experienced not only emotionally deviant labelling and mother blaming by the public, but also negative encounters with law enforcement officials after their sons' shootings—creating a deviant status imposed by the police. After each shooting, Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006), recall in detail how law enforcement officers reacted to their families. Soon after the Columbine shooting was announced on the news, Klebold (2016) describes rushing home with the hope her son would be safe, unaware her son was the shooter. Minutes later, law enforcement officers arrived at the Klebold residence to inform them their son Dylan was one of the two shooters. Officers than removed the Klebold family from their residence in order to search the house. Klebold (2016) asserts that:

The police would not let others back into her house: we would have to find another place to stay. Tom, Allison, and I would each be allowed to go inside for five minutes to collect a few personal belongings. We would have to go in one at a time, and under the close watch of two guards (p.21)

Klebold (2016) describes how the family had to be escorted inside their own house:

The two police officers escorting me into the house stayed on me like basketball guards, watching my hands closely and keeping their own hands near to mine as I packed. This confused and frightened me and I felt embarrassed as I rifled through drawers to find underthings and hygiene products. (p.21)

Terri Roberts (2015) and her husband Chuck experienced an unusual encounter with the police after the Nickle Mine schoolhouse shooting. The day of the shooting, the police searched

every area of their son's house. The police officers then took Chuck to their family home to search their residence, even though it a location their son neither owned nor had lived in since he was a boy. Rather than meeting Chuck at their residence, the police detained Chuck, a retired police officer, and placed him in the back of their cruiser "like a perpetrator" (p.26). Charlie's parents were searched and questioned as if they had been accomplices to the shooting. Roberts (2015) describes her and her husband's embarrassment as they escorted Chuck to their home:

During this time, there were police in the house, searching through closets and drawers, rummaging under furniture. Looking for guns, I would guess, or any indication as to why Charlie would have done such a thing. At some point, state troopers left with my husband to drive to our house. I found out later that they wanted to check our gun safes for any weapons that might have belonged to Charlie. My husband had been a police officer for 30 years, a man of honorable standing in the community. I cannot imagine his feelings as he was escorted out of the police cruiser like a perpetrator after 30 years of being the one escorting. (p.26)

Lépine (2008) was a single mother who did not have the support of a husband or partner during the police interrogation. Because she was sole active parent of the shooter, the investigation narrowed in around her. Lépine (2008) describes her involvement with the police after they picked her up from work:

After I had given the police the picture I wanted to be left in peace. I wanted to call my friends for help or to find a quiet corner to curl up in cry until my tears ran dry. The detectives were not going away. After conducting a rapid search of my condo, they said, "Mrs. Lépine, you'll have to come with us to the police station." "Why? I have done nothing wrong," I protested. "The other officers of the case want to talk to you about your son," they replied. For the first time since they had told me Marc was the killer, I felt anger and dislike for the forces of law and order. For all they feigned consideration, those two detectives had little regard for what I might be going through. They were intent on carrying out the orders of their supervisors with single-minded determination. (p.11)

Unable to deal with the detectives and their techniques during the interrogation, Lépine (2008) had enough of their questions and responded with "Figure it out for yourself and go to hell!" (p.13). Years later in 2006, another detective inspired Lépine to write her story, as Lépine (2008)

relays what the officer had to say “I strongly suggest you tell your life story so others can learn from it. In my line of work, I meet so many unhappy people; I am sure it would inspire them” (p.184).

The Los Angeles Times wrote that Harper was unwilling to assist the investigation of the Umpqua massacre, suggesting that she should have done more to help. *The Los Angeles Times* quoted Harper’s words on the investigation surrounding herself, stating that “There’s nothing I could look back at and say, ‘Oh, yeah, this, there’s an arrow pointing the way” (Anderson, 2017, p.2). As Harper was the sole guardian of her son, she was publicly and legally scrutinized for how she raised her son to have such a love for guns, which led to an FBI investigation that resulted in criminal charges for her involvement in the Umpqua massacre (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). The Los Angeles Times wrote that:

The release of the Umpqua shooting files, a week before the Spokane shooting, came almost two years after the Oregon incident, delayed in part because the FBI was investigating the mother for possible charges. None were filed, and officials declared that Harper-Mercer “acted alone.” (Anderson, 2017, p.3)

Finally, Sandhu reported that she was questioned the Montreal police department for their actions in her son’s death following the Dawson college shooting, stating that she did not believe he killed himself:

She doesn’t believe he shot himself, as the police contend. She wants to know why the police dragged his body out of Dawson and into the pouring rain if he was part of a crime scene. During the cleansing ceremony—a Sikh tradition where the body is washed prior to burial—she noted that a bullet wound in her sons’ right arm, and a red mark in his chest. His face, she said, was completely intact, and there was a bullet hole in the crown of his head. “If the police shot him in the right arm first, how could he shoot himself in the head?” (Montreal Gazette, 2006, p.13)

The Montreal police department contested Parvinder Sandhu claims that her son was killed by police, as the Montreal Gazette (2006) notes: “Police spokesman Marc Marcz said the police

determined he was hit in the upper right arm with a Montreal police bullet and in his head with one of his own” (p.13). Parvinder Sandhu continued to question the ethics and actions of the Montreal police while her claims against the police department were discredited and ignored by the public (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006).

Klebold (2016), Roberts (2015), Lépine (2008) Harper (Anderson, 2017) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006) had experienced negative encounters with law enforcement personnel, on account of questions regarding the shooters’ immediate family’s motives and status. Thus, a deviant label imposed by the police. The results for Klebold (2016) Roberts (2015), Lépine (2008) and Harper (Anderson, 2017) coincide with Becker’s (1963/1991, p. 21) concept of a “false deviant.” The police approached the Klebold family skeptically, which led them to question their involvement in the shooting. The public and police only viewed these victims in a negative way. Due to their son’s actions, these mothers, as victims, could not be seen as wholly positive, leading to the questioning of their motives and victim statuses (Becker, 1963/1991; Klebold, 2016; Roberts, 2015; Lépine, 2008; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017).

The results indict that Klebold (2016) Roberts (2015), Lépine (2008) and Harper (Anderson, 2017) were seen as deviant by law enforcement personnel, however, the results do not suggest that Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) had deviant status imposed upon her by the police. Though Sandhu questioned a police officer’s integrity for his involvement in her son’s death, media reports do not indicate that she was suspected to be involved in the shooting (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017). Out of five (5) of the mothers, four (4): Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015) and Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), reported, or was reported to have experienced negative encounters with law enforcement after their sons’ shootings’—creating a

deviant status imposed by the police. Thus, four (4) out of five (5) of the mothers were socially stigmatized and labelled as deviant by police officers.

Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

The results of this study have shown interesting trends and patterns on how mothers of school shooters, as secondary victims, have been labelled. The presentation of data seems to coincide with Becker's (1963/1991) labelling theory, in the sense that these offenders seem to have been labelled based on public perception. The original application of labelling theory was exclusively for offenders. As shown in the results section, labelling theory can be adjusted and applied to victims of crime. Though this study has significant results, there are limitations within this research.

Chapter 6.1: Summary of the Overall Results—The overall results of this this paper suggest that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), were exposed to the shootings and suffered from behavioural, psychological, and cognitive complications, which aligns with Jordan's (2003) and Morrall et al.'s (2011) research. Out of five (5) of the mothers, four (4): Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) reported, or were reported to have suffered from sociological, psychological, and cognitive complications (Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008; Roberts, 2015; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017; Jordan, 2003; Morrall et al., 2011). Thus, four (4) out of five (5) of the mothers were socially stigmatized, blamed and labelled while suffering physically, psychologically and biologically after their sons' shootings.

The results of this paper suggest that the labelling of mothers of school shooters is a social reaction, which coincides with Kenney's (2002) study on how labelling is applied to secondary victims based on different social reactions, public sympathy, victim behaviour, and their adjustment to their identities. Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper

(Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), as secondary victims, were provided with support and sympathetic behaviour from strangers. Their ability to be sympathized with was based on the perceived legitimacy of their claim to victim status and the nature of their relationships to their sons. Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper and Sandhu experienced less emotional support from their families than they did in comparison to strangers, and as a result, complex family dynamics arose.

Out of five (5) of the mothers, three (3): Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) experienced difficulty in reciprocating or receiving family support, and instead received support from strangers more receptive to their needs because they were not overcome by grief from the loss of their relationship with the deceased. The families of Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), and Roberts (2015) suffered as victims, unable to cohesively grieve with their families, and as such are secondary victims. Thus, three (3) of the mothers were unable to receive sufficient family support and experienced a rise in complex family dynamics due to the emotional grief from the shooting, while two (2) of the mothers, were unable to receive any type of support and became social outsiders.

Out of five (5) of the mothers, two (2), Harper and Sandhu, did not report receiving family support as strangers were not receptive to their needs. Thus three (3) out of five (5) of the mothers would align with Kenney's (2002) findings that secondary victims have a legitimate claim to sympathy by strangers and the public; while two (2) out of five (5), were not seen to hold a legitimate claim to sympathy because they were perceived as unworthy victims. Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) had experienced difficulty in reciprocating or receiving family support. It is interpreted within this study that their families have also suffered as the result of the events, and as such can be considered secondary victims of a school shooting.

As a result of these shootings, Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), and Roberts (2015) experienced family dysfunction. Their family members were unable to support each other, they simply lacked the capacity to function as a family unit as a result of their secondary victims' status; an unexpected result within this paper. It is possible that Harper and Sandhu were seen as unworthy, lacking the legitimate claim to sympathy by strangers and the public; as these mothers were aware that their sons had a fascination with firearms and ammunition. Moreover, the media outlets provided the mothers recollection of their interaction with the public, which may have led to a bias conclusion.

Out of five (5) of the mothers, five (5): Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), experienced events where they were stigmatized and blamed as mothers. Thus, five (5) out of five (5) of the mothers were socially stigmatized and labelled as deviant by individuals who held them responsible for their sons' shootings. All the mothers were subsequently stigmatized as deviant because the perpetrator was a family member. The mothers felt as if they were to blame, and reported being viewed as if they were accomplices to their son's crimes (Kenny, 2002; Klebold, 2016; Roberts, 2015; Lépine, 2008; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017).

Harper's (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu's (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), statements are indicative of mother blaming and suggest an application of being labelled and socially stigmatized as deviant (Becker, 1963/1991; Kenney 2002). The results from Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) and Parvinder Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz,

2017), align with Pickett's (2017) and Kafka's (2008) findings which assert that members of the public assign sole blame to the mothers of delinquent children. The results from Harper's (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) interviews align with Melendez's et al. (2016) findings; as the media and public assigned sole blame to Harper, a single mother, for her son's actions. Similarly, the data from Lépine (2008), aligns with Melendez 's et al. (2016) findings, as the media and the public assigned sole blame to only mothers, but not their surviving ex-husbands.

Out of five (5) of the mothers, four (4): Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015) and Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), reported, or were reported to have experienced negative encounters with law enforcement personnel after their sons' shootings', creating a deviant status imposed by the police. Thus, four (4) out of five (5) of the mothers were socially stigmatized and labelled as deviant by police officers who suspected them to be involved with their sons' shootings. The results of this paper do not suggest that Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) experienced negative encounters with law enforcement which led to deviant status being imposed by the police. Although Sandhu questioned the police officers' integrity and involvement in her son's death, media reports do not indicate that she was under suspicion of being involved in the shooting (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017).

Chapter 6.2: Limitations— While examining the literature of previous scholars, it was clear that there were limitations to this study on account of the lack of literature linking school shootings, secondary victimization and mother blaming. The potential effects from being victimized by a school shooting homicide suggest there are certain ramifications to holding the status of a secondary victim (Elklit & Kurdahl, 2013; Jordan, 2003; Morrall et al., 2011). Few studies have been conducted on secondary victims of school shootings. This study combines research that examines the effects homicides have on secondary victims (Morrall et al., 2011), as well as the effects secondary victims experience after being subjected to school shootings (Elklit & Kurdahl, 2013; Jordan, 2003). The intention of this study is to provide an understanding of what ramifications secondary victims may experience as the result of a school shooting homicide. By synthesizing previous research on secondary victims of school shooting homicides, this study was able to see results, fill in gaps, and apply labels to the victims.

Additional limitations are present under the feminist critique within this paper. Feminist critiques discussing the social importance of recognizing secondary victims of school shooting homicides are rare. Thus, the feminist literature analyzed within this paper is limited. Moreover, the feminist approach to maternal roles is culturally created, as such the feminist literature used in this study examines the role of a westernized mother.

There are limitations within Klebold's (2016) Lépine's (2008) and Roberts' (2015) autobiographies, as well as in Sandhu's (2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) and Harper's (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) testimonies to media outlets, and as such create limitations within this study. Each of these women were the offenders' mothers, so there may be a bias behind their stories. It is a possibility that these mothers were providing filtered stories with respect to their sons; perhaps they were unconsciously protecting their sons through their words. These autobiographies provide riveting testimonies from these

mothers' perspectives. However, there is a lack of self-reporting. Klebold (2016) and Lépine (2008) provide information on how they were personally affected, though more information could be provided regarding the labels to which they had been subjected. These women focused on what their sons had done rather than on how it had affected them as their mothers.

Klebold's (2016), Lépine's (2008) and Roberts (2015) autobiographies are not scholarly literature, nor are the news reports on Sandhu and Harper. These autobiographies and reports are only representative of five secondary victims of school shooting homicides, additional victims need to be examined. As this study examines only five victims, further research needs to be conducted on the mothers of school shooters. Finally, Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) and Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), provided clear evidence that they were stigmatized as deviant based on the relationships they held with their sons. As these results are indicative of mother blaming, further research needs to be conducted with respect to the mothers of school shooters and mother blaming.

Chapter 6.3: Discussion— By extending the existing scholarly literature on secondary victimization, the ramifications secondary victims experience from traumatic events, the labels to which secondary victims are subjected, and the feminist critique on mother blaming, this study expands the research on mothers of school shooters. Moreover, this research on the social importance of recognizing the victimization of mothers of school shooters will allow additional researchers fill the gaps in previous research, as well as this study.

The victim experiences of Klebold, Lépine, Roberts, Sandhu and Harper after their sons' delinquent and criminal behaviour during the school shootings may be understood through the application of the scholarly literature utilized within this study on the social ramifications suffered by mothers of school shooters, public labelling and perceptions of secondary victim families and the dynamics of mother blaming for both single and married mothers, based on their career choices.

The results within this study align with Melendez's et al. (2016) findings that the mothers of school shooters were publicly blamed for how they raised their sons. Klebold (2016) and Melendez, et al. (2016) noted that after the Columbine shooting feminism was blamed for the shooter's deviant behavior. Both mothers of the Columbine shooters held full-time jobs, and as such, Klebold was accused of parental neglect. Melendez, et al. (2016) assert that mothers of school shooters who held a job during the time of the shootings are perceived as failures, unable to live up to society's expectations for an ideal mother. Melendez, et al. (2016) findings on society's expectations for an ideal mother may be the cause for mother blaming after a school shooting.

However, while each mother had a full-time career at the time of the shootings, Lépine and Harper were single mothers who raised their sons on their own. Thus, only Lépine's, (2008) and Harper's (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) results coincide with

the findings of Melendez et al. (2016) that the mothers of school shooting homicides were solely found to be to blame for their sons' actions. Because Lépine, (2008) and Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017) were single mothers who held sole custody while raising their sons, they shouldered social blame even though their fathers, who were still alive at the time of the shooting, did not. By comparison, Klebold (2016), Roberts (2015), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006) assert that the blame generated by the public was geared towards both parents. Thus, only Lépine's, (2008) and Harper's (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), results align with the findings of Melendez, et al. (2016) indicating that the mothers of school shooters held the sole responsibility and were publicly blamed for how they raised their sons, while their fathers received no blame or criticism.

To provide an understanding as to why mothers of school shooters, and why Lépine and Harper in particular were solely to blame for their son's actions, I took a feminist approach to understanding the social implications of their status as mothers. Melendez, et al. (2016) provide a unique approach in determining if mothers of school shootings are publicly blamed for what their sons had done, and also offer a significant critique as to why the mothers of the shooters are to blame, and not the fathers.

In order to provide for their children, Klebold, Lépine, Roberts, Sandhu and Harper worked full-time. An examination of the literature by Pickett (2017), Dillaway and Paré (2008), and Zimmerman et al (2008), indicates there may be a social misconception that maternal employment creates a predisposition for aggression in a working mother's home. While this public misconception does not accurately reflect the reality of maternal employment in the twenty-first century, the findings from Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal

Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) indicate all had been subjected not only to mother blaming, but also to accusations that their sons' aggressive behavior stemmed from their homes.

Zimmerman's et al. (2008) findings suggest maternal employment indicates a positive outcome for children of working mothers, rather than a being a negative influence on the outcome of a child. Nevertheless, they do suggest that the absence of a parental caregiver may lead to children's' aggressive future behavior (Zimmerman et al., 2008). An absent father and single motherhood led to the public blaming of Lépine and Harper, both employed full-time single mothers with confirmed mass murders as their children (Lépine, 2008; Healy, McIntire & Turkewitz, 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017). By contrast, because the husbands of Klebold (2016), Roberts (2015) and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) were actively involved in their sons' lives, in these cases both parents were subject to parental blame. Although Zimmerman, et al. (2008) suggest that aggressive behaviour stems from single-parent homes, Klebold's (2016), Robert's (2015) and Sandhu's (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) sons came from two-parent households. Additional research needs to be conducted in order to understand the blame we place on the families and the mothers of school shooters.

The application of a feminist critique within this research study will build upon and fill in the gaps in studies by Zimmerman, et al (2008), Dillaway and Paré (2008), Kafka (2008) and Pickett (2017) on how working mothers have been blamed for their sons' actions. The application of mother blaming for both single and married mothers, extends our understanding of why Klebold, Lépine, Roberts, Sandhu and Harper were blamed for their children's delinquent and criminal behaviour. Moreover, an expansion of mother blaming on secondary victims will not only further the understanding of mothers of school shooters, it may extend a feminist critique of mother blaming to all mothers of delinquent or criminal children.

As noted in studies by Morrall, et al. (2011), and Jordan (2003), secondary victims are at a higher risk of suffering from sociological, psychological, cognitive, and physical complications. Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) experienced complex family dynamics from their grief and were subjected to labels such as deviant, secondary deviant, and unworthy. It is clear that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) suffered from sociological, psychological, cognitive, and physical complications as secondary victims of a school shooting. Examining the scholarly literature on the effects suffered by secondary victims will allow future researchers to expand their understanding of the effects secondary victims experience after a traumatic event.

This current study on the social importance of recognizing the victimization of mothers of school shooters builds upon Kenney's (2002) research on how secondary victims have experienced events where they had been labeled and subjected to mistreatment. This application of the labels subjected to secondary victims may extend our understanding of why Klebold, Lépine, Roberts, Sandhu and Harper experienced certain social reactions and labelling because of their son's delinquent and criminal behaviour. It may also extend our understanding of the labels applied to all secondary victims within their victimization category.

It is clear that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017), experienced events where they were socially stigmatized and blamed as deviant by individuals who held them responsible for their sons' shootings. Subsequently, the mothers felt as if they were socially viewed as if they were accomplices to their son's crimes' (Kenny, 2002; Klebold, 2016; Roberts, 2015; Lépine, 2008; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts,

2015; Anderson, 2017; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017). It is not clear how these mothers view themselves after a prolonged period of time of having been labelled as deviant. Additional research needs to be conducted to understand if mothers of school shooters view themselves as deviant after a prolonged period of subjection to public blame. Furthermore, additional research on more than five mothers of school shooters needs to be conducted in order to understand the full ramifications of their secondary victimization. Finally, as Becker (1963/1991) notes, being identified as deviant is a social label. However, a deviant label does not necessarily mean you have the quality of a bad person; rather, they are the results of someone defining you as deviant; does this suggest a social implication on society? Is society defining individuals as deviant based on the evidence, or are we subjecting our own negative qualities upon them? As these mothers have been stigmatized as deviant, does this suggest members of Western society are deviant in nature? Perhaps additional research can be conducted in regards to the perception of Westernized mass shootings and where the public stands in regards to blame.

Chapter 6.3: Conclusion—It is clear that the application of Becker's (1963/1991) labelling theory on secondary victims is plausible, the results of this paper suggest that labelling secondary victims is a social reaction. The results further indicate that Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008), Roberts (2015), Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) have been subjected to mother blaming, a deviant status that coincides with Becker's (1963/1991) notion that deviance is socially constructed. Individuals within the public held Klebold, Lépine, Roberts, Harper, and Sandhu accountable for their sons' actions because they were the mothers of the shooters.

Blaming the mother of a school shooter for their actions raises the question: when is a mother no longer accountable for her child's actions, particularly their criminal acts? Perhaps further research can be conducted to understand the role of a mother and the extent of her responsibility. Furthermore, it was noted that while Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) and Roberts (2015) did subject themselves to scrutiny and blame, they had also provided positive comments on their lives. The lives of Harper (Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017) were documented by reporters, and as such, the focus on negativity was stronger. Thus, it is recommended that additional research be conducted in regards to how mothers of school shooters are portrayed in the news, compared to how the mothers are reported in a controlled environment, such as an autobiography, T.V interview, or broadcast.

It is clear that in some instances the mothers of school shooters treated are treated as victims by those around them. However, they are also subjected to other labels. Within this study, secondary victims of school shooting homicides experience complex family dynamics from their grief and were labelled as deviant, secondary deviant, unworthy. Klebold (2016), Lépine (2008) Roberts (2015), and Sandhu (CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz,

2017) can assume the new label of falsely deviant. There are certain factors that shape the treatment of these mothers and the labels applied to them. The mothers are perceived as unworthy victims based on their emotional grief and their relationship with their sons, yet they exhibited obedient social behaviour (Becker, 1963/1991; Kenney, 2002; Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008; Healy et al., 2015; Castillo & Watts, 2015; Anderson, 2017; CBC, 2007; Montreal Gazette, 2006; Lewkowicz, 2017).

The results have further indicated that for the most part secondary victims are exposed to supportive and sympathetic behaviour (Kenney, 2002). Each mother had been provided with more support from strangers than close friends and family. Kenney (2002) suggests that this is the result of friends and family mourning their loved one, although additional behavioural and family issues may be caused if a victim begins to close themselves off to others (Jordan, 2003). Moreover, these mothers were more likely to be blamed if their son lived in their home, suggesting a social judgement that the mothers should be aware of what their sons are up to in their homes (Kenney, 2002; Klebold, 2016; Lépine, 2008)

The results of this paper indicate that the process of labelling a secondary victim is a social reaction. Rather than the public being supportive of all victims, some victims are labeled emotionally “unworthy,” if other individuals view their grieving process to be excessive or socially unacceptable. The application of emotional deviance is applied to secondary victims who are grieving, but what is an acceptable form of grieving? Further research is needed to understand the social reaction of grieving the loss of a loved one. Finally, if an individual is involved with a school shooting homicide, that individual is at a higher risk of suffering from sociological, psychological, cognitive, and physical complications. The secondary victims of school shooting homicides are commonly diagnosed with PTSD. The results of this paper suggest that further research be conducted with respect to victims of school shooting homicides.

Particularly, the secondary victims and the labels to which they are subjected. Secondary victims who are involved with a traumatic event such as a victim of school shooting homicides may experience effects similar to those of primary victims.

References

- Anderson, R. (2017). 'Here I am, 26, with no friends, no job, no girlfriend': Shooter's manifesto offers clues to 2015 Oregon college rampage. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from <http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-school-shootings-2017-story.html>
- Becker, H. S. (1963/1991). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster. First published in 1963.
- Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, public policy, and law*, 5(3), 665.
- Blair-Loy, M. (2009). *Competing devotions: Career and family among women executives*. Harvard University Press.
- Boscarino, J. A., Figley, C. R., & Adams, R. E. (2004). Compassion fatigue following the September 11 terrorist attacks: A study of secondary trauma among New York City social workers. *International journal of emergency mental health*, 6(2), 57.
- Castillo, M., & Watts, A. (2015). Oregon shooter's mom wrote about loaded guns, Asperger's. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from <http://www.cnn.com/2015/10/06/us/oregon-umpqua-shooting-mother-online-posts/index.html>
- CBC, News. (2006). Dawson victim's family rejects meeting with shooter's mom. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/dawson-victim-s-family-rejects-meeting-with-shooter-s-mom-1.593253>

- Cullen, F. T., Agnew, R., & Wilcox, P. (2011). *Criminological theory: Past to present: Essential readings* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Codd, H. (2008). *In the shadow of the prison: Families, imprisonment and criminal justice*. Cullompton, UK: Willan.
- Comfort, M. (2008). *Doing time together: Love and family in the shadow of the prison*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dignan, J., & Maguire, M. (2005). *Understanding victims and restorative justice*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press
- Dillaway, H., & Paré, E. (2008). Locating mothers: How cultural debates about stay-at-home versus working mothers define women and home. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(4), 437-464.
- Elklit, A., & Kurdahl, S. (2013). The psychological reactions after witnessing a killing in public in a Danish high school. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 4(1), Article 19826- Article 19826. doi:10.3402/ejpt.v4i0.19826
- Figley, C. R. (2013). *Compassion fatigue: Coping with secondary traumatic stress disorder in those who treat the traumatized*. Routledge.
- Frieze, I. H., Hymer, S., & Greenberg, M. S. (1985). Describing the Victims of Crime and Violence. In A. S. Kahn (Ed.), *Victims of crime and violence: Final report of the APA Task Force on the Victims of Crime and Violence* (pp. 18-78). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Furedi, F. (2007). The only thing we have to fear is the 'culture of fear' itself. *American Journal of Sociology*, 32, 231-234.
- Garbarino, J., & Haslam, R. H. (2005). Lost boys: Why our sons turn violent and how we can save them. *Pediatrics & Child Health*, 10(8), 447.

- Healy, J., McIntire, M., & Turkewitz, J. (2015). Oregon Killer's Mother Wrote of Troubled Son and Gun Rights. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/06/us/mother-of-oregon-gunman-wrote-of-keeping-firearms.html>
- Heidensohn, F. (2012). The future of feminist criminology. *Crime, Media, Culture: An International Journal*, 8(2), 123-134. doi:10.1177/1741659012444431
- Heidensohn, F. (1968) The deviance of women: A critique and an enquiry. *British Journal of Sociology* 19: 160–175. Republished 2010 in 60th Anniversary Issue of the BJS, ‘Shaping Sociology over Sixty Years’.
- Hoffman, L. N. W., & Youngblade, L. (1999). *Mothers at work: Effects on children's well-being*. Cambridge University Press.
- Holstein, J. A. and G. Miller. (1990). Rethinking victimisation: An interactional approach to victimology. *Symbolic Interaction* 13(1):103–22.
- Jackson, D., & Mannix, J. (2004). Giving voice to the burden of blame: A feminist study of mothers’ experiences of mother blaming. *International journal of nursing practice*, 10(4), 150-158.
- Jacobs, J., Horne-Moyer, H. L., & Jones, R. (2004). The effectiveness of critical incident stress debriefing with primary and secondary trauma victims. *International Journal of Emergency Mental Health*. doi:10.1080/00050060410001660308
- Jordan, K. (2003). A trauma and recovery model for victims and their families after a catastrophic school shooting: Focusing on behavioral, cognitive, and psychological effects and needs. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention*, 3(4), 397-411. doi:10.1093/brief-treatment/mhg031

- Kafka, J. (2008). Disciplining youth, disciplining women: Motherhood, delinquency, and race in postwar American schooling. *Educational Studies*, 44(3), 197-221.
- Karmen, A. (2007). *Crime victims: An introduction to victimology* (6th ed.). Australia; Canada; Thomson Wadsworth.
- Karmen, A. (2012). *Crime victims: An introduction to victimology*. Cengage Learning.
- Kenney, J. S. (2002). Victims of crime and labeling theory: A parallel process? *Deviant Behavior*, 23(3), 235-265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/016396202753561239>
- Kirchhoff, G. F. (2010). *History and a theoretical structure* (pp. 95-123). Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Kirchhoff, G. F., & Morosawa, H. (2009). The study of victimology: basic considerations for the study of theoretical victimology. 2009) *Victimization in a multi-disciplinary key: recent advances in victimology*. Wolf Legal Publishers (WLP). Nijmegen, The Netherlands.
- Klebold, S. (2016). *A mother's reckoning: Living in the aftermath of tragedy*. New York, NY: Broadway Books.
- Langman, P. (2009). Rampage school shooters: A typology. *Aggression and Violent behavior*, 14(1), 79-86.
- Lee, S., Colditz, G., Berkman, L., & Kawachi, I. (2003). Caregiving to children and grandchildren and risk of coronary heart disease in women. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(11), 1939-44. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.uproxy.library.dcuoit.ca/docview/215091666?accountid=14694>
- Lehner-Zimmerer, M. (2011). Future challenges of international victimology. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies: AJCJS*, 4(2), 13-27. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com.uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/docview/870326819?accountid=14694>

Lemert, E. M. (1951). *Social pathology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Lépine, M. (2008). *Aftermath*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Group.

Lewkowicz, F. (2017). Kimveer Gill. Retrieved February 06, 2018, from

<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/kimveer-gill/article20413818/>

Mason, K. O., & Bumpass, L. L. (1975). US women's sex-role ideology, 1970. *American Journal of Sociology*, 80(5), 1212-1219.

Mancusi, S. (2010). Witnesses and Victims. In *The Police Composite Sketch* (pp. 63-76). Totowa, NJ: Humana Press.

Mawby, R., & Walklate, S. (1994). *Critical victimology: International perspectives*. Sage.

Melendez, M. S., Lichtenstein, B., & Dolliver, M. J. (2016). Mothers of mass murderers: Exploring public blame for the mothers of school shooters through an application of courtesy stigma to the Columbine and Newtown tragedies. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(5), 525-536.
doi:10.1080/01639625.2015.1060754

Meloy, J. R., Hempel, A. G., Mohandie, K., Shiva, A. A., & Gray, B. T. (2001). Offender and offense characteristics of a non-random sample of adolescent mass murderers. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40(6), 719-728.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200106000-00018>

Mendelsohn, B. (1963). The origin of the doctrine of victimology. *Excerpt a criminological*, 3(3), 239-244.

- Montreal Gazette. (2007). Kimveer Gill Family, Friends grieve a 'gentle soul' - and ask themselves what went wrong in those final months. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from <http://www.pressreader.com/canada/montreal-gazette/20070310/282308200645509>
- Morrall, P., Hazelton, M., & Shackleton, W. (2013). Psychotherapy and social responsibility: The challenging case of homicide. *Psychotherapy and Politics International, 11*(2), 102-113. doi:10.1002/ppi.1302
- Mulvey, E. P., & Cauffman, E. (2001). The inherent limits of predicting school violence. *American Psychologist, 56*(10), 797-802. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.797
- Nock, M. K., Green, J. G., Hwang, I., McLaughlin, K. A., Sampson, N. A., Zaslavsky, A. M., & Kessler, R. C. (2013). Prevalence, correlates, and treatment of lifetime suicidal behavior among adolescents: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication Adolescent Supplement. *JAMA Psychiatry, 70*(3), 300-310. doi:10.1001/2013.jamapsychiatry.55
- Nodding's, N. (1989). *Women and evil*. University of California Press.
- Okin, S. M. (2013). *Women in western political thought*. Princeton University Press.
- Perreault, S., & Brennan, S. (2010). Criminal victimization in Canada, 2009. *Jurist at: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 30*(2), 1–33. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2010002/article/11340-eng.pdf>
- Quinney, R. (1972). Who is the victim? *Criminology, 10*(3), 314-323. doi:10.1111/j.17459125.1972.tb00564.x
- Renzetti, C. M., & Curran, D. J. (1999). *Women, men, and society* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Rock, P. E. (1993). *The social world of an English Crown Court: Witness and professionals in the crown court centre at wood green*. Clarendon Press.
- Shoham, S. G., Knepper, P., & Kett, M. (2010). *International handbook of victimology*. Boca Raton, Fla: CRC Press.
- Suryadi. (2009). Muslims and matriarchs: Cultural resilience in Indonesia through jihad and colonialism.
- Cohen, P., & Somerville, M. (1990). *Ingelba and the five black matriarchs*. Allen & Unwin.
- Thoits, P. A. (1990). Emotional deviance: Research agendas. In T. D. Kemper (Ed.), *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions* (pp. 180–203). New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Wallace, H., & Roberson, C. (1998). *Victimology: Legal, psychological, and social perspectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Von Hentig, H. (1948). *The criminal & his victim: Studies in the sociobiology of crime*. Yale University Press.
- Viano, E. (1992). *Critical issues in victimology: International perspectives*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Walklate, S. (2006). *Imagining the victim of crime*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Zimmerman, T. S., Aberle, J. T., Krafchick, J. L., & Harvey, A. M. (2008). Deconstructing the “mommy wars”: The battle over the best mom. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 20(3), 203-219.