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The Original Femicide Study

**Purpose:** Identify and establish risk factors for intimate partner femicide over and above intimate partner violence.

**Significance:** Many women experience IPV, but few women are killed. Women may not accurately assess their own risk of intimate partner homicide. Understanding risk factors can inform safety planning and the development of strategies to prevent intimate partner homicide.
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Case-control design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASES</strong> - women who are killed by their intimate partners</td>
<td>Proxy informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police homicide files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROLS</strong> - women who are physically abused by their intimate partners</td>
<td>Female survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random digit dialing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proxy informants allowed the team to hear the voice of the IPH victim.
## Case-control design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASES</strong> - women who are killed by their intimate partners</td>
<td>Proxy informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police homicide files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROLS</strong> - women who are physically abused by their intimate partners</td>
<td>Female survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random digit dialing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASES</strong> - women who are ALMOST killed by their intimate partners</td>
<td>Female survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelter &amp; hospital case files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of femicide and attempted femicide victims experienced prior physical abuse, including threats of violence.
## Top ten risk factors on Danger Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Adjusted Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perpetrator gun ownership</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perpetrator unemployment</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Threats with a weapons</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Threats to kill her</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Avoided arrest for DV</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Perpetrator stepchild in home</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Highly controlling</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Forced sex</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strangulation</td>
<td>1.0, OK-LA / RAVE: 4.29, multiple strangulation or altered consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Suicide threats or attempts</td>
<td>OR: 2.6, femicide-suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protective: Never lived with him</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

540% increased odds of lethality

(Campbell, Webster, & Glass, 2009; Messing, Campbell, AbiNader, & Bolyard, 2020)
The Danger Assessment

DANGER ASSESSMENT AUTOMATED CALENDAR
Jacquelyn C. Campbell, Ph.D., R.N. Copyright 2003; update 2018; www.dangerassessment.org

Create a calendar for any year. Replace the YEAR to update the calendar. Then print. Do not change or edit any other cell. Several risk factors have been associated with increased risk of homicides (murders) of immigrant women in violent relationships. We cannot predict what will happen in your case, but we would like you to be aware of the danger of homicide in situations of abuse and for you to see how many of the risk factors apply to your situation.

Using the calendar, mark the approximate dates during the past year when you were abused by your partner or ex-partner. Start with the current month and work backwards. Write on that date how bad the incident was according to the following scale:

1. Slapping, pushing, no injuries and/or lasting pain
2. Punching, kicking, bruises, cuts and/or lasting pain
3. "Beating up"; severe contusions, burns, broken bones
4. Threat to use weapons; head injury, internal injury, permanent injury, miscarriage or choking
5. Use of any weapon and/or wounds from weapon

If any of the descriptions for the higher number apply, use the higher number.

2020

MARK YES OR NO FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING: ("He" refers to your husband, partner, ex-husband, ex-partner, or whoever is currently physically hurting you.)

1. Has the physical violence increased in severity or frequency over the past year?
2. Does he own a gun?
3. Have you left him after living together during the past year?
4. If (have never lived with him, check here).
5. If unemployed?
6. Has he ever used a weapon against you or threatened you with a lethal weapon?
7. Yes, was the weapon a gun?
8. Does he threaten to kill you?
9. Has he avoided being arrested for domestic violence?
10. Do you have a child that is not his?
11. Has he ever forced you to have sex when you did not wish to do so?
12. Does he try to choke, strangle you or cut off your breathing?
14. Is he an alcoholic or problem drinker?
15. Does he control most or all of your daily activities? For instance: does he tell you who you can be friends with, when you can see your family, how much money you can use, or when you can take the car? (If he tries, but you do not let him, check here.)
16. Is he violently and constantly jealous of you? (For instance, does he say "I can't have you, no one can.")
17. Have you been beaten by him while you were pregnant? (If you have never been pregnant by him, check here.)
18. Has he ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?
19. Does he threaten to harm your children?
20. Do you believe he is capable of killing you?
21. If he follows you or stays on you, leaving threatening notes or messages, destroys your property, or calls you when you don't want him to?
22. Have you ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?
23. Total "Yes" Answers

Thank you. Please talk to your nurse, advocate or counselor about what the Danger Assessment means in your situation.
The Lethality Screen

Police call for service

Police administer the Lethality Screen

Connect high-risk cases with an advocate on the scene

### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LETHALITY SCREEN FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Case #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim:</td>
<td>Offender:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Check here if victim did not answer any of the questions.**

1. Has he/she ever used a weapon against you or threatened you with a weapon? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
2. Has he/she threatened to kill you or your children? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
3. Do you think he/she might try to kill you? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**

- **Negative response to any of questions 1-3 automatically triggers the protocol referral.**
- **Positive response to at least two of questions 1-3 triggers the protocol referral.**

4. Does he/she have a gun or can he/she get one easily? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
5. Has he/she ever tried to choke you? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
6. Is he/she violent or constantly jealous or does he/she control most of your daily activities? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
7. Have you left him/her separated after living together or being married? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
8. Is he/she unemployed? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
9. Has he/she ever tried to kill himself/herself? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
10. Do you have a child that he/she knows is not his/her? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**
11. Does he/she follow or spy on you or leave threatening messages? **☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Ans.**

- **An officer may trigger the protocol referral, if not already triggered above, as a result of the victim’s response to the below question, or whenever the officer believes the victim is in a potentially lethal situation.**

Is there anything else that worries you about your safety? (If “yes”): What worries you?

Check one:  ☐ Victim screened in accordance to the protocol  ☐ Victim screened in based on the belief of officer  ☐ Victim did not screen in

If victim screened in: After advising her/him of a high danger assessment,  ☐ Yes  ☐ No did the victim speak with the hotline counselor?

**Note:** The questions above and the criteria for determining the level of risk a person faces is based on the best available research on factors associated with lethal violence by a current or former intimate partner. However, each situation may present unique factors that influence risk for lethal violence that are not captured by this screen. Although most victims who screen “positive” or “high danger” would not be expected to be killed, these victims face much higher risk than that of other victims of intimate partner violence.

*Messing et al., 2015*
Evaluation of the Lethality Assessment Program

The Oklahoma Lethality Assessment Study: A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of the Lethality Assessment Program

Validation of the Lethality Screen

Reduced the frequency & severity of violence (~7 months)

Increased help-seeking associated with reductions in violence (e.g., restraining orders)
Goals of the DA-LE

Identify victims at risk of lethal or near-lethal assault

Inform Domestic Violence High Risk Teams (DVHRT)

Provide information to the courts for decision-making
Identify victims at risk of lethal or near-lethal assault

Connect survivors with additional services based on the protocol

Brief screening in fast-paced environments, such as the Emergency Department
Developed by Dr. Nancy Glass at JHSON, myPlan assists users to:
- assess the health & safety of a relationship
- make decisions about safety and well-being
- connect to resources

Backed by research, private, and free via web, iOS, or Android myPlanApp.org
Please don’t let her death be for nothing – please get her story told

-Mother of IPH victim

Never forget who it’s for.
Purpose & goals

1. Understand the scope of intimate partner homicide
2. Replication & Expansion of the original femicide study
Replication & Expansion

1. Urban, suburban, and rural
2. Examine marginalized populations:
   • Immigrants & refugees; LGBTQ individuals; and Indigenous American communities and lands
3. Novel risk factors:
   • Firearm use/ownership/possession, protective orders, military and combat history, children killed, technology-based abuse, multiple strangulation
4. Currently used risk assessments (e.g., ODARA)
5. Expand Nationally
Definitions

**Intimate partner homicide** is one in which an individual kills a current or former intimate partner.

An intimate partner is someone with whom one has repeated romantic, sexual, or dating contacts.

**Intimate partner violence-related homicide** occurs in a context of intimate partner violence, but where the person killed was not themselves an intimate partner of the perpetrator.

Either:
- There is a known history of intimate partner violence (coercive control, physical or sexual violence, stalking, emotional abuse) or
- The perpetrator attempted or successfully killed their partner and other people.
## Data Collection Pillars

### Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Files</th>
<th>Proxy Informant Interviews</th>
<th>IPV Survivor Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Medical examiner autopsy reports</td>
<td>Interviews with proxy informants</td>
<td>Interviews with IPV victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Police investigation files</td>
<td>Gather in-depth data on relationship history for cases.</td>
<td>Gather in-depth data on relationship history for controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prosecutor files</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aims

- Identify IPH cases.
- Gather baseline data.
- Identify IPH cases. Gather in-depth data on relationship history for cases.
- Gather in-depth data on relationship history for controls.

### Community Partners

- Medical examiners
- Law enforcement agencies
- Prosecutor offices
- Fatality review boards
- Medical examiners
- Criminal justice agencies
- Victim witness advocates
- Community-based advocates
- Survey research firm
- Community agencies*
Cases:
Intimate partner homicide data collection

- Years: 2016-2020
- Geographic variation: Urban areas, Rural areas, tribal lands
- Avoid relational misclassification: Including of LGBTQ relationships
- Identify IPV-related homicides
- Identify next-of-kin of homicide victims for interviews
  - Gather additional information on relationship history: Including IPV not reported to law enforcement
  - Avoid racial misclassification: Particularly of Indigenous women
Cases: Proxy informant interviews

- Trauma-informed
- Items: validated risk assessment instruments, existing measures, team expertise
- Supplements with population-specific risk factors (e.g., foreign-born, transgender)
- Content validity (n=64, fatality review board members, law enforcement, researchers, culturally-specific service providers)
- Cognitive interviews (n=6)
Controls:
Survey intimate partner violence survivors

- 70% female victims have victimization history based on proxy reports
- 75% female offenders have victimization history
- 25-45% had a prior arrest

(Campbell et al., 2003; Harden et al., 2019; Koppa & Messing, 2019)
To what extent & how did COVID-19 affect homicide rates & risk?

1. Were the trends in intimate partner homicide rates different than the trends in familial and non-domestic homicide rates during the pandemic (a) within NJ, (b) within AZ, and (c) between NJ and AZ?

2. To what extent did stay-at-home policies affect rates of IPV-related homicides, including child homicides?

3. How was individual-level IPH risk affected by COVID-19 and its related policies?

Figure 2: Seven-day moving average rates per 100K of new cases of COVID-19 and deaths in AZ (blue) and NJ (orange) through December 31, 2020. Horizontal axis starts the first day the state had 10 cases (AZ: 3/22/2020, NJ: 3/16/2020). Data labels indicate the date and rate of seasonal peaks. Data Source: CDC COVID-19 Data Tracker
Preliminary findings from other states
Arizona Data Collection

1. Collected MEO data on all homicides
2. Identified homicides of interest
3. Data collection from LEAs
4. Confirmed adjudication

- Identified next of kin contact information
  - Letter from MEO
  - Letter from PAIRs
- Next of kin contacts PAIRs
- PAIRs contacts next of kin
- Next of kin interviews
Phoenix, AZ: IPH & IPVR Homicide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Reviewed</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>12.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPVR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Reviewed</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

**IPH:** An individual kills a current or former intimate partner.

**IPVR:** A homicide that occurs in a context of intimate partner violence, but where the person killed was not themselves an intimate partner of the perpetrator.
Phoenix, AZ: IPH & IPVR (2016-2020)
Missouri: Parallel Processes

- Victim Advocate Recruitment
- Collect LEA Data
- Collect MEO Data
- Identify next of kin
- Letter from partner or PAIRs
- Next of kin contacts PAIRs
- Next of kin interviews
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ASSAULTS IN ST. LOUIS CITY, MISSOURI
A TREND ANALYSIS OF 2015-2021

The PAIR Studies Research Team:
Jesenia Pizarro, PhD
William Werner, MCJ
Millan AbiNader, MSW, PhD
Jill Messing, MSW, PhD
Jacquelyn Campbell, PhD, MSN, RN
The city should conduct more in-depth analyses of domestic violence assaults during the study period.

There should be a clear focus on identifying domestic violence cases that are at high risk for severe re-assault and homicide.

In depth analyses of services and prevention strategies available within, or near, neighborhoods where domestic violence assaults concentrate should be conducted.
Why New Jersey?
New Jersey’s femicide rate is consistently lower than the national average, and one of the lowest in the country.

Data: www.vpc.org
NJ IPH Numbers 2006-2016

Data: FBI UCR

IPH Rate per 100K
Adults: 0.40
New Jersey has some of the strictest gun laws in the country.

• Regulations:
  • Protective order prohibition for possession and surrender laws
  • Misdemeanor prohibition for possession and surrender laws
  • Seizure laws
  • Stalking prohibition for possession laws
  • Limitations on concealed carries
  • Closed boyfriend loophole
  • Red flag laws

• 15.94% household gun ownership
New Jersey is the 6th most diverse state in the US.

- Racial & Ethnic Diversity
- 3.82% LGB
- 0.43% Transgender/Gender non-conforming/non-binary
- 22.16% foreign born
- 8k active-duty members,
- 17k national guard & reserve members
- 5.32% rural
Partnerships with Community Agencies

What we offer:

• Training & Technical Assistance
• State-specific risk factors
• Calibration of the ODARA specifically for NJ
• Community-driven inquiries
• Reports and data

What we need:

• Recruitment of next-of-kin
• Data from criminal justice agencies
Please schedule a meeting with us:

Email: millan.abinader@sp2.upenn.edu