



September 1992

# Intimate Femicide: An Ecological Analysis

Karen Stout  
*University of Houston*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

 Part of the [Domestic and Intimate Partner Violence Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Stout, Karen (1992) "Intimate Femicide: An Ecological Analysis," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 19 : Iss. 3 , Article 3.  
Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol19/iss3/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work at ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [maira.bundza@wmich.edu](mailto:maira.bundza@wmich.edu).



# Intimate Femicide: An Ecological Analysis

KAREN STOUT

University of Houston  
Graduate School of Social Work

*This research identifies the killing of women by male partners as a multidimensional problem and, through empirical analysis, identifies relationships between intimate femicide and individual, family, community services, state status of women, and violence against women factors. The conceptual base follows an ecological framework. Individual demographic and situational factors are presented. The findings of the study indicate that factors within each of the ecological settings are associated with intimate femicide. An implication of this exploratory study is that intimate femicide is related to a number of state factors, including factors associated with gender inequality in a state.*

## Introduction

Drawing upon an ecological framework and upon a broad range of social work, psychological, criminological, sociological, and feminist scholarship on violence against women, this study examines factors within ecological settings which may be associated with the killing of women by male intimate partners. The study focuses on two units of analysis: the individual and the state environment. The individual unit of analysis examines micro ecological setting factors such as age, race, and victim/offender relationship. The state-level unit of analysis focuses on examining factors within the family (exo), community (meso), and societal (macro) ecological settings such as possible associations between child homicides and intimate femicides; services addressing violence against women; the level of gender equality of women in a state and intimate femicide; and the presence of other forms of violence against women and intimate femicides in a state.

Identifying factors which may contribute to the killing of women by male intimates is an attempt to unearth and expose

the deeply rooted practices which contribute to the ongoing prevalence and severity of violence against women. This research focuses on two major problems: the oppression of women and intimate femicide. This exploratory study posed a series of exploratory questions in order to begin focused investigation into the many factors which may be associated with the killing of women by male intimate partners in this country.

### Conceptual Framework

Reviewing the literature on homicide and on violence against women, it is suggested that there is no single cause of homicide, violence against women, or intimate femicide. Yllo (1983) reviewed factors related to family violence and notes, "A complicated web of factors are at work. Some of these factors are embedded in the social structure and culture; others grow out of socialization experiences or day-to-day stresses" (p. 82). Smith and Parker (1979) challenge the assumption that homicide is a unidimensional phenomenon. These authors suggest the importance of looking at (1) primary homicide, which is described as killings among family or acquaintances, and (2) non-primary homicide, where the homicide occurs along with the commission of another crime and among people unknown to each other. Breines and Gordon (1983) call for gender to become a category of analysis for every social issue.

These scholars recognize the limits in current research on homicide and/or family violence. The recognition of gender as a factor, homicide as a multidimensional problem, and family violence as a complicated set of structural and individual factors creates a need for a conceptual framework which can encompass a review of multiple factors which may be related to intimate femicide.

An ecological conceptual framework provides an opportunity to study this web of factors which may be associated with crime in the family—specifically, femicide by male intimate partners. Furthermore, an ecological framework allows the opportunity to merge feminist world views with more traditional models on homicide and other forms of violence to maximize one's ability to understand the many facets which contribute to violence against women in today's complex society. Germain

and Gitterman (1979) suggest, "In the ecological perspective, people and their environments are viewed as interdependent, complementary parts of a whole in which each is constantly changing and each is reciprocally shaping the other" (p. 370).

Carlson (1984), in reference to an ecological conceptual framework, notes, "The model can be used to explain or understand individual instances of spouse abuse as well as domestic violence as a social problem in contemporary America. . . ." (p. 570). Bronfenbrenner (1977) defines four ecological settings: (1) the microsystem, (2) the mesosystem (3) the exosystem, and (4) the macrosystem.

The microsystem is defined by Bronfenbrenner (1977) as "the complex of relations between the developing person and environment in an immediate setting containing that person. . . ." (p. 514). For the purposes of this research, demographic variables such as age, race, relationship of the victim to offender, and other descriptive variables will be the micro level variables under review. These variables serve the purpose of describing the intimate femicide population in the United States.

The mesosystem can be conceptualized as the family system (Carlson, 1984). Numerous scholars have conceptualized intimate violence against women as one component of the larger problem named "family violence." This research explored the relationship between other forms of family violence for possible associations with intimate femicide. Specifically, this research posed two questions, "Is the abuse of children in a state associated with the killing of women by a male partner in a state?" and "Are the number of child homicides in a state associated with the number of women killed by male partners in a state?"

The exosystem addresses formal influences on people in our society. Bronfenbrenner (1977) suggests components of the exosystem to be: major institutions, mass media, the paid employment sphere, neighborhoods, government agencies, transportation services, and informal social networks. Carlson (1984), focusing on battered women, suggests that important variables in this system include: unemployment of perpetrators, services for victims and perpetrators of abuse, and community attitudes. This research posed the following question for exploratory analysis: "Controlling for the state population, do states which have

more (1) shelters for battered women, (2) treatment services for men who batter, and (3) rape crisis centers have a lower rate of intimate femicide?"

The macrosystem refers to "the overarching institutional patterns of the culture or subculture, such as economic, social, educational, legal, and political systems, of which micro-, meso-, and exosystems are the concrete manifestations" (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 515). Bronfenbrenner suggests that laws, regulations, and rules are variables to be considered as part of an ecological analysis of the macrosystem. This research focused on examining gender inequality—legal, political, and economic—as factors of the macro ecological setting. This area of inquiry relied heavily upon the scholarship of Yllo (1983) and Sugarman and Straus (1986). These authors have constructed indexes to measure the status of women and gender equality, respectively. Yllo (1983) provided the first empirical evidence regarding the status of women and the level of wife beating in a state. The second macro focus was on examining the relationship of other crimes against women and the number of women killed by male intimates in a state. Three of the research questions in this section are: "Is the rape rate in a state associated with the state rate of intimate femicide?", "Is the rate of pornographic magazine sales associated with the state rate of intimate femicide?", and "Is the rate of sex discrimination in a state associated with the rate of intimate femicide in a state." Scholars have suggested that the many forms of violence against women are related to a woman's status in a society as well as to other forms of violence against women (Stanko, 1985; Russell, 1984).

The selection of variables, generation of research questions, and analysis of data focused on these four systems. A broad, inclusive examination of factors which may be associated with intimate femicide is important to establish the context of violence against women. Stark-Adamec and Adamec (1982) remind scholars that, "Concentration on eliminating only one contributor to the problem [of men's aggression against women]—like any univariate research on a multivariate phenomenon—is likely to yield unintended, undesirable, or misleading results" (p. 18).

### Methodology, Data Collection, and Analysis

This research is an exploratory study relying heavily upon secondary data. Kerlinger (1973) notes three general purposes of the exploratory study. The first is to identify variables in a field situation. The second is to identify relationships between variables. The third is the building of a foundation upon which future studies can draw for more rigorous and systemic testing of hypotheses. Current theory on lethal violence against women is not developed sufficiently for prediction or hypothesis testing. This study provides a foundation for future research on the relationship between ecological factors and intimate femicide.

This research focuses on females, age 16 and over, who are killed by male intimate partners, defined as husbands, common-law husbands, ex-husbands, friends, and boyfriends, age 16 and over. This study examines femicide wherein a female is presently or formerly involved in a relationship with a male by choice, with varying degrees of friendship and/or where a past or present intimate relationship is involved. The focus of the study is on each of the 50 U.S. states.

The data collection was dependent upon numerous archival records and statistics (see Appendix A). Whenever possible, data were collected for the years 1980, 1981, and 1982 and then were averaged. When data were not available for all three years, the data available during the time frame studied were utilized, e.g., if data for 1982 were the only data available, those were used as representing the time period of 1980–1982. The data collection represents the “best” source of data available (within the limits of the researcher’s knowledge) and none are without limitations despite the best intentions of the administrative source responsible for the collection of the data. Each type of data obtained had to be available for each of the 50 states for the time period under review. For details on the strengths and limitations of the data used in this study, complete information is available from Stout (1987). The independent variables were classified into four ecological systems: the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem.

The dependent variable of “average rate of women killed by male intimate partners” is derived from the *Uniform Crime Reports, 1980–1982: Supplemental Homicide Reports*<sup>1</sup> for the time

period from January 1980 through December 1982. All females, age 16 and over, whose deaths were classified as "murder or non-negligent manslaughter" and who were killed by male intimate partners are included in the data set. While *Uniform Crime Report* data have been criticized for both reliability and validity problems, O'Brien (1985) found that homicides are well reported.

Several means of data analysis were employed, dependent upon the question asked and the variable's level of measurement. Descriptive statistics, Student T-Tests and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient were the major forms of statistical analysis employed.

#### Micro Ecological Setting Results—Descriptive Data

From January 1, 1980, through December 31, 1982, 4189 females, 16 and over, were known to have been killed by male intimate partners (Stout, 1987). Married women comprised the majority of women killed by intimate partners with 57.7% of intimate femicide victims as wives of offenders. Girlfriends have the next highest frequency of lethal victimization comprising 24.9 percent of intimate femicide victims. Wives and girlfriends as victims of intimate femicide were followed by the killing of common-law wives (7.9 percent), ex-wives (4.9 percent), and friends (4.7 percent).

The age of victims ranged from 16 to 91. The modal age was 26. The age group of 25–29 was the modal grouped age category. The number of lethal killings by male intimate partners declines with each subsequent age category. The age group of 30–34 was the modal group age for the male offenders.

White women (includes Hispanics) comprise the majority of intimate femicide victims. While white women comprise the majority of victims (60.44%), black women are disproportionately represented, comprising 37.12 percent of intimate femicide victims. The majority of victims and offenders were of non-Hispanic origin. The data also support that most killings of intimate partners are intraracial and intraethnic.

The situation which surrounds the incident of intimate femicide is described as the number of offenders and the victims

involved in the killing. Virtually all (96.7%) of the intimate femicide killings were comprised of a single offender and a single victim. The second most frequent situational category is that of multiple victims with a single offender.

Sixty-eight percent of intimate femicide victims were killed by a firearm, 14.4% by a knife, and eight percent by the use of personal weapons (beatings with hands, feet).

The circumstances in which the killings took place were also examined. The *UCR* classifies circumstances according to felonies or nonfelonies. The majority of intimate femicide cases fell into the nonfelony category. The broad description of "other arguments" is the category in which most of the nonfelony intimate femicide cases fell. This would be consistent with the lay and police terminology of "domestic quarrel." These 2426 "domestic quarrels" ended in the death of the female partner. The second most frequent category was that of "lover's triangle." This is the category often described in lay and academic literature as "crimes of passion." Ninety deaths were attributed to alcohol or drug use on the part of the offender.

#### Meso, Exo, and Macro Ecological Analysis Results

These variables were drawn from the meso ecological setting reviewing violence against children; the exo ecological setting reviewing services which address violence against women; the macro ecological setting which reviews indicators of gender equality and indicators of violence against women in a state.

Table 1 presents the correlation of these selected violence against children factors and selected services which address violence against women factors with intimate femicide.

This analysis suggests three factors as statistically significant in their association with intimate femicide. First, the rate of child homicides in a state was positively correlated with the rate of intimate femicide in a state at the .0001 alpha level. Second, the rate of shelters for battered women in a state was negatively correlated with the rate of intimate femicide in a state at the .0001 alpha level. Third, the rate of rape crisis centers in a state was negatively correlated with intimate femicide at the .005 alpha level.



Table 1

*The Correlation between Selected Violence Against Children Factors, Services Which Address Violence Against Women Factors, and Intimate Femicide*

Factor	r	P
Meso Ecological Factors		
Child Abuse Rate, Per Thousand	.207	.150
Child Homicide Rate, Per Million	.544	.0001
Exo Ecological Factors		
Number of Shelters, Per Million	-.517	.0001
Number of Rape Crisis Centers, Per Million	-.403	.0046
Number of Programs for Men Who Batter, Per Million	.116	.4426

Table 2.0 presents results on a macro ecological variable. This analysis focused on the relationship between economic and political factors with the rate of intimate femicide in a state.

Four of the selected economic and political factors were statistically significant in their correlation with intimate femicide. The first factor, as indicated in Table 2.0, is the percent of women employed in managerial and administrative positions, as relative to the percent of men in management and administrative positions. This is a positive correlation at the .02 probability level. The second correlated factor was the percent of unemployed women, relative to the percent of unemployed men, in a state. This factor is positively correlated with the rate of intimate femicide at the .02 probability level. The third factor correlated with intimate femicide at a statistically significant level is the percent of state house members who are women. This factor was negatively correlated with the rate of intimate femicide in a state at the .05 probability level. The fourth factor is a combined measure of members of a state house and members of a state senate who are female. This factor was negatively correlated with the rate of intimate femicide in a state at the .03 probability level.

The next section presents the results of the analysis on the relationship between the legal status of women in a state and intimate femicide. Fifteen of the measures used to assess women's

Table 2

*The Correlation between Selected Economic and Political Factors and Intimate Femicide*

Factor*	r	P
Macro Ecological Factors		
Women in the Civilian Labor Force, Percent	.080	.580
Women in Professional and Technical Occupations, Percent	.020	.892
Women in Managerial and Administrative Positions, Percent	.324	.022
Women's Unemployment, Percent	.326	.021
Women's Median Income, Percent	.226	.115
Judges, Percent Women	-.028	.846
State House Representatives, Percent Women	-.285	.045
State Senators, Percent Women	-.267	.064
Combined State House and Senate Representation, Percent Women	-.315	.026
Mayors and Councillors, Percent Women	.166	.249
United State Congress Representatives, Percent Women	-.164	.256

\* Each factor in Table 2.0 is calculated by the formula:

$$\text{Index} = \frac{\text{Females with Characteristic}}{\text{Males with Characteristic}} \times 100$$

legal status in the 50 U.S. states were compiled from a composite index developed by Sugarman & Straus (1985) to assess women's legal status in the 50 U.S. states.<sup>2</sup> In addition to the measures developed by Sugarman & Straus (1985), three additional legal status factors were analyzed in the current research. These factors include:

(1) Whether or not a state passed the federal Equal Rights Amendment.

(2) Whether or not a state passed state equal rights legislation.

(3) Whether or not a state had a marital rape exemption in its statutes.

Each of the Sugarman & Straus (1985) measures and each of the additional legal status variables were tested for significance with the Student T-Test which compared the average number of intimate femicides with states which did have the law and states which did not have the law. Due to space limitations, only variables which were tested as statistically significant will be reviewed.

*Legal 1: State passed a fair employment practices act*

Forty states had passed a fair employment practices act by 1982 while 10 states had not passed such legislation. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did not have a fair employment practices act was 11.71. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did have such legislation was 7.22. The differences of means in states which had this legislation and states which did not have this legislation was statistically significant at the .0005 probability level.

*Legal 2: State Passed Equal Pay Laws*

Forty-three states had passed an equal pay law by 1982 while seven states had not passed such legislation. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did not have equal pay legislation was 13.37. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did have such legislation was 7.27. The differences in means for states which had this legislation and states which did not have this legislation was statistically significant at the .0001 probability level.

*Legal 3: Sex Discrimination Law in the Area of Public Accommodations*

Twenty-nine states had passed legislation prohibiting sex discrimination in the area of public accommodations by 1982 while 21 states had not passed such legislation. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did not have sex discrimination prohibitions in the area of public accommodations was 10.0. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did have such legislation was 6.76. The differences in means for states which had this legislation and states which

did not have this legislation was statistically significant at the .002 probability level.

*Legal 4: Sex Discrimination Law in the Area of Housing*

By 1982, 29 states had passed legislation prohibiting sex discrimination in housing while 21 states had not passed such legislation. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did not have sex discrimination prohibitions in housing was 9.59. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did have such legislation was 7.06. The differences in means for states which had this legislation and states which did not have this legislation was statistically significant at the .019 probability level.

*Legal 5: Statutes Providing for Civil Injunction Relief for Victims of Abuse*

By 1982, 33 states had passed legislation providing for civil injunction relief for victims of abuse while 17 states had not passed such legislation. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did not have civil injunction relief for abuse victims was 9.59. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did have such legislation was 7.36. The differences in means for states which had this legislation and states which did not have this legislation was statistically significant at the .048 probability level.

*Additional Legal Variable 1: Passage of the Federal Equal Rights Amendment*

Thirty-five states had passed the federal equal rights amendment by 1982 while 15 states had not passed the constitutional amendment. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did not pass the federal equal rights amendment was 11.45. The mean number of intimate femicide cases in states which did pass this constitutional amendment was 6.69. The differences in means for states which had this legislation and states which did not have this legislation was statistically significant at the .0001 probability level.

The final section of the analysis to be presented includes factors which represent varying degrees of violence against women. These factors are: rate of sex discrimination charges filed in a state, monthly circulation rate for five pornographic magazines (*Penthouse*, *Playboy*, *Genesis*, *Gallery*, and *Club*), rape rate, rate of women killed by nonintimate partners. These measures were analyzed for their relationship with intimate femicide. Table 3 presents the results of this analysis.

Table 3

*The Correlation between Selected Violence Against Women Factors and Intimate Femicide*

Violence Against Women Factor	r	P
Macro Ecological Factors		
Women Killed by Nonintimate Partners, Per Million	.822	.0001
Sex Discrimination Charges, Per Ten Thousand	.140	.331
Rape Rate, Per Ten Thousand	.604	.0001
Pornographic Magazine Sales Rate, Per Thousand	.166	.248

As indicated in Table 3, two of the four factors used to measure violence against women in a state were statistically significant. The rape rate in a state was positively correlated with the intimate femicide rate at the .0001 probability level. The rate of women (16 and over) killed by nonintimate partners was also statistically significant at the .0001 probability level. This relationship has a positive correlation.

### Discussion

This research focused on exploring associations between intimate femicide and factors representing ecological settings which could influence the killing of women by male intimate partners. This analysis is an initial step toward delineating factors which are associated with the rate of intimate femicide in

this country. This research departed from traditional homicide research through the focus on gender and relationship, by the variables chosen for review, and by the definition of the problem. This research focused on several sets of factors and research questions which have often been presented as having possible associations with violence against women. The gender equality measures have not been tested in prior research for their relationship with intimate femicide and were only recently tested on battering (Yllo, 1983) and rape (Baron & Straus, 1986).

The analysis of micro factors described the prevalence of intimate femicide as well as presented information on the nature of the event and the nature of victim/offender relationships. While women 25–29 appear to be at highest risk for lethal victimization by male partners, it is important to note that women of all ages fall prey to this type of violence. It also seems important to note that most intimate femicides are the end result of an argument. This implies the need for education and clinical intervention strategies which advocate and teach nonviolent communication.

Examination of the meso ecological factors of violence against children indicates that child abuse rates were not statistically significant in their relationship with intimate femicide while the rate of child homicides by relatives is indeed positively correlated with intimate femicide. This finding suggests that more intense investigation and development of theory needs to occur to begin to better delineate lethality predictors for all types of family violence.

The results of the exo ecological setting alerted us to the negative correlation between the rate of shelters in a state and rape crisis centers in a state with the state intimate femicide rate. While correlational data cannot be interpreted as causal, i.e., that fewer women are killed in states because there are more shelters, reviewing shelter services and rape crisis center services is a factor which is (1) newly introduced to studies on homicide and (2) may warrant further investigation as to the antecedent variables which affect the number of shelter or rape crisis centers in a state. A question which emerges is, "Does a feminist presence in a state affect the rate of women killed in a state by male intimate partners?"

Two economic factors were statistically significant—the percent of women in management and administration and the percent of unemployed women in a state. The positive correlation with the percent of unemployed women fits theoretically with assumptions that the lower the gender equality in a state, the higher the rates of femicide will be in a state. Where women are unemployed in disproportionate numbers to men, economic gender inequality is a result. On the other hand, the positive correlation between women in management and administrative positions with intimate femicide, suggests that as women's status in a state rises, violence against women may be higher in those states. This finding is consistent with 1983 research by Yllo related to the status of women in a state and battering. Yllo found that when the status of women was low in a state, more women were battered; when the status of women was moderate, the battering declined; and when the status of women was highest, the rate of battering again increased. While Yllo's research was based on the use of indexes, instead of isolating individual factors, one explanation of Yllo's may be relevant in understanding the positive correlation on the variable of percent of women in management and administrative positions,

In states where the general status of women is relatively high, husbands may feel threatened by the rapid social change and the breakdown of traditional husband-wife roles. Increased domestic conflict may be a consequence of women's move toward equality. (pp. 82–83)

Several political variables were also presented in the results as correlates of intimate femicide. The measure of percent of state house representatives who were women and the measure of percent of women in the state house and senate was negatively correlated with intimate femicide. Again, this finding is consistent with the idea of gender equality, noting that there will be less violence against women in states which have attained a greater degree of equality in different spheres—in this case in the political arena.

The finding that states which had statutes promoting "equality"—Fair Employment Practices Act, Equal Pay Laws, Sex

Discrimination Law in the areas of housing and public accommodations, and the passage of the federal Equal Rights Amendment—were the states with a lower mean number of intimate femicide cases is worth pursuing in future research. These legal findings appear to affirm the concept of social justice and should be encouraging to all who have advocated the necessity of legislative change to promote social justice for women.

States that had legislation allowing for civil injunction relief had fewer intimate femicide cases than states without this legislation. Obtaining civil injunction relief or a protective order is often psychologically easier for victims of abuse to obtain than going through the criminal courts for “Protection.” This difference may suggest that social workers and others involved with victims of violence need to continue to strive to be client oriented, seeking immediate and uncomplicated bureaucratic relief for our clients.

The final analysis focused on the relationship between intimate femicide and other forms of violence against women. Only the rape rate and femicide by nonintimate partners was statistically significant with the rate of intimate femicide in a state. Sex discrimination and pornography rates were statistically significant in their relationship with rape rates but not with intimate femicide. Further evaluation is needed in this area to assess whether or not there is a continuum of violence against women and to assess which variables have the most impact on the manifestation of different forms of violence against women.

This exploratory research on intimate femicide can provide a foundation upon which future studies on femicide can build. It will be important that future research focus on developing predictive models. It also must be emphasized that smaller scale qualitative studies are needed in this area focusing more directly on the the micro factors of the individual and meso family factors. This could be possible within a single state with cooperation of law enforcement in order to gain access to records, perpetrators, and family members of the victim.

The first step in any research or practice endeavor is to identify the problem. This study has clearly named and identified intimate femicide as a social problem meriting attention and action. The social science professions have an obligation to strive



to understand factors which may contribute to the final act of woman abuse—the killing of women by male intimate partners.

### References

- American Humane Association (1983). Annual report, 1981: Highlights of official child neglect and abuse reporting. (Available from the American Humane Association, 9725 E. Hampden Avenue, Denver, CO 80231).
- Baron, L. & Straus, M. (1986). Four theories of rape: A macrosociological analysis. Mimeographed paper, Family Research Lab, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
- Breines, W. & Gordon, L. (1983). The new scholarship of family violence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 8, 490–530.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32, 667–676.
- Bureau of the Census (1980). Table 17. Income in 1980 of person in regions, divisions, and states. Current Population Survey. Unpublished Data. (Available from Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233).
- Bureau of the Census (1981). Table 17. Income in 1981 of person in regions, divisions, and states. Current Population Survey. Unpublished Data. (Available from Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233).
- Bureau of the Census (1980). Table 17. Income in 1982 of person in regions, divisions, and states. Current Population Survey. Unpublished Data. (Available from Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233).
- Carlson, B. E. (1984). Causes and maintenance of domestic violence: An ecological analysis. *Social Service Review*, 58, 569–587.
- Center for the American Woman and Politics (1981). Factsheet: Women in Elective Office, 1980 (Mayors and Municipal/Township Councillors). Unpublished Mimeograph. (Available from the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901).
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1982). *16th annual report*. FY 1981. Washington, D. C.: Equal Opportunity Commission.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1983). *16th annual report*. FY 1982. Washington, D. C.: Equal Opportunity Commission.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1981). *15th annual report*. FY 1981. Washington, D. C.: Equal Opportunity Commission.
- Germain, C. & Gitterman, A. (1979). The life model of social work practice. In F. Turner (Ed.) *Social Work Treatment* (pp. 361–385) New York: The Free Press.
- O'Brien, R. M. (1985). *Crime and victimization data*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Kerlinger, F. (1973). *Foundations of behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

- Lerman, L. G. & Livingston, F. (1983). State legislation on domestic violence. *Response to violence in the family and sexual assault*, 6, 193–196.
- National Center for Women and Family Law. (1986, June). Marital rape exemption: State by state analysis. Item No. 95. (Available from National Center on Women and Family Law, 799 Broadway, Room 402, New York, New York, 10003).
- National Women's Political Caucus. (1983). *National directory of women elected officials*, 1983. Washington, D. C.: National Women's Caucus.
- Norberg, C. (1982). *Model programs: Working with men who batter*. (Available from RAVEN, P.O. Box 24159, St. Louis, MO 63130).
- Pink Sheet. (1980, September). *Penthouse*. Geographic analysis of total paid circulation for the September, 1980 issue. (Available from the Audit Bureau of Circulations, 900 N. Meacham Road, Schaumburg, IL 60195).
- Pink Sheet. (1980, September). *Genesis*. Geographic analysis of total paid circulation for the September, 1980 issue. (Available from the Audit Bureau of Circulations, 900 N. Meacham Road, Schaumburg, IL 60195).
- Pink Sheet. (1980, September). *Club*. Geographic analysis of total paid circulation for the September, 1980 issue. (Available from the Audit Bureau of Circulations, 900 N. Meacham Road, Schaumburg, IL 60195).
- Pink Sheet. (1980, September). *Gallery*. Geographic analysis of total paid circulation for the September, 1980 issue. (Available from the Audit Bureau of Circulations, 900 N. Meacham Road, Schaumburg, IL 60195).
- Ross, S. D. & Barcher, A. (1983). *The rights of women*. Toronto: Bantam Books.
- Russell, D. E. (1984). *Sexual exploitation*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Smith, M.D. & Parker, R.N. (1980). Type of homicide and variation in regional rates. *Social Forces*, 59, 1, 136–147.
- Stanko, E. A. (1985). *Intimate intrusions: Women's experiences of male violence*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Stark-Adamec, C. & Adamec, R. E. (1982). Aggression by men against women: Adoption or aberration? *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 5, 1–21.
- Stout, K. D. (1987). Intimate femicide: Individual and state factors associated with the killing of women by men. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 10. (University Microfilms, No. 87–28, 649).
- Sugarman, D. & Straus, M. (1985). Indicators of the status of women for American states. Unpublished manuscript, Family Research Lab, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.
- U.S. Department of Labor (1982, March). *Geographic profile of employment and unemployment*, 1980. (Bulletin 2111). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Labor.
- U.S. Department of Labor (1983, January). *Geographic profile of employment and unemployment*, 1980. (Bulletin 2156). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Labor.
- U.S. Department of Labor (1983, May). *Geographic profile of employment and unemployment*, 1980. (Bulletin 2170). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

- Warrior, B. (1982). *Battered women's directory* (8th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Warrior.
- Yllo, K. (1983). Sexual equality and violence against wives in American states. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 14, 1, 67–86.

### Notes

- 1 The data used to analyze the 1980–1982 incidence of intimate femicide by male intimate partners were made available by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. The data for the *Uniform Crime Reports, 1980–1982: Supplemental Homicide Report* were originally collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Neither the collector of the original data nor the consortium bear any responsibility for the analysis and interpretations presented in this paper.
- 2 Most of the indicators used for the economic and political gender equality measures were developed and presented in a mimeographed paper by Sugarman & Straus (1985). These authors used indexes to measure each of the gender equality spheres. The present research, while relying heavily on the work of Sugarman & Straus (1985), differs in that the present research reviews each factor within the index for a possible association with intimate femicide.

## Appendix A.

*Summary Table of Independent Variables by Ecological System*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Operationalization</i>	<i>Data Set</i>
<i>Microsystem</i>		
1. AGE	Chronological age by year	UCR:1980–1982 <i>Supplemental Homicide Report</i>
2. RACE	Categorization by race: White (includes Hispanics), Black, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander	UCR
3. ETHNICITY	Categorization by Ethnic background: Hispanic Origin, Non-Hispanic Origin, Unknown	UCR
4. RELATIONSHIP	Relationship of victim to offender	UCR
5. CIRCUMSTANCE	Events surrounding the homicide: Felony murders, Nonfelony murders, Manslaughter by negligence, Suspected Felony types, Justifiable homicides	UCR
6. SITUATION	Number of victims and offenders involved in the homicide event	UCR
7. WEAPON	Weapon used to carry out homicide	UCR
<i>Mesosystem</i>		
1. STATE RATE OF CHILD HOMICIDE BY RELATIVES	Number of children killed by relatives: mother, father, sister, brother, stepfather, stepmother, other family	UCR

2. STATE RATE OF CHILD ABUSE	Substantiated and nonsubstantiated reports of families reported for child abuse	<i>American Humane Association</i>
------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

*Exosystem*

1. NUMBER OF SHELTERS IN A STATE	Services which provide housing for battered women in a state	<i>Battered Women's Directory, 1982</i>
2. NUMBER OF TREATMENT SERVICES FOR MEN WHO BATTER	Therapeutic services for men who batter, excluding jail or prison services	<i>Response, 1980 &amp; Norberg</i>
3. NUMBER OF RAPE CRISIS CENTERS IN A STATE	24-hour crisis and advocacy services for adult victims of rape	<i>Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape</i>

*Macrosystem*

## 1. GENDER EQUALITY INDICATORS

## ECONOMIC INDICATORS

a. % women in the labor force	Department of Labor
b. % women as professional and technical workers	Department of Labor
c. % women as managers and administrators	Department of Labor
d. Median Income	Department of Commerce

## POLITICAL INDICATORS

a. Members of U.S. Congress—Percent Female	National Women's Political Caucus
b. Members of the state senate—Percent Female	National Women's Political Caucus

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| c. Member of state house—<br>Percent Female                          | National<br>Women's<br>Political Caucus             |
| d. Judges in State Courts—<br>Percent Female                         | National Center<br>for State Courts                 |
| e. Mayors and Muni-<br>cipal/Township Councillors—<br>Percent Female | Center for<br>the American<br>Woman and<br>Politics |

## LEGAL INDICATORS

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| a. Fair Employment Practices<br>Act                   | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| b. Lawsuit under Fair<br>Employment Practices Act     | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| c. Equal Pay Law                                      | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| d. Lawsuit under Equal Pay<br>Law                     | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| e. Sex Discrimination Law—<br>Public Accommodations   | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| f. Sex Discrimination Law—<br>Housing                 | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| g. Sex Discrimination Law—<br>Loan Laws               | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| h. Sex Discrimination Law—<br>Education               | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| i. Name Change at Marriage                            | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| j. Civil Injunction Relief—<br>abuse                  | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| k. Temporary injunctions<br>during divorce/separation | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |
| l. Physical abuse defined as<br>crime                 | Ross & Barcher<br>(ed.) |

	m. Warrantless arrest in domestic violence cases	Ross & Barcher (ed.)
	n. Required reports of domestic violence cases	Ross & Barcher (ed.)
	o. Funds/standards for shelters	Ross & Barcher (ed.)
	p. Federal Equal Rights Amendment	Hoff-Wilson (ed.)
	q. State Equal Rights Amendment	National Organization for Women
	r. No marital rape exemption	National Center on Women and Family Law
2. NONINTIMATE FEMICIDE	Rate of women killed other than intimate victims	UCR
3. SEX DISCRIMINATION CHARGES	Rate of sex charges filed with the EEOC	EEOC
4. RAPES AND ATTEMPTED RAPES	Rate of rapes reported and filed with the FBI	UCR: 1980–1982: <i>Offenses Known and Persons Arrested</i>
5. PORNOGRAPHIC MAGAZINE SALES	Rate of monthly magazine circulation: <i>Club, Gallery, Genesis, Penthouse, Playboy</i>	Audit Bureau of Circulation (Pink Sheets)