

Women in Danger of Femicide: Predicting Population at Risk of Femicide from Intimate Partner Violence Survivors in Turkey

Alanur Çavlin*
Hacettepe University

Abstract

The highest threat for intimate partner femicide (IPF) is linked to the previous history of intimate partner violence (IPV). This study estimates the magnitude of women with an increased IPF risk in Turkey based on available data of different forms of violence among specific high-risk groups including those from the Research on Domestic Violence against Women in Turkey (2014) and 2014 population size. The result shows that about 2 million 15-59-aged-women are currently exposed to IPV while some other 1 million women face concurrent threats of physical, sexual, emotional violence. Also, about 170 thousand women are threatened/attacked with lethal objects. Amongst the divorced/separated women, almost 123 thousand severe violence survivors are at high-risk of femicide.

Keywords: *intimate partner femicide, intimate partner violence, population at risk of IPF.*

* Assoc.Prof. Alanur Çavlin, Hacettepe University, Institute of Population Studies, Ankara-Turkey. E-Mail: alanurcv@hacettepe.edu.tr. ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9714-9984.

Öldürülme Riski Altındaki Kadınlar: Türkiye’de Partner Şiddetine Maruz Kalmış Kadın Cinayeti Riski Altındaki Nüfus Tahmini

Alanur Çavlin
Hacettepe Üniversitesi

Öz

Kadınların partnerleri tarafından öldürülmelerine dair en büyük tehditi daha önce partnerlerin şiddetine uğramış olmaları oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışma Türkiye’de partnerleri tarafından öldürülme riski yüksek olan kadınların sayısını 2014 Türkiye’de Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddet Araştırması sonuçlarına ve 2014 yılı nüfusuna göre farklı şiddet biçimlerine yüksek oranda maruz kalan kadın gruplarına dayalı olarak tahmin etmektedir. Buna göre 15-59 yaşları arasında 2 milyon civarında kadın partnerinin şiddetine maruz kalmıştır. Bir milyon civarında kadın eş zamanlı olarak fiziksel, cinsel ve duygusal şiddetle yüz yüzedir. 170 bin kadın öldücü aletlerle saldırıya uğramış ya da tehdit edilmiştir. Eşinden boşanmış ya da ayrı yaşayan kadınlar arasında 123 bine yakını şiddetin en ağır biçimlerine maruz kalmış olan partneri tarafından öldürülme riski en yüksek kadınlardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: kadın cinayetleri, kadına yönelik partner şiddeti, partnerleri tarafından öldürülme riski olan kadınlar.

Introduction

As the most widespread example of male violence, domestic violence is among the major forms of human rights violations, and thus one of the most threatening risks to women's lives today. In Turkey, we can estimate the prevalence of violence against women from the household surveys on Domestic Violence against Women conducted in the years 2008 and 2014 (HUIPS, 2009; HUIPS, 2015). These surveys enable us to infer the period in which the violence occurred (defined herein as the 12-month period prior to the survey) and the lifetime prevalence of violence for female survivors. As the data is based on information collected directly from women, these studies, by their very nature, exclude the number of and characteristics of women who have lost their lives due to male violence. Based on comparative analyses of these surveys, there is no statistically significant difference recorded in the proportion of women who have ever-experienced intimate partner violence in Turkey between the year 2008 and 2014; 39 per cent and 36 per cent respectively (HUIPS, 2009; HUIPS, 2015). However, in recent years, there has been strong public interest concerning women who have lost their lives due to male violence. Defined as the murder of women or girls by men due to their gender, femicide seemingly cannot be curbed in Turkey.

Nevertheless, statistics for male violence against women are not officially collected and published. There is no specific code for 'death due to male or domestic violence' in the official death records published annually. More importantly, any information that can be gathered from official records is limited to the overall number of murdered women. There is no information which includes the social and demographic characteristics of murdered women and whether they were previously subjected to intimate partner violence. However, in order to prevent domestic violence, and in particular male violence, it is necessary to determine and differentiate risk and priority groups.

Since statistical information is lacking in the official records, some non-governmental organisations are attempting to create a public platform for registering femicides. In this context, the two sources of up-to-date and inclusive data on femicide are monthly and annual data reports of the volunteer-run BIANET (Independent Communication Network) with their Male Violence Tally, and "We Will Stop Femicide" Platform (BIANET, 2018; Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu, 2018). These data sources manage to compile some social and demographic characteristics of women who have lost their lives due to male violence. Neither repositories of data are the compilation of official statistics, but they employ generally trusted information sources such as printed and visual media, social media, plus applications made to non-governmental organisations. According to BIANET, in the year 2017, at least 290 women and 22 children were murdered as a result of male violence. Moreover, "We Will Stop Femicide" Platform has recorded 409 femicides (including female children) for the same year. Both sources of data show that in 2 murders out of 3, the perpetrator is the partner or the ex-partner of the murdered woman. Unfortunately, a woman's intimate partner is the most likely suspect in femicides.

International literature and studies on Turkey show that a significant proportion of offenders are the husbands, former husbands, or boyfriends and that these women have been subjected to violence even before their deaths (Abramsky et al., 2007; Caman et al., 2017; Campbell et al., 2007; Campbell et al., 2003; Cullen et al., 2018; Jonhson et al., 2017; Ertürk, 2015; Toprak & Ersoy, 2017). Stöckl's et al. (2013) study, consisting of a systematic analysis based on records in literature and country-specific survey data to estimate partner violence globally, has concluded that at least 39% of femicides are committed by the partner. Studies demonstrate that, in most cases, the violence leading to femicide was not an isolated incident but a series of escalating acts of violence finally resulting in death (Campbell et al., 2003; Cullen et al., 2018; Office of the Chief Coroner for Ontario, 2015; Toprak & Ersoy, 2017). For instance, a research conducted in Canada based on 12 years' data shows that the most important risk factor in IPF is male violence directed towards his partner beforehand (Office of the Chief Coroner for Ontario, 2015). Studies investigated to determine the risk factors for women in IPF that occur without any previous physical or sexual violence mainly emphasise the prior controlling behaviours of men (Johnson et al., 2017). Yet, these studies also admit that the basic predictor of IPF is continual patterns of partner violence (Johnson et al., 2017). It is worth mentioning that the studies acknowledging the relationship between intimate partner violence, and femicide, in particular, have focused more on severe physical violence (Campbell et al., 2003; Cullen et al., 2018; Toprak & Ersoy, 2017).

Femicidal murderers tend to report their crimes as an unconscious act owing to a lack of self-restraint, both in their testimonies and in the limited number of social research studies conducted on them (Bahadır, 2017; Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, 2015). Their testimonies reveal that they aim to act as being innocent in the society and in the presence of their families and children - a way of mitigating their crimes. A recent qualitative research confirms that men who killed their partners and inflicted violence against them have developed a similar discourse in Turkey (Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, 2015). However, as we learn from the other researches, as well as from femicide victims' life stories as reported by their relatives, friends and people in their immediate surroundings, most victims were exposed to violence in the form of death threats before their murders (Campbell et al., 2003; Cullen et al., 2018; Toprak & Ersoy, 2017). In Turkey, most of the murdered women's life stories include information that they were exposed to partner violence for years (Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu, 2017). It is impossible to forget a quotation from Burçe Bahadır's (2014) book, *Dead Women's Land*, by a woman interviewed in the research who warns other women indicating that "[i]f a man says that he will kill you, the woman should believe him."

Wilson and Daly (2017) have inspired many studies in the area of homicide with their long-term work based on data from different countries to find out who killed and whom s/he was killed. However, it has been emphasised in works conceptualising femicide that these murders are part of a pattern of male violence, rather than a spontaneous act of homicide (Allwood, 1989; Corradi & Stöckl, 2014; Gover, Richards, & Patterson, 2017). Femicides are examined

under the study interests of psychology, public health, law, forensics and demography, along with other disciplines. Yet, murders committed by family members and relatives are mostly scrutinized by researchers working on gender studies, since the murdered victims are mostly women killed by men.

Male violence is not standardised; it can arise from all socio-economic groups and ages. Therefore, it does not have a homeland, country, or a constant space. It also does not have where we can draw a line and determine borders, or indeed, put up a wall (Ertürk, 2015). However, studies made for empowering women against male violence point to certain groups of women that should be supported urgently, since they are more vulnerable and have already been exposed to severe violence and death threats (Campbell et. al., 2003). In other words, violence survivors in general and violence survivors who have risk related experiences, in particular, have a higher risk of femicide.

Violence survivors who made a formal request for help and who have left their home due to violence are among high risk carrying women. The qualitative interviews conducted with violence survivors confirm that women generally consult institutions long after the beginning of violence in their lives, and only when the extent of physical violence goes beyond their endurance (Ergöçmen, 2015). Similar to the relationship between leaving home and violence, one should not be taken in by the perception that attempting to receive institutional support, such as taking shelter in the police station and filing a complaint, taking legal action, or consulting a non-governmental organisation are the catalysts for increasing violence; one must remember that the reason women go through these extreme efforts in the first place is the presence of male violence in their lives.

Case studies point out that women have the highest risk after divorce, or after leaving home for even a short while (Campbell et. al., 2003; Ellis, 2017; Wilson & Daly, 1993). Research on femicide reveals that ex-partners who have more tendency to control women are more likely perpetrators (Campbell et. al., 2003; Desmond, 2017; Dawson & Gartner, 1998; Ellis, 2017; Garcia et. al., 2007; Wilson & Daly, 1993). Wilson & Daly (2009), in their work examining the femicides in Canada and the USA, statistically show that the risk of murder among divorced women is much higher. A significant point emphasized by the research is that even when the marriage does not end in divorce, incidents such as declaring the thought of separation, leaving home with the thought of separation, or opening a divorce case, are major risk factors for male violence and femicide (Campbell et. al., 2007).

Stalking, as a form of IPV, is associated with other forms of IPV and among the identifiable risk factors for IPV (Campbell 2009; Campbell et. al., 2003; McFarlane et. al., 2002). Studies show that some specific forms of stalking, including threatening behaviour and the threat of harming the children, mainly directed to women by their partners or former partners (McFarlane et. al., 2002; Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu & Çavlin, 2015). Excuses used by abusers such as 'losing control' or 'not knowing what they are doing' are not adequate explanations for such violent male behaviour. Stalking reveals this insidious and obsessed dimension of male violence through a clear lens. Previous researches

also confirm the association between stalking and controlling behaviours of male partners (McFarlane et. al., 2002). Therefore, stalking behaviour of the abuser has been included into the risk items of the revised version of the Danger Assessment (Campbell, et. al., 2009).

Violence during pregnancy, though not revealed thoroughly, is seen as a significant reason for the death of women (Campbell et. al., 2007; McFarlane et. al., 2002). Various researches show that pregnant women are two or three times more likely of being murdered by their intimate partners than non-pregnant women (Campbell et. al., 2007; Eryurt & Çağatay, 2015; Krulewitch et. al., 2003; Krulewitch et. al., 2001; McFarlane et. al., 2002). If they are exposed to violence during pregnancy, their risk of being murdered is even much greater (Campbell et. al., 2007).

Another important point is the connection between individually owned armaments and social violence, especially domestic violence (Campbell et. al., 2007; Campbell et. al., 2003). Siegel and Rothman (2016), in their work explaining the relationship between personal armaments in different states of the USA and the number of women murdered by intimate partners, have found out that an increase in the number of individual weapons increased the number of murders, as well. Campbell et al. (2007) point out that the biggest risk factors are partner's possession of a weapon and being threatened with a gun, followed by his personal potential for physical violence. Studies demonstrating that the existence of past behaviours, such as stalking of the victim by the attacker, physical and sexual violence and violence during pregnancy are all closely related to the risk of femicide. They also emphasise that the risk increases when the attacker has threatened the victim with death, or directly attacked the woman with a weapon (Campbell, 2009). In this perspective, personal armament increases the potential risks of lethality.

In this article, I attempt to estimate the number of women who are at increased risk of femicide in Turkey by using the statistical characteristics of women killed due to male violence and the prevalence of exposure to diverse forms of male violence. I have consulted the most current data, the Research on Domestic Violence against Women (2014), along with the 2014 female population aged 15-59 from the annual population registry of Turkey. Furthermore, in order to determine which groups carry a higher risk of death, I used femicide follow-up reports in Turkey and international literature discussing the relationship between intimate partner violence and femicide, particularly the danger assessment scale developed by Campbell (Campbell, 2004 & Campbell et. al., 2009). Previous experience of severe forms of violence especially threat and attack with lethal objects are defined as the main identifiable risk for IPF. Besides those risk groups, violence survivors who have formal request for help, who have left their homes because of violence, who are divorced or separated, who are divorced mothers, who have been stalked with threat, who experienced violence during pregnancy and who are pregnant are examined among high risk carrying women in this study.

Femicide is the preventable cause of women death, and the overall number of women murdered via male violence highlights the severity of this social

problem. This manuscript, with its data-driven estimates, focuses on the increased risk of femicide and demonstrates the magnitude of violence survivor women who live in daily risk of being murdered. The estimated number of women at increased risk of femicide is quite significant to present the magnitude of women who are in need of urgent protection in Turkey.

Methodology

Data

The primary source of data in this study is the Research on Domestic Violence against Women in Turkey (DVAW-2014). DVAW-2014 is a representative household survey which is designed to estimate period and lifetime prevalence of physical, sexual and emotional intimate partner violence. A weighted, stratified and multi-stage cluster sample approach was employed in the research with a sample size of 11,247 households and 7,462 women aged 15-59. We, as Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies, designed DVAW-2014 for not only married women but all women, and it is comprised of not only husband-based violence but male violence in all sorts of intimate partnerships. Therefore, research estimates are available for interpreting the total female population in the reference age group. The violence definitions in "Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women" by the World Health Organization (WHO) were followed for the questionnaire design of DVAW-2014 (Garcia-Moreno et. al., 2005). Consequently, the fieldwork was conducted according to the ethical principles of the WHO (WHO, 2001; HUIPS, 2015). Each interview started following the informed consent of the respondents. Furthermore, DVAW-2014 has received ethical approval from the Hacettepe University Academic Ethics Board. Data is available from TURKSTAT upon request.

In DVAW-2014 physical violence was divided into two categories, moderate and severe according to 6 different violent behaviours. Among these behaviours, 1) slapping or throwing something at the woman that can injure and 2) pushing or shoving her or pulling her hair are identified as moderate physical violence; whereas 3) punching the woman or hitting her with something that can hurt her, or 4) kicking and dragging her, beating her up, or 5) choking, burning her and 6) threatening her with a gun, or actually using a gun, knife or other weapon are identified as severe physical violence. In terms of sexual violence and emotional violence/abuse behaviours WHO definitions were employed in the research (see Table 1 and HUIPS, 2015). In this manuscript, all lifetime and period prevalence of violence indicators are calculated from DVAW-2014 data for all women ages 15-59. The secondary data source is end-of-year population in 2013 and 2014 by sex and age from the annual population registry of Turkey. The 2014 mid-year population of women aged 15-59 has been calculated based on these tabulations (TURKSTAT, 2019).

Estimation Procedure

Firstly, I calculated the lifetime and period prevalence of different forms of violence against women. Results reflect the prevalence of different types of violence in all types of intimate relationships from flirtations to marriage, along with confidence intervals for all women regardless of their marital status. (Table 1 & Table 2). These prevalence levels are utilized in order to estimate the total number of women exposed to various forms of violence by applying the observed population size.

Secondly, I determined the groups of women who are at a higher risk of death. High-risk groups were defined in accordance with world literature on the IPF, the Danger Assessment Scale, and the characteristics of IPF cases recorded in Turkey since 2016. The first increased risk group consists of a single risk category, i.e. the severity of previous intimate partner violence (Table 3). In other words, severe physical violence survivors and those who have been threatened or injured by sharp objects are defined in the increased single risk group for IPF. The other group consists of multiple increased risk layers. In this group, the severity of IPV experience forms the first layer while the other particular experiences of survivors shape the second layer (Table 4). The second layer of multiple high-risk groups employed in this article consists of women who ever applied an institution to report IPV, women who have left home because of violence, women who are divorced or separated, women who are divorced mothers, women who are exposed to stalking by their partners with the threat of death, women who are exposed to violence while pregnant, and pregnant women. I calculated period prevalence of physical violence survivors and severe physical violence survivors in each risk category. Finally, I estimated the number of women at increased risk of femicide in various categories by employing the survey prevalence and the observed population size.

Results

The Magnitude of Intimate Partner Violence Survivor Women in Turkey

Regardless of marital status, almost 4 women out of 10 are lifetime physical intimate partner violence survivors in Turkey (HUIPS, 2009; HUIPS, 2015). This prevalence shows that intimate partner violence is a frequent social problem. With succeeding estimates, I would like to go beyond the prevalence of violence and show the magnitude of male violence in society. In Turkey, 2014 female mid-year population aged 15-59 is calculated 24,981,000 based on population registry results as of 31 December 2013 and 31 December 2014 (TURKSTAT, 2019). When we transcribe the results of the 2014 research where we have estimated the prevalence of women exposed to violence compared to the general population of women aged 15-59, it can be seen that 10,474,106 women in this age group were exposed to their partners' lifetime emotional violence (Table 1). As well as having its own severe results, emotional violence triggers anxiety and creates an environment that makes women less able to cope with other types of violence. I also estimated the current magnitude of emotional violence among the

cumulative number of survivors. The prevalence data for the 12-month period before the study shows that 6,158,955 women were faced with acute emotional violence in 2014 (Table 2).

Following the emotional violence, I calculated the magnitude of physical violence survivors as the main predictor for femicides due to its strongest indication of the serious risks women live with. When the results of violence research are gathered, it can be seen that 8,160,000 women were exposed to physical violence by their partners at least once in their lifetimes (Table 1). We have also calculated the number of women exposed to intimate partner physical violence in a one-year period. This number is significant; calculations show that 1,936,410 women are currently exposed to their partners' physical violence (Table 2). Another destructive and prevalent form of violence is sexual violence. Results show that 1,221,875 women were exposed to sexual violence over a one-year-period in 2014 (Table 2). More than twice this number, 2,737,937 women, were subject to lifetime sexual violence (Table 1).

Table 1 Lifetime Violence: Estimated Population of Women Who Have Ever-Experienced IPV, Turkey

Type of violence	Percentage of women who have ever-experienced IPV % [95% CI]	Number of women who have ever-experienced IPV
Emotional violence ^a	42.9 [41.3-44.4]	10,474,106
Physical violence ^b	33.4 [31.9-35.0]	8,160,166
Sexual violence ^c	11.2 [10.4-12.1]	2,737,937
Mid-year population of women aged 15-59		24,422,981

^aEmotional violence/abuse behaviors: 1. Insulted her or swore at her, 2. Belittled or humiliated her in front of other people, 3. Scared or threatened her, and 4. Threatened to hurt her or someone that she cared about. ^bPhysical violence behaviors: 1. Slapped her or threw something at her that could hurt her, 2. Pushed or shoved her or pulled her hair, 3. Hit her with fist or something else that could hurt her, 4. Kicked, dragged her or beat her up, 5. Choked or burned her, and 6. Threatened to use or actually used a gun, knife or other weapons against her. ^cSexual violence behaviors: 1. Physically forced her to have sexual intercourse, 2. Had sexual intercourse when she did not want to because she was afraid of what partner might do, and 3. Forced her to do something sexual that she found degrading or humiliating.

Table 2 Period Violence: Estimated Population of Women Who Have Experienced IPV, Turkey

Type of violence (2014)	Percentage of women who have experienced IPV in 2014 % [95% CI]	Number of women who have experienced IPV in 2014
Emotional violence ^a	25.2 [23.9-26.6]	6,158,955
Physical violence ^b	7.9 [7.1-8.8]	1,936,410
Sexual violence ^c	5.0 [4.4-5.7]	1,221,875
Mid-year population of women aged 15-59		24,422,981

^aEmotional violence/abuse behaviors: 1. Insulted her or swore at her, 2. Belittled or humiliated her in front of other people, 3. Scared or threatened her, and 4. Threatened to hurt her or someone that she cared about. ^bPhysical violence behaviors: 1. Slapped her or threw something at her that could hurt her, 2. Pushed or shoved her or pulled her hair, 3. Hit her with fist or something else that could hurt her, 4. Kicked, dragged her or beat her up, 5. Choked or burned her, and 6. Threatened to use or actually used a gun, knife or other weapons against her. ^cSexual violence behaviors: 1. Physically forced her to have sexual intercourse, 2. Had sexual intercourse when she did not want to because she was afraid of what partner might do, and 3. Forced her to do something sexual that she found degrading or humiliating.

Who has Increased Risk of Intimate Partner Violence and Intimate Partner Femicide?

Some survivors live with a higher risk than others. Subsequent results present the magnitude of severe physical violence survivors who are at an increased risk of being murdered. When we take a snapshot of the five-year period, we see that 3,563,676 women at the age of 15-59 are exposed to severe physical violence at least once in a lifetime (Table 3). Of this group, some 913,783 women were exposed to severe physical violence in a one-year period (Table 3).

The risk of femicide is much higher for a specific group of women who were subjected to the most severe physical violence behaviour, i.e. 'threatening with objects like knife and gun or using them'. In only one year's time in Turkey, there were 168,625 women who were threatened or attacked with objects like guns and knives (Table 3). We should not forget that this number is merely the victims of one-year period; the number of women who were subject to such attacks in a lifetime is markedly higher. According to the 2014 data, 666,456 women have been exposed to the most severe form of physical violence at least once their lifetimes (Table 3). A notable point when examining these numbers is that while the prevalence of the other forms of violence does not change much, the most severe physical violence has increased both cumulatively and currently in the last decade. Around 170 thousand women in today's Turkey - those who are constantly threatened with objects like guns and knives; face a heightened risk of femicide as they go about their daily lives.

In the following section, I will focus on diverse groups of women who are more at the risk of physical violence and death due to violence. Table 4 presents the magnitude of women with an increased risk of intimate partner femicide in the two layers. The first layer consists of seven certain characteristics or experiences of women that put them in a more fragile situation. This layer is a non-relative risk category. Women may have more than one high-risk characteristic from the first layer, consequently, they multiply the risk of death. The second layer is the severity of intimate partner violence that addresses women who are more vulnerable. This layer is a relative risk category. Women who experienced severe IPV live under a higher risk of IPF.

It is worth mentioning that age is a major crosscutting high-risk characteristic for all the above-mentioned categories, that means young women are at higher risk of IPV as well as IPF. The results of DVAW-2014 demonstrate that, among the women aged 15-24, the prevalence of physical violence is twice that of the general population. Male violence tallies also verify that young women are more at the risk of murder. When we examine the most current incidents according to the June 2018 report of We Will Stop Femicide Platform, of the 21 women that were murdered, twelve of them are under the age of 35.

Table 3 Estimated Population of Women With Increased Single Risk of IPF, Turkey

Increased single risk groups for IPF	Lifetime prevalence % [95% CI]	Period prevalence % [95% CI]	Num. of women ever experienced	Num. of women experienced in 2014
Subjected to severe physical violence ^a	14.5 [13.5-15.8]	3.7 [3.2-4.3]	3,563,676	913,783
Threatened/attacked with lethal objects	2.7 [2.3-3.2]	0.7 [0.5-1.0]	666,456	168,625
Mid-year population of women aged 15-59				24,422,981

^a Severe physical violence behaviors: 1. Hit her with fist or something else that could hurt her, 2. Choked or burned her, 3. Threatened to use or actually used a gun, knife or other weapons against her, 4. Kicked, dragged her or beat her up.

Multiple Risk Categories Among Physical and Severe Physical Violence Survivors

Formal Help Seeking for IPV

Most of the women who were exposed to violence have not consulted any institutions that could offer support; they have even avoided telling anyone that their partners were inflicting violence upon them. Women attempting to receive institutional support, such as taking shelter in the police station and filing a complaint, taking legal action, or consulting a non-governmental organisation are generally exposed to the IPV, especially severe form of violence, for a long time.

According to my estimation based on the results of the research, there are 304,871 women who applied to an institution to report IPV. Amongst them, some 254,130 women, or the wide majority, are survivors of severe violence (Table 4). Those women are likely to survive with increasing levels of violence and they carry more potential risk for being murdered.

Having Left Home Because of Violence

When confronted with physical violence, a desperate defence mechanism is to run away from the place where violence has occurred. Women might try to leave their homes as a way of fleeing violence since male violence mostly threatens them in their homes. For women, leaving home is an indicator of fear and despair caused by violence. Women usually leave their homes when they are exposed to severe violence and violence is directed toward their children, along with themselves. In Turkey, many violence survivors have tried to escape their homes. Based on the research results, as in Table 4, I estimate that 687,653 women have left their homes at least once in order to escape violence. Of these women, 476,530 of them, are the ones exposed to the most severe violence. Women may mistakenly think that violence will end up upon leaving their homes; or worse, even though they know that the violence will not end, they are forced to return home since they do not have the means to live on their own. This big group of women live under an increased risk of IPF.

Divorcing or Separation

Violence is one of the major reasons in women's decision for separation. Additionally, a woman expressing her decision to separate, or taking action to leave her partner, might be seen by men as a justification for femicide. From this perspective, the circular and cumulative effect of male violence increases the wish for separation, and declaration of this will or actualising it increases the risk of male violence. The 2017 Male Violence Tally claims that one out of every four murdered women was killed when they wanted to divorce. Based on the results of this research, when the relationship between the prevalence of violence and marital status is examined, I estimate that almost 168,782 women who were exposed to violence and who were divorced in Turkey are at high risk of femicide. Among them, 132,098 women who were survivors of severe violence carry more potential risk of femicide (Table 4). We observe that not only physical violence were experienced, but also all types of violence are experienced more frequently by divorced women. Such circumstances indeed multiplies the risk of IPF for divorced women.

Being Exposed to Stalking by an Ex-Partner

The results of DVAW-2014 have shown that perpetrators of stalking are mostly people other than the intimate partners of women. Yet, a remarkable point in these results is that partners or former partners are the main perpetrators in some specific forms of stalking. These forms involve threats of death, namely threatening the woman with killing her or a family member, and threatening suicide if the woman does not see him. Another significant point regarding stalking is that when the cases of male violence and femicide are examined, it is seen that especially ex-husbands might go to workplaces or homes of unsuspecting women to commit violent acts. Under these circumstances, I tried to estimate the number of women who are at high risk due to the above mentioned three types of stalking exposure which is closely related to femicides. Within the last year in Turkey, the number of women who were exposed to male violence and at the same time were pressured with threats by their intimate partners to see them, or stalked by them through appearing unexpectedly, is 227,145; 187,708 of those are women exposed to severe violence.

Being a Divorced Mother

Research shows that being a mother does not protect a woman from male violence. In fact, for divorced women, having a child is a condition that prevents them from completely breaking up with their ex-partners. This condition increases the risk of being exposed to violence and death after divorce. The estimates in Table 4 taken from research and population studies show that, in today's Turkey, 151,212 divorced women who are survivors of violence have children. Among them, 123,960 women with children are severe violence survivors who are at a higher risk of femicide.

Violence During Pregnancy

Violence during pregnancy as a significant reason for the death of women represents one of the most fragile situations of women are made to face. Results of this study underline a big scale of risk. As given in Table 4, in Turkey, 557,755 women are exposed to violence while they are pregnant. Even worse than that, men have attacked 427,196 of those pregnant women using severe forms of violence.

Pregnant IPV Survivors

Among violence survivors, risk of recursive IPV, as well as IPF, increases during the pregnancy. According to my estimates, there are 102,585 pregnant women who have been exposed to previous intimate partner violence and 42,056 of these pregnant women have survived under severe physical violence (Table 4). They are under an increased risk of IPF in their current pregnancy period.

Table 4 Estimated Population of Women With Increased Multiple Risks of IPF, Turkey

Increased multiple risk groups for IPF (2014)		Percentage with multiple risks of IPF % [95% CI]	Number of women with multiple risks of IPF
Ever applied an institution to report IPV	Subjected to IPV	1.2 [0.9-1.6]	304,871
	Subjected to severe IPV	1.0 [0.8-1.4]	254.130
Ever left home due to IPV	Subjected to IPV	2.8 [2.4-3.3]	687,653
	Subjected to severe IPV	2.0 [1.6-2.4]	476.530
Divorced or separated	Subjected to IPV	0.7 [0.5-1.0]	168,782
	Subjected to severe IPV	0.5 [0.4-0.8]	132.098
Divorced mothers	Subjected to IPV	0.6 [0.4-0.9]	151,212
	Subjected to severe IPV	0.5 [0.3-0.7]	123.960
Being stalked with threat ^a	Subjected to IPV	0.9 [0.7-1.2]	227,145
	Subjected to severe IPV	0.8 [0.6-1.0]	187.708
Experienced violence during pregnancy	Subjected to IPV	2.3 [1.9-2.7]	557,755
	Subjected to severe IPV	1.7 [1.4-2.1]	427.196
Pregnant at survey date	Subjected to IPV	0.4 [0.3-0.7]	102,585
	Subjected to severe IPV	0.2 [0.1-0.3]	42,056
Mid-year women population aged 15-59			24,422,981

^a Behaviors of stalking with threat: 1. Threatening to commit suicide if she does not want to see him, 2. Threatening to physically and/or sexually harm her if she does not want to meet, and 3. Threatening to hurt her children or someone from the family if she does not want to meet.

Discussion

Behind the Numbers: Living with Increasing Violence and Increased Risk of Death

In 2017, more than 400 women were killed by their male partners or ex-partners in Turkey. The violence cases that have become known to the public via academic works, judicial reports and media show that the biggest risk for intimate partner femicide is that the murdered women were previously exposed

to physical acts of violence by their perpetrators. In other words, men who kill women are mainly intimate partners who have previously committed violence against these women. This risk increases especially for the women who are severe violence victims.

Approaches which tend to underestimate the dangers of violence in women's lives frequently use the excuse that this behaviour is a one-time, mistaken act of violence and thus it can be ignored and disregarded. It is clear that violent behaviour cannot be underrated and deemed acceptable; it is indeed socially damaging. Keeping this in mind, another truth I would like to underline is that women are continually bracing face to face with sexual violence. In more than 1 million women's lives, sexuality is experienced as a form of violence instead of being a right and a source of pleasure. Beginning from their first sexual relationship, women are forced into intercourse through the use of physical violence. Results of the research have shown that, in many cases, sexual and physical violence are concurrent. Bearing in mind that the prevalence of emotional violence is high, it is clear that around 1 million women are living under the combined threats of their intimate partner's physical, sexual and emotional violence.

It is clear that all types of violence are destructive and unacceptable. However, while interpreting the relationship between domestic violence and femicides, severe violence should be handled scrupulously. Estimations of this study currently show that more than 900 thousand women live their daily lives while being exposed to severe violence at the hands of their partners in Turkey. Perpetrators practice severe violence upon women before they escalate to murder; they injure their partners and commit femicide with guns and sharp objects. From this perspective, the risk of death is greater for violence survivors, especially severe violence survivors that were threatened with death. The experiences in countries that regularly follow the cases of femicides and thus make plans to prevent them, prove that increase in personal armaments is a factor that escalates the risk of femicides more than any other factor. When we examine femicide records in Turkey it is seen that half of the murdered women were killed with guns while sharp objects were used in one of every four cases (BİANET, 2018; Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu, 2018). In most cases, before these murders are committed, violence, especially armed attack and threatening, occurs. Analyses among violence survivors in this study show that the number of women who were exposed to the most severe violent behaviours, attacking with a gun and threatening, is around 170 thousand.

When examples of male violence and femicides appear in the media, these examples of women who leave the marital home are reported as an attempt to create a justification for such male violence, instead of using it as an opportunity to protect the victim and unveil the perpetrator. As a reflection of this situation, it is not male violence that is blamed for a woman's abandonment of the marital home, but it is the women's act of leaving home which is the focus of the news. For women who have to leave their homes due to violence, the risk is definitely greater, but this heightened risk is not due to the woman's act of fleeing. On the

contrary, the extent of male violence has increased so much that these women were obliged to leave their homes. Under these circumstances, returning home increases women's learned helplessness, while at the same time feeding men's presumptuousness in controlling women and continuing violence. Estimations of this work underline that more than 254 thousand severe violence survivor women who applied to an institution and more than 476 thousand who have left their home live under increased risk of femicide in Turkey.

There is a circular relationship between IPV and divorce. Divorce rates are low in Turkey, however, IPV appears as the main reason for divorce among women in Turkey. This study points out more than 168 thousand violence survivor women, more than 151 divorced mothers live in a hotbed of violence circle.

Towards the End: The Need for Detailed Data

Male violence against women and intimate partner femicides are not limited to a particular region in the world, or some just parts of Turkey (Ertürk, 2015). Therefore, timely and widespread official record and researches are extremely important for all countries. For instance, in a campaign to prevent male violence in Australia, inventories and records of femicides have been registered since 2014 (Cullen et. al., 2018). As a matter of fact, recording murders has become a campaign in itself. Records of deaths due to domestic violence taken by high-income countries are created in order to eliminate male violence and provide strong support for women. Adapting the system which exists in the United States of America, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and New Zealand, and working hand in hand with health and law institutions, will be a significant achievement for lower-income countries, especially when taking their unique conditions and needs into consideration (Dawson, 2017; Bugeja et. al., 2015). Still, there are some problems regarding the scope of data for countries that currently have record systems for partner violence and murders (Stöckl et. al., 2013). Even for the European Union countries that are close to one another geographically and economically, researchers point to the uncoordinated diversity of data channels and policy scopes developed against male violence (Corradi & Stöckl, 2014; Vives-Cases et. al., 2016). However, we should not forget that improvements in data scope and quality would strengthen us in determining risk categories and taking precautions; therefore, we should continue lobbying the responsible institutions for standardised data collection and a cohesive framework of support for women.

While evaluating the magnitude of violence against women in Turkey, indicators showing the percentages regarding the prevalence might not always be enough to comprehend how large a group is represented here. We should continue working to record and report violence, protect the victim and try to eliminate violence with the consciousness that millions of women live their lives in homes where many types of violence reside. Among these women are thousands who are severe violence survivors, who have ended, or are about to

end, their relationships, who are young, mothers or pregnant, who have been threatened with guns or sharp objects, or who have already been injured. Therefore, some researchers underline that women applying to health institutions due to domestic violence should be officially warned by healthcare personnel when their circumstances imply that they are under constant and continued threat (Campbell et. al., 2003).

Women who are exposed to violence and are later murdered are not just a number; each of them has a unique life story. However, being able to estimate the numerical magnitude of women who need support and urgent precautionary measures would lead the way to better social mechanisms. Consequently, what I would like to attract attention to with this study is that it is necessary for public institutions to gather official information on violence against women, including femicides. It is critical for government agencies to have accurate femicide records in order to develop data-driven protection policies. International conventions correspondingly describe collecting information on violence and homicides based on gender, and having this information can lead to preventive measures, which are ultimately the responsibility of the state.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank the research group of the Domestic Violence against Women in Turkey 2014 project for their fruitful collaboration; particularly the team leader Assoc. Prof. Dr İlknur Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu for her encouragement for writing this manuscript; Dr. Tuğba Adalı for her support in data analysis and Özgür Güneş Öztürk and Cansu Dayan for sharing their reflections.

References

- Abramsky, T., Watts, C.H., Garcia-Moreno, C., Devries, K., Kiss, L., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L. (2011). *What Factors are Associated With Recent Intimate Partner Violence? Findings from the WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence*. BMC Public Health, 11,109.
- Bahadır, B. (2017). *Ölü Kadınlar Memleketi [Homeland of Death Women]*. İstanbul: Ayizi Kitap.
- Bugeja, L., Dawson, M., McIntyre, S. J., & Walsh, C. (2015). Domestic/Family Violence Death Reviews: An International Comparison. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 16(2): 179-187.
- BİANET [Independent Communication Network]. (2018, July 23). Erkek Şiddeti Çetelesi [Male Violence Tally]. Retrieved from <http://bianet.org/bianet/toplumsal-cinsiyet/193661-erkekler-2017-de-290-ka-din-ve-22-cocuk-oldurdu>.

- Caman, S., Kristiansson, M., Granath, S. & Sturup, J. (2017). Trends in Rates and Characteristics of Intimate Partner Homicides between 1990 and 2013. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 49: 14-21.
- Campbell, J.C. (2004). Helping Women Understand their Risk in Situations of Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(12): 1464-1477.
- Campbell, J. (2009). Risk Factors for Femicide and Femicide-Suicide: A Multisite Case Control Study, In Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH), InterCambios, Medical Research Council of South Africa (MRC), & World Health Organization (WHO) (Eds.). *Strengthening Understanding of Femicide: Using Research to Galvanize Action and Accountability*. Washington DC: 57-65.
- Campbell, J.C., Glass, N., Sharps, P.W., Laughon, K. & Bloom, T. (2007). Intimate Partner Homicide Review and Implications of Research and Policy. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 8 (3): 246-269.
- Campbell, J.C., Webster, D.W., & Glass, N. (2009). The Danger Assessment Validation of a Lethality Risk Assessment Instrument for Intimate Partner Femicide. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24 (4): 653-674.
- Campbell, J.C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C.R., Campbell, D.W., Curry, M.A. Gary, F.A., et al. (2003). Risk Factors for Femicide in Abusive Relationships: Results from a Multisite Case Control Study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(7): 1089-1097.
- Corradi, C. & Stöckl, H. (2014). Intimate Partner Homicide in 10 European Countries: Statistical Data and Policy Development in a Cross-National Perspective. *European Journal of Criminology*, 11(5): 601-618.
- Cullen, P., Vaughan, G., Li, Z., Denis, J.P., & Sullivan, E. (2018). Counting Dead Women in Australia: an in-depth case review of femicide. *Journal of Family Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-018-9963-6>.
- Dawson, M. (Ed.) (2017). *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An International Perspective*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dawson, R. & Gartner, R. (1998). Differences in the Characteristics of Intimate Femicides: The Role of Relationship State and Relationship Status. *Homicide Studies*, 2: 378-399.
- Desmond, E. (2017). Marital Separation and Lethal Male Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 23(4): 503-519.
- Ergöçmen, B.A., Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, İ. & Jansen, A.F.M.H. (2013). Intimate Partner Violence and the Relation Between Help-Seeking Behavior and the Severity and Frequency of Physical Violence Among Women in Turkey. *Violence Against Women*, 19(9): 1151-1174.

- Ergöçmen, B.A. (2015). Institutional application process regarding violence against women. In Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS) (Eds.), *Research on Domestic Violence Against Women* (1st ed.). Ankara: Elma Teknik Basım Matbacılık: 203-225.
- Ertürk, Y. (2015). *Sınır Tanımayan Şiddet: Paradigma, Politika ve Pratikteki Yönleriyle Kadına Şiddet Olgusu [Violence Against Women in Paradigmatic, Political and Practical Aspects]*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Eryurt, M.A. & Çağatay S.P. (2015). Consequences of Violence Against Women. In Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS) (Eds.), *Research on Domestic Violence Against Women*. Ankara: Elma Teknik Basım Matbacılık: 125-149.
- Garcia, L., Soria, C., & Hurwitz, E.L. (2007). Homicides and Intimate Partner Violence a Literature Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 8(4): 370-383.
- Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. A.F.M, Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., & Watts, C. (2005). *WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women: Initial Results on Prevalence, Health Outcomes and Women's Responses*. Geneva: WHO publications.
- Gover, A.R., Richards, T.N., & Patterson, M.J. (2017). Explaining Violence Against Women Within the Context of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). In Renzetti, C.M., Edleson, J.L., & Bergen, R.K. (Eds.). *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE: 31-51.
- Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS) (2009). *Research on Domestic Violence Against Women in Turkey*. Ankara: Elma Teknik Basım Matbacılık.
- Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS) (2015). *Research on Domestic Violence Against Women in Turkey*. Ankara: Elma Teknik Basım Matbacılık.
- Johnson, H., Eriksson, L., Mazerolle, P. & Wortley, R. (2017). Intimate Femicide: The Role of Coercive Control. *Feminist Criminology*, (April, 7): 1-21.
- Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu [We Will Stop Femicide Platform]. (2018, July 23). 2017 Veri raporu [Femicide report 2017]. Retrieved from <http://kadincinayetlerini-durduracagiz.net/veriler/2845/kadin-cinayetlerini-du-rduracagiz-platformu-2017-veri-raporu>.
- Krlewitich, C.J., Pierre-Louis, M.L., De Leon-Gomez, R., Guy, R. & Green, R. (2001). Hidden from View: Violent Deaths Among Pregnant Women in the District of Columbia, 1988-1996. *Journal of Midwifery and Women's Health*, 46(1): 4-10.

- Krulewitch, C.J., Roberts, D.W., & Thompson, L.S. (2003). Adolescent Pregnancy and Homicide: Findings for the Maryland Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, 1994-1998. *Child Maltreatment*, 8(2): 122-128.
- McFarlane, J., Campbell, J.C., Sharps, P.W., & Watson, K. (2002). Abuse During Pregnancy and Femicide: Urgent Implications for Women's Health. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 100(1): 27-36.
- McFarlane, J., Campbell J.C. & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate Partner Stalking and Femicide: Urgent Implications for Women's Safety. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 20 (1-2): 51-68.
- Office of the Chief Coroner for Ontario (2015). Domestic Violence Death Review Committee 2013-14 Annual Report. Toronto: Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/sites/default/files/content/mcscs/docs/ec165340.pdf>.
- Reckdenwald, A., Szalewski, A. & Yohros, A. (2019). Place, Injury Patterns, and Female-Victim Intimate Partner Homicide. *Violence Against Women*, 25(6):654-676.
- Siegel, M.B. & Rothman, E.F. (2016). Firearm Ownership and the Murder of Women in the United States: Evidence that the State-Level Firearm Ownership Rate is Associated with the Nonstranger Femicide Rate. *Violence and Gender*, 3(1): 20-26.
- Sheehan, B.E., Murphy, S.B., Moynihan, M.M., Dudley-Fennessey, E. & Stapleton, J.G. (2015). Intimate Partner Homicide: New Insights for Understanding Lethality and Risks. *Violence Against Women*, 21(2): 269-288.
- Stöckl, H., Devries, K., Rotstein, A., Abrahams, N., Campbell, J., Watts, C. & Moreno, C.G. (2013). The Global Prevalence of Intimate Partner Homicide: A Systematic Review. *The Lancet*, 382: 859-65.
- Toprak, S. & Ersoy, G. (2017). Femicide in Turkey between 2000 & 2010. *PLoS One*, 12(8): 1-16. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0182409>.
- Taylor, R. & Nabors, E.L. (2009). Pink or Blue ... Black and Blue? Examining Pregnancy as a Predictor of Intimate Partner Violence and Femicide. *Violence Against Women*, 15(11): 1273-1293.
- TURKSTAT (2019, February 17). Adress Based Population Registration System Results. Retrieved from <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/medas/?kn=95&locale=en>.
- Vives-Cases, C., Goicolea, I., Hernández, A., Sanz-Barbero, B., Gill, A.K., Baldry, A.C. & Stoeckl, H. (2016). Expert Opinions on Improving Femicide Data Collection Across Europe: A Concept Mapping Study. *PLoS One*, 11(2): e0148364. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0148364.

- Wilson M. & Daly M. (1993). Spousal Homicide Risk and Estrangement. *Violence and Victims*, 8: 3-15.
- Wilson, M. & Daly, M. (2009). Spousal Conflict and Uxoricide in Canada. In Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH), InterCambios, Medical Research Council of South Africa (MRC), & World Health Organization (WHO) (Eds.). *Strengthening Understanding of Femicide: Using Research to Galvanize Action and Accountability*. Washington DC: 73-76.
- Wilson, M. & Daly, M. (2017). *Homicide*. New York: Routledge.
- World Health Organization Department of Gender and Women's Health. (2001). Putting women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence Against Women. WHO/FCH/GWH/01.1. Geneva: WHO Publications.
- Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, İ. (2015). Views of Men on Violence Against Women. In Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS) (Eds.), *Research on Domestic Violence Against Women* (1st ed., pp.). Ankara: Elma Teknik Basım Matbacılık: 225-261.
- Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, İ. & Çavlin, A. (2015). Prevalence of Violence Against Women. In Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS) (Eds.), *Research on Domestic Violence Against Women* (1st ed.). Ankara: Elma Teknik Basım Matbacılık: 81-125.