Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

____ 4-12-2022

Maya FarrHenderson Date

Social Capital Among an Incarcerated Sample of Femicide Perpetrators

By

Maya FarrHenderson
Master of Public Health

Hubert Department of Global Health

____

Dabney P. Evans, PhD, MPH

Committee Chair

____

Martín H. Di Marco, PhD, MSc

Committee Member

Social Capital Among an Incarcerated Sample of Femicide Perpetrators

By

Maya FarrHenderson

Bachelor of Arts
William & Mary
2020

Thesis Committee Chair: Dabney P. Evans, PhD, MPH

An abstract of
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Rollins School of Public Health of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Public Health
in the Hubert Department of Global Health
2022

// Abstract

Social Capital Among an Incarcerated Sample of Femicide Perpetrators

By Maya FarrHenderson

Over the past two decades, the gender-based killing of women, known as femicide has gained attention. Yet, aside from demographics, relatively little data on femicide perpetrators, a key driver of the phenomena exists. Moreover, much of the existing work has focused on individual risk factors with less attention paid to the community and societal-level factors that contribute to violence.

In 2012, femicide was incorporated into Argentina's penal code, recognizing the crime as separate from homicide and punishable by a life sentence of 50 years. Still, a woman is murdered every 30 hours in Argentina. In the last seven years, the national femicide rate has remained static while the homicide rate has steadily declined. Although the penalty for committing femicide and homicide is ostensibly equivalent—a life sentence—we hypothesize that the informal punishment femicide perpetrators experience is not as severe as that experienced by homicide perpetrators. This study examines the social capital of femicide, homicide, and other (non-lethal) crime perpetrators before and after imprisonment. We focus on the extent of informal social sanctions that femicide perpetrators experience relative to homicide and other crime perpetrators.

We administered a questionnaire across four prisons in Buenos Aires. Social capital scores were assigned based on responses to two scales adapted from the World Bank's "Integrated Questionnaire for the Measurement of Social Capital (SC-IQ)." Data were analyzed using difference of means tests, both ANOVA and t-tests, using SAS® 9.4. Among a sample of 208 incarcerated men, other crime perpetrators did not experience any difference in their social capital score following imprisonment. Although femicide and homicide perpetrators' social capital scores were statistically equal before imprisonment, after being charged, femicide perpetrators retained significantly greater scores than perpetrators of homicide ($p < .0001$) suggesting that non-gender related homicide is not as socially sanctioned as gender related killing.

The act of femicide should be unconscionable, yet this study provides evidence that femicide perpetrators do not experience the same scorn from their social networks as homicide perpetrators. These findings suggest a lack of informal social control within the communities of femicide perpetrators that if identified may be useful for violence prevention.

(Word count:350)

Social Capital Among an Incarcerated Sample of Femicide Perpetrators

By

Maya FarrHenderson

Bachelor of Arts
William & Mary
2020

Thesis Committee Chair: Dabney P. Evans, PhD, MPH

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Rollins School of Public Health of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Public Health
in the Hubert Department of Global Health
2022

Acknowledgements

Scholarship is not an individual endeavor, but an intensely collaborative process.

Thank you so much to my thesis committee members, Dr. Dabney Evans and Dr. Martín Di Marco who helped to guide me from the earliest stages of my work as I was just falling into the field of violence prevention through to the production of my thesis. Thank you for your edits, your advice, your encouragement, your course correction. Thank you for allowing me into this part of your world and trusting me with this work. I am so extraordinarily grateful for your partnership.

This project was impossible without the collaboration of the sociology department at the University of Buenos Aires and the data collection team there. Matías Bruno, Elizabeth Talarico, and José Rodríguez, thank you so much for the hours you each put into administering questionnaires, cataloging data, and doing all of the work to produce a rich dataset of information. I am so thankful for the opportunity to work with an international and interdisciplinary team, and I am in your debt.

I would like to thank all of the participants of this study who donated their time and energy to respond to our questionnaire. These men trusted us with their stories and their valuable contribution makes up the substance of what follows.

I am thankful for the generous funding the from the Rollins School of Public Health's Global Field Experience which allowed me to dedicate time over the course of my summer to developing and editing the questionnaire used in our study.

Finally, I wish to thank my friends and family who extended their love and graciously accepted me on the days I could do nothing by think or talk about my thesis. Much love to you all.

Table of Contents

Table of Tables
Acronym List
Definition of Terms

Introduction & Rationale……………………………………………………..……………1
Problem Statement…………………………………………………………………..5
Purpose Statement……………………………………………………………………5
Significance Statement………………………………………………………….....7
Literature Review…………………………………………………...…………......7
Individual Risk Factors………………………………………………………………8
Traditional Police Intervention……………………………………………………..10
Risk Factors of Perpetration………………………………………………………...11
Neighborhood Risk Factors…………………………………………………………...12
Social Capital, Social Networks, Social Sanctions…………………………………………14
Methods…………………………………………………………………………………………18
Research Design………………………………………………………………………19
Data Collection and Procedures………………………………………………………19
Data Analysis and Instruments……………………………………………………..20
Ethical Considerations………………………………………………………………...23
Results……………………………...……………………………………………………………24
How social capital of femicide perpetrators changes after the crime……………………25
Prior Crime and Violence Exposure……………………………………………………..27
Perpetrators on Prevention…………………………………………………………………28
Limitations and Delimitations………………………………………………………...29
Discussion……………...………………………………………………………………………..31
Prior Crime and Violence Exposure……………………………………………………..34
Perpetrators on Prevention…………………………………………………………………35
Implications & Recommendations………...………...…………………………………………...36
References……………………………………………………………………………………..39

Table of Tables

Table 1. Age and socioeconomic status of 208 men convicted
of femicide, homicide or another crime in Buenos Aires, Argentina……………………………24

Table 2. Social capital scores for perpetrators of femicide,
homicide and other crimes before and after the commission of the crime (*N* = 208)……………25

Table 3. Unadjusted ANOVA (p<.0001) of social capital
scores for perpetrators of femicide, homicide and other
crimes before and after the commission of the crime……………………………………………26

Table 4. Adjusted least squares means of social capital scores for perpetrators
of femicide, homicide and other crimes before and after the commission
of the crime controlling for age, SES and carceral institution…………………………………...27

Table 5. Adverse childhood experience, adult violence
exposure, prior crime, and neighborhood cohesion scores
among perpetrators of femicide, homicide. and other crimes
adjusted for age and SES…………………………………………………………………...28

Acronym List

ACE – Adverse Childhood Experiences

GBV – Gender-based violence

IPH – intimate partner homicide

IPV – Intimate partner violence

RNFJA – Registro Nacional de Femicidios de la Justicia Argentina (National Registry of Femicides of the Argentinean Justice System)

SES – Socioeconomic status

Definitions of Terms:

Community: A feeling of fellowship among a group of people who share common goals, attitudes, interests and norms. In this work, community is used interchangeably with social network.

Femicide: "The violent death of women for reasons of gender, whether it takes place within the family, domestic unit or in any other interpersonal relationship; in the community, by any person, or that is perpetrated or tolerated by the State and its agents, by action or omission" (Oficina de la Mujer, 2020).

Gender-Based Violence (GBV): "Gender-based violence is a general term used to capture any type of violence that is rooted in exploiting unequal power relationships between genders" (Office to End Domestic and Gender-Based Violence, 2020). Victims of GBV may be of either sex and of any gender identity, but the crime is motivated by gender insecurity or a desire to punish someone because of their gender.

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV): Violence committed by an intimate partner or ex-partner including, but not limited to, physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse, and controlling behavior (WHO, 2021).

Neighborhood: Different from community, this term refers to the actual geographic area in which people live together.

Social Capital: **"**The networks of relationships among people who live and work in a particular society, enabling that society to function effectively" (Oxford English Dictionary, n.d.). An individual may accrue a certain intangible degree of social capital from the people around them by behaving in such a way that benefits those around them.

Social Control: **"**The rules and standards of society that circumscribe individual action through the inculcation of conventional sanctions and the imposition of formalized mechanisms" (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

Social Network: A structure made up of social actors (individuals, institutions, organizations) that are linked by relationships and characterized by frequent exchange of tangible (goods, services, fungible capital) and intangible (concepts, ideas, social capital) resources (Cornell University, n.d.).

Social Sanctions: Actions by individuals or an informal body in response to someone's behavior which serve to discourage nonconformity to norms. These actions serve to punish or reward a person for their behavior in the community context (Sociology Dictionary, n.d.).

Introduction & Rationale

Approximately 238 women are intentionally killed by an intimate partner or family member per day (UNODC, 2018). Femicide, the killing of females by males because they are female, is an intrinsically gendered crime that arises at the intersection of patriarchal norms and male entitlement over female bodies and agency.

Worldwide, "women are more likely to be killed by an intimate partner than by all other categories of known assailants combined" (McFarlane, Campbell, & Watson, 2002, p. 54; see also: Kellerman & Mercy, 1992; Browne, Williams, & Dutton, 1999). Distinct from femicide, intimate partner homicide (IPH) refers solely to the murder of one's intimate partner and is perpetrated by both men and women, however, in Latin America the rate of IPH with a female victim is five times that of male IPH (UNODC, 2018). Almost 40% of all intentionally murdered women are killed by an intimate partner compared to only 6% of men who are murdered (Johnson et al., 2019). To date, much of the data collection on IPH has been heteronormative, therefore it is difficult to determine how often a woman kills her female intimate partner, the same is true for men killing male partners. Yet, data on IPH are often used as a proxy measure for femicide. Femicide is an extreme form of intimate partner violence (IPV). The majority of women who experience IPV are not murdered by their partners (Stöckl, 2013; Dobash et al., 2004; Johnson, 2008).

The concept of femicide[1] —and by extension feminicide, (a poltical term which holds responsible both the perpetrator and the state which normalizes misogyny—has continued to evolve, encompassing crimes committed in both public or private spheres against cis- and

[1] Femicide is used throughout as a synonym of feminicide

transgender women and girls (Corradi et al., 2016). In Argentina, a country where a woman is murdered every 30 hours, femicide is defined as,

> "The violent death of women for reasons of gender, whether it takes place within the family, domestic unit or in any other interpersonal relationship; in the community, by any person, or that is perpetrated or tolerated by the State and its agents, by action or omission." (Oficina de la Mujer, 2020)

Since 2015, Argentina's Supreme Court has tracked cases of femicide and prepared an annual report, the *Registro Nacional de Femicidios de la Justicia Argentina* (RNFJA). The registry considers gender to be a social category including both cis- and transgender women and girls in its reporting. The existence of the registry allows for detailed data collection on the individual and sociodemographic characteristics of the victims and perpetrators of femicide in the country. In 2020, 59% of Argentine femicide victims were current or former partners of the perpetrator and 48% were living with the perpetrator at the time of the attack (Oficina de la Mujer, 2020). Although 84% of the victims knew the man who killed them, fewer than 14% had previously reported the perpetrator for abusive or stalking behavior (Oficina de la Mujer, 2020). Nearly ten percent (9.6%) were children or adolescent girls (Oficina de la Mujer, 2020). These data are only available because of the mobilized and persistent action of women's rights activists across Argentina — and the government's response to their calls to action.

In 2010, five years before the introduction of the registry, Wanda Taddei was killed by her husband, Eduardo Vázquez, the drummer of a popular band. He covered her in gasoline and lit her on fire. His crime, and the proceedings of the trial following it brought femicide to the forefront of national conversation in Argentina. The prosecutors in the case pushed for life imprisonment, but Vázquez's defense fought for a shorter sentence, arguing the crime was the

result of ‘passion’ and ‘violent emotion’; Vázquez was sentenced to 18 years, whereas homicide perpetrators were typically sentenced to ‘life imprisonment’ of no more than 50 years (Clarín, 2016). Because Vázquez was a somewhat well-known musician, the case attracted public outrage as well as imitation crimes. Many activists in Argentina argued the ‘passion’ defense implies violence between intimate partners is natural and legitimate (Cremona, Actis, & Rosales, 2013). The National Deputy, Victoria Donda was incredulous as to how the penalty was reduced for ‘violent emotion’ given Vázquez’s violent history with Taddei (Peker, 2012). In the years following Taddei’s murder there was a spate of similar killings, substantiating the claims by feminist commentators that the reduced sentence would inspire a sense of impunity and legitimacy. From 2010 to 2013 in what has been called the “Wanda Taddei effect,” 132 women were burned by men in Argentina (half of whom died), compared to only nine cases of burnings in the two years prior (El Tribuno, 2013).

Two years after Taddei’s murder, femicide was incorporated in Argentina’s penal code under Law 26,791. Although femicide had a previous legal definition in Argentina, it was considered an “aggravating factor for homicide”; but it is now considered an autonomous criminal act punished by life imprisonment (Contini, 2013). Despite the legal change, many argued the root causes of gender-based violence (GBV) remained unaddressed. Discussing the new law, Contini (2013) asserted authorities needed a different tactic to prevent, “the eventuality of cases, which are increasingly frequent” and that GBV, “must be combated through the cooperation of different institutions, state or not.”

Hundreds of thousands of women across Latin America vocally agreed that “state or not,” GBV and femicide must be brought into the popular dialogue and tackled. In 2015, the feminist collective, *Ni Una Menos* (Not One Less) went to the streets with massive marches in dozens of

cities in Argentina and Uruguay advocating for political action to save women's lives. "Born out of exhaustion from sexist violence," *Ni Una Menos* is named for a quote in a 1995 poem protesting femicide by Susana Chávez, "not one woman less, not one more death;" Chávez herself was later the victim of femicide (Gago, 2020). Chapters of the organization spread rapidly throughout Latin America and eventually to North America, Europe, and Asia. Based on the understanding that it is "unacceptable to continue counting women murdered for the fact of being women or dissident bodies" (Ni Una Menos, 2017).

Alongside numerous achievements of the Argentine feminist movement, the creation of the RNFJA, the national femicide registry, was a significant win. Just one day after *Ni Una Menos'* first march in 2015, the Supreme Court announced the establishment of the registry. While the RNFJA tracks every criminal case of femicide, critics argue it is still limited because it does not record femicide cases where the perpetrators also commit suicide because there were no criminal charges carried against him. Nor does the registry track when women commit suicide following a period of sustained abuse, despite the arguments of some femicide researchers that the cases of women who die by suicide who have been subjected to GBV should be considered femicides (Russell and Harmes, 2001). Despite these limitations, research on femicide in Argentina is made possible in part because of the legal infrastructure that recognizes, prosecutes, and records the crime. Comparative studies of femicide are challenging methodologically because there is no universally accepted definition, and in many states, no legal definition. In different parts of the world a femicide perpetrator might be charged with committing homicide, feminicide, uxoricide, a hate crime or not charged at all. The following research takes place in Argentina, not only because of the high burden, but because of the country's growing precedent to confront and combat the problem of woman killing both formally and as a popular movement.

Problem Statement

Despite an expanding body of research and interventions, femicides continue unabated. Much of the existing femicide research has largely focused on identifying the individual level factors that put victims at risk. However, this approach implicitly places the burden on the woman herself to prevent her own victimization. Primary prevention begins with the perpetrator, yet there is relatively little information on the drivers of perpetration and the life-courses and social networks of offenders (Dobash & Dobash, 2017, p. 135; Johnson et al., 2019; Di Marco and Evans, 2020; Evans et al., in press). The literature on community-level risk factors is also limited, despite spatial clustering of femicide perpetration. The current research lacks substantial evidence supporting upstream approaches to femicide prevention. Considering the role of the community in how norms around GBV are developed and shared may allow primary prevention to take place even before potential femicide perpetrators are identified.

Purpose Statement:

This work fits into a larger investigation titled "Narratives of Life and Death: Life Stories of Men Who Committed Homicide or Femicide in AMBA" (P.R.I R20-24) in collaboration with the sociology department at the University of Buenos Aires. We seek to understand the drivers of femicide perpetration and to determine the role of the community in femicide prevention. This study aims to:

1. Assess different offenders'—femicide, homicide, and other (non-lethal) crime —level of social capital within their social networks both prior to and following their crime;
2. Examine offenders' lifetime exposure to and experience with violence and prior crime (childhood, adulthood, and within one's neighborhood); and

3. Document how male perpetrators of femicide understand and describe the drivers of femicide.

To live in and participate in a community, a certain degree of trust must be established among members. To kill another person is a massive breach of this trust; a murderer is either so disconnected from their community that to break from the standard norms around violence would not further isolate them *or* the standard norms are such that a person who kills will not face significant informal punishment from the community. In patriarchal society, the community's response to violence and thus the form of social punishment the perpetrator faces will depend on if the victim is male or female. Within some communities, violence against a woman, and in particular an intimate partner, is discursively constructed as legitimate and even inevitable (Segato, 2013). Assuming these precepts, we hypothesize that among a sample of institutionalized men, femicide perpetrators will not report the same degree of informal social punishment from their social network as perpetrators of homicide. This hypothesis corresponds with Aim 1, and we test it by considering social capital scores (operationalized as social network size, social support given and received) of femicide perpetrators relative to those of homicide and other crime perpetrators.

For Aim 2, we hypothesize that homicide and femicide perpetrators will not significantly differ in their prior experiences with violence and crime, although offenders of non-lethal crimes will have less lifetime exposure to violence and greater prior crime experience relative to homicide and femicide offenders.

Finally, Aim 3 is not hypothesis driven but may help to inform the development of future interventions.

Significance Statement:

In the last seven years, the national femicide rate in Argentina has remained static while the homicide rate has steadily declined (Oficina de la Mujer, 2020; Ministerio de Seguridad de la Nación, 2021; UNODC, 2020; Observatorio de Seguridad Ciudadana, 2017). This trend is consistent internationally, even in countries where the overall homicide rate has declined, the rate of intimate partner homicide has not changed (McEvoy & Hideg, 2017). While necessary, legal intervention cannot address the root causes of GBV without which it is impossible to prevent femicide.

This research contributes to the literature on femicide prevention that takes as its central focus perpetration. Bridging sociological theory and public health practice, we consider the individual risk factors of perpetration and widen the scope to analyze potential drivers or facilitators of violence within high-risk communities from the perspective of those closest to the issue, the perpetrators themselves. The data provided by these men may help develop new models of effective interventions for primary prevention of femicide.

Literature Review

Women bear the brunt of "lethal victimization as a result of gender stereotypes and inequality" (UNDOC, 2018). Despite intervention, femicide trends have remained relatively unchanged over the last decade (UNODC, 2021). Although researchers have most often examined femicide by identifying risk factors of victimization, the literature on perpetration risk factors is beginning to grow. Along with it, the field is also expanding to examine the impact of neighborhood factors on femicide perpetration and victimization. Like many other forms of violence, femicide is spatially clustered. Still much of the literature on neighborhood level

factors is focused on domestic violence and abuse, and not femicide specifically. While the neighborhood has been viewed as an important element to understand femicide incidence, there has been very limited discussion on the social networks and relationships developed within one's community that may facilitate or prevent violence.

Individual Risk Factors

Prior to committing femicide, men who kill women predominantly exhibit a desire to control the women they murder. Johnson (2008, p. 11) defines intimate terrorism as a form of violence characterized by coercive control, and in heterosexual relationships, "perpetrated almost entirely by men." Intimate terrorism is a pattern of systemic physical and emotional—sometimes economic—abuse; its presence has the "highest risk for homicide" (Monckton Smith, 2020, p. 1268). Campbell et al. (2003, p.1091) found that physical violence is the "primary" risk factor for femicide; 70% of femicide victims in their sample experienced physical abuse at the hands of their killer. Dobash et al. (2004) determined similar results, finding 59% of male femicide perpetrators previously physically abused the women they killed.

Although physical abuse is prevalent in relationships that end in femicide, coercive control, best exemplified by extreme possessiveness and stalking behavior, is another notable risk factor. Among a sample of survivors of attempted femicide, 41% reported their partner had stalked them compared to 19% of controls (survivors of abusive partners, not attempted femicides) (McFarlane, Campbell, & Watson, 2002, p. 61). In Podreka's (2019, p. 19-20) study, one-third of male perpetrators did not use physical violence against their partner prior to committing femicide, but rather used psychological and verbal abuse, humiliated her, and/or stalked her. Johnson et al. (2019) found half of male perpetrators did not report a physical or sexual assault against the women they killed taking place in the year prior to the femicide. They

argue these results indicate a need to further examine how potential femicide victims are identified. Whether or not the abuse is physical, it is pervasive.

"Coercive control doesn't require a threatened consequence to be actually delivered—only creation of the belief that it could be" (Dutton & Goodman, 2005, p. 750). Prior to their murder, the victims of femicide are living in a world seemingly ruled by their partners. There is a portion of the greater body of femicide literature that maintains a primary driver of femicide is a crisis of male identity (Jewkes, 2002; Altinöz, et al., 2018; Podreka, 2019; Monckton Smith, 2020). Podreka (2019, p. 16) argues femicide is a reflection of broader patriarchal power relations between men and women; in her sample male perpetrators were self-conscious men who utilized violence when they felt they were losing power and control in their relationship and/or as a means to reposition themselves and their own authority in their relationship and their community. Monckton Smith (2020, p. 1278) identifies a "discursive link between losing control and losing status," by killing their partners, these men seek to re-establish the roles they believe they should hold and hoped for some "confirmation of their manliness" (Podreka, 2019, p.22). Dobash & Dobash (2011, p. 113) found the men in their sample viewed their victims as responsible because they were "inadequate partners" which in turn is a reflection on him in a patriarchal society which tells men their role is to possess and control women. These findings are consistent with many of the identified risk factors of femicide perpetration—unemployment (Campbell et al., 2003; Beyer et al., 2013; Altinöz et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2019; Zara et al., 2019), the children of another man lived in the home of the victim and perpetrator (Campbell et al., 2003; Beyer et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2019), the victim was leaving the relationship or was unfaithful (real or perceived) (Echeburúa et al., 2009; Beyer et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2019; Monckton Smith, 2020). Drawing on previous studies, Aguilar-Ruiz (2018, p. 46) characterizes

femicide perpetrators as "extremely jealous people;" Campbell, Webster, & Glass (2009) described them as "constantly jealous" (see also: Echeburúa & Fernández-Montalvo, 2007; Echeburúa et al., 2009).

A significant portion of the current literature focuses on individual risk factors of victimization. Mapping victims' age, employment, and socio-economic status, education, how often and how severely she had been physically abused in the past. But research on victim characteristics implicitly places the burden of action on victims. Once risk factors are identified, and information disseminated there is only so much a potential victim can do with that information. It is well established that the most dangerous time in an abusive relationship is when the victim attempts to leave. Intimate partner femicide primarily occurs after a woman declares her intention to leave her partner or she has begun a new relationship (Campbell et al. 2003; Podreka, 2019; Beyer, Wallis, & Hamberger, 2015). Translating research into the prevention of victimization introduces a variety of challenges and while these recommendations may aid public health providers and law enforcement in identifying likely victims, there is more work that must be done to understand what factors facilitate perpetration.

Traditional Police Intervention

Femicides "rarely occur unexpectedly without obvious prior risk factors" (Podreka, 2019, p. 19). But if femicides follow clear and "obvious" patterns of abuse, what makes them so difficult to prevent? Johnson et al. (2019) theorize that police, who are called to perform immediate intervention, often miss the deeper coercive control men exert over their partners. "Police respond just to the specific incident of criminal assault that triggered the call for help and disconnect it from patterns of behavior that control, intimidate, and isolate the woman" (Johnson et al., 2019, p. 9). Law enforcement is often considered the first line of defense in preventing

violent crime, including femicide. But many women who become the victims of femicide do not receive the help they require from law enforcement. While Koppa & Messing (2019) found that 91% of victims in their sample had been in some contact with the police in the three years prior to their murder, fewer than half of these complaints resulted in an arrest of the perpetrator. On average, victims of femicide were visited by police six times in the three years before their murders. Koppa & Messing (2019) conclude that while most victims of femicide interact with the police, this do not result in interventions that prevent femicide. Koppa & Messing's conclusion could be a result of survival bias. Because our measure of failure is death by femicide, we do not have an equally definitive measure of success (alive because of police intervention). While this is an important consideration, their findings are supported by studies with samples of women who survived attempted femicide (Evans et al., 2018).

Risk Factors of Perpetration

Compared to research on preventing victimization, the existing information on the drivers of perpetration is relatively scant (Dobash & Dobash, 2017, p. 135; Johnson et al., 2019; Di Marco & Evans, 2020). Understanding the motivations and thought processes of those who commit femicide is crucial to understanding the crime itself. There is enough information on the behaviors of likely femicide perpetrators to sketch a profile—stalking (McFarlane, Campbell, & Watson, 2002; Johnson, 2008; Monckton Smith, 2020), threatening to kill one's partner (Echeburúa et al., 2009; Monckton Smith, 2020), a history of violence in past relationships (Echeburúa et al., 2009), use of coercive control (Dutton & Goodman, 2005; Johnson, 2008). But there is limited evidence of any indicators that could identify a potential perpetrator before he exhibits these behaviors. A "unique psychopathology" among femicide perpetrators does not appear to exist or is yet to be identified (Altinöz et al., 2018, p. 4174). Nor has scholarship

supported the belief that these men are generally criminal and/or mentally ill. An "intense, though problematic" relationship is more predictive of femicide than of criminality itself (Zara & Gino, 2018, p.7). Most victims of femicide are killed by men who do *not* suffer from a mental disorder (Zara et al., 2019, p. 1301). Lysell et al. (2016) could not determine a significant correlation between femicide perpetration and major mental disorder or prior violent crime convictions. It appears that "men who kill their partners deviate less from the 'normal' then do other homicide offenders" (Lysell et al., 2016, p. 342). Given that potential perpetrators are difficult to identify and lack a distinct "psychopathology" that can be measured, identified, and then treated, Altinöz et al. (2018, p. 4181) argue we should view femicide not as an individual act of violence but evaluate it as a "primarily society-related phenomenon."

Neighborhood Risk Factors

An emerging trend in femicide research is an examination of the communities and neighborhoods that experience femicide perpetration. McQuestion (2003, p. 335) finds support for IPV as the cause of individual-level risk factors to be inconsistent, while community-level clustering is consistently autocorrelated.

In a 2020 paper Sá et al. (p. 7) published what they claim to be the first study to analyze factors associated with "spatial clusters" of femicide and found that in the state of Sergipe, Brazil, there was an increase in femicide rates in places where "patriarchal culture is perpetuated." The spatial distribution was non-random, with a high autocorrelation. Although it may be the first study to identify these specific clusters, there is an established precedent for examining geographic loci of violence and IPV. Years of research indicate an individual's risk of experiencing IPV increases when there are higher levels of IPV within their neighborhood and social network. (McQuestion, 2003; Raghavan et al., 2006, 2009; Uthman et al., 2011).

There is some overlap in the literature that focuses on individual risk factors and that which discusses neighborhood and community level effects. Both see a geographic clustering of individual risk factors of femicide. Many of the individual risk factors that have been identified such as eviction (Johnson et al., 2019), unemployment (Campbell et al., 2003; Beyer et al., 2013; Altinöz et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2019; Zara et al., 2019), immigration (Echeburúa et al., 2009; Altinöz et al., 2018), and exposure to violence (Altinöz et al., 2018, Beyer, Wallis, & Hamberger, 2013, Johnson et al., 2019) are often concentrated in similar geographic regions as a result of class segregation. Benson et al. (2003) found that women living in neighborhoods with above-average levels of economic deprivation were significantly more likely to be victimized by their partners than women living in more economically advantaged neighborhoods. This is not to suggest that femicide or IPV is an ill of the poor, rather it speaks to historical and contemporary wealth-based inequities and systems of oppression. As Miles-Doan & Kelly (1997, p.134) identified, "compared to other neighborhoods, those with a concentration of people living in poverty are…likely to have fewer formal (police protection) or informal (community crime prevention strategies) social controls available." Drawing on previous studies, Lanier & Maume (2009, p. 1313) theorize that socioeconomic segregation increases social isolation in a community, "which in turn has a direct and positive impact on rates of violence." In wealthier neighborhoods, the social contagion of violence effect may also be muted as homes in these neighborhoods tend be spaced farther apart and the wealthy may have a greater ability to hide the evidence of escalating IPV (Miles-Doan & Kelly, 1997, p.141). Poverty may also incentivize a woman to stay with an abusive partner as leaving requires funds and resources she does not have (Browning, 2002).

Social Capital, Social Networks, Social Sanctions

Social capital is made up of the "connections among individuals—social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" (Putnam, 2000, p.19) The everyday interactions between neighbors and friends builds social networks and within these networks certain norms are established. Social networks are societal structural units through which bonds are created, norms are set, and information is disseminated. Friends, family members, and co-workers often make up an individual's social network. Individuals within one community trust one another not violate these norms, otherwise offenders can expect consequences and social isolation.

On the local level, social capital is considered a public good that is protective against crime. Robert Putnam argues social capital is required for democracy and since the 1960s the social theorist Jane Jacobs has discussed social capital as the key to neighborhood safety and the development of mutual trust (Alexiou, 2006). Social capital can be withdrawn as punishment; this is the primary means by which communities enact informal social sanctions. When 'deviant' behavior (i.e., the commission of a crime) is punished others in the community are more likely to refrain from this same behavior. Beyond the theoretical, there is also empirical evidence that an inverse relationship exists between social capital and crime rates. In a sample of 142 Dutch municipalities, Akçomak and ter Weel (2008) observed social capital levels increase as crime rates decrease. A 2006 study with a sample of 1,435 American mothers, found that a 1-point increase in a social capital score was associated with a 30% reduction in domestic violence (Zolotor & Runyun, 2006). Lederman, Loayza, and Menéndez (1999) included 39 countries in a study examining the effect of social capital—measured by voluntary participation in civil,

community, and religious organizations—on the homicide incidence in each country. They found increased social capital reduced the risk of violent crime.

For potential victims of IPV, Kirst et al. (2015) point to several studies that have found as social capital increases, the likelihood of experiencing IPV decreases. McQuestion (2003) found that the probability of a woman experiencing IPV was dependent on indicators traditionally associated with measuring social capital, "union status, schooling…area of residence, her partner's schooling." Lanier and Maume (2009) found similar results, women had a lower risk of IPV when they received help from family and friends with "childcare, transportation, housework, and advice," in other words when they had a wealth of social capital.

In the literature, there are two primary social capital related explanations for the incidence of crime, a deficit of social capital and the perversion of social capital. A common thread between these two branches is that social networks can exert control over individuals' actions and decision making via the implementation of social sanctions.

Social Capital Deficit

As increased levels of social capital are associated with decreased crime, the opposite is also true. The inverse relationship of social capital and violence presents something of a chicken or the egg problem. Are some neighborhoods characterized by violence because they lack social capital, or do they lack social capital because of the rate of violence? It is difficult to establish causality and to complicate the issue further, lower levels of social capital are often found in economically depressed areas (Rubio, 1997; Lederman, Loayza, and Menéndez, 1999; Akçomak & ter Weel 2008; Kirst et al., 2015). As described in the previous section, Miles-Doan and Kelly (1997) posit the association between violence and poverty is a result of limited formal and informal social control.

Much of the literature on social capital among incarcerated individuals is focused on re-entry and recidivism. The prevailing theory is people who can maintain strong social ties while in prison after release from prison and are less likely to be incarcerated again. But social capital is difficult to maintain while in prison, not only are there logistical barriers, but “friends and relatives might not want to keep contact with someone who has committed a crime” (Liem, 2013). This deficit of social capital makes it all the more difficult to successfully re-integrate following imprisonment (Liem, 2013; Lafferty et al., 2015; Liu, Pickett, & Baker; 2016). Perpetrators of crime, particularly sex offenders, suffer significant social sanctions upon returning to their communities, unable to gain employment, housing, join organizations, or maintain relationships with old friends (Burchfield and Mingus, 2008; Tolson and Klein, 2015; Liu, Pickett, and Baker; 2016).

Nagin and Paternoster (1994) use rational choice theory to argue the withdrawal of social capital is an effective means of social control. They found that offenders not only consider the formal and legal consequences of crime, but also the informal sanctions they may face, the “cost of damage to social bonds.” The risk of losing ties with family, friends, and neighbors increases the cost of committing crime and therefore serves as a further deterrent.

Perverse Social Capital

Other authors argue that social capital may not always help to prevent crime, it may also facilitate crime. Rather than risk losing relationships, in some communities, committing crime can strengthen relationships. While researching juvenile gangs in Colombia, Mauricio Rubio (1997) distinguished between productive and perverse social capital, arguing that criminality is not always evidence of a social capital deficit, but rather a different type of social capital is present. Perverse social capital motivates and normalizes crime and violence rather than deters it.

A prime example of perverse social capital is the trust and bonding relationships that are established between members of a gang. While violence may undermine social capital, it also reconstitutes it. Perverted social capital may incentivize violent crime as a means of establishing and maintaining social connections. This understanding of social capital dovetails with Podreka's (2019, p.22) theories around what motivates men to commit femicide; "The men in our sample used deadly violence against their partners mainly as a means of repositioning themselves and their own authority, both in relation to their partner, among their friends and in the wider society from which they want to get confirmation of their manliness."

Social Sanctions

There is substantial evidence that IPV and femicide are phenomena primarily driven by social factors. Public health has a variety of tools to aid in behavior change and social norm setting. Using social network analysis, in rural Senegal, Sandberg et al. (2021) determined an association between an individual's belief that IPV is acceptable and the level of IPV acceptability within a respondent's social network. In some cases, they found that social networks had a stronger influence over a person's belief of IPV acceptability than even the respondent's individual characteristics, overriding the influence of a person's sex and level of education. The authors referred to this as the "'direct' learning or normative effect" of social networks (Sandberg et al., 2021, p. 5636).

When discussing collective efficacy as a means of violence prevention, Browning (2002) recognized the importance of social networks and community, but fears community members cannot be relied upon to 1) view IPV as deviant or 2) monitor and intervene. Despite this concern, there is support that communities can be taught as a group to view IPV as unacceptable and infrastructure can be put in place to make intervention safer and more viable. Beyer, Wallis,

& Hamberger (2013, p. 41) posit that community attitudes are more modifiable than individual risk factors. Sandberg et al. (2012, p. 5636) suggest two strategies, intervening to change the minds of influential opinion leaders within a community or network to spread ideas and norms through already established information channels. Sandberg et al. also argue that designing and tailoring interventions to target and change the beliefs among those who hold them most closely in each network, while it may require more resources, is more effective for long-term change. Fabiano et al. (2003) found that among college-age men, individual adherence to consensual sex was heavily influenced by their perceptions of what the authors referred to as a rape-supportive environment. The men in the sample held misperceptions as to how their peers, both male and female viewed consent and underestimated the support other men and women had for consensual only sexual activity. The authors argue social norm interventions that address an entire population can help make these misperceptions apparent and prevent sexual violence. Traditional forms of IPV prevention are often focused on police and public health professionals intervening in the lives of at-risk couples, but these institutions do not have the same reach into the private sphere that social networks do. Public health interventions to prevent femicide should attempt to leverage the pre-existing social controls with communities experiencing increased rates of violence.

Methods

A preliminary review of the literature on femicide perpetration revealed both spatial clustering of femicides and neighborhood-level risk factors as understudied areas of the field. The initial aim of the study was to determine if there are neighborhood-level risk factors that can be identified within Buenos Aires. As the study progressed, the secondary aims became primary: exploring the role of the community on the individual perpetrator and considering the

perpetrators' social capital and degree of integration within their communities. From this, we developed a questionnaire that could be administered to lethal and non-lethal crimes perpetrators and analyzed quantitatively. The research design and analysis sought to determine the role of community-level social control and the extent of informal punishment femicide perpetrators endure following imprisonment.

Research Design

The hypothesis originated from close readings of the literature on social capital and the role of both formal and informal social control on crime incidence. The social capital measures included in the questionnaire would be compared across all criminal groups to measure the degree to which social sanctions were employed against the individual perpetrator. Homicide perpetrators were included in the sample as a criminal group comparable to femicide perpetrators as their crimes both involved murder. The group of other crime perpetrators serves as the control group. This is supported by criminological studies indicating differences in the criminal social identity between murders and other types of offenders (Sherretts et al., 2017). The null hypothesis that femicide perpetrators' social capital scores following imprisonment will not differ significantly from those of homicide perpetrators, does not require a non-instutitonalized control group to be tested. We explored the research question by designing a cross-sectional quantitative study.

Data Collection and Procedures

Data collection took place in four carceral institutions in Metropolitan Buenos Aires, Argentina. These facilities were purposely selected due to prior institutional agreements. All data were collected during the summer of 2021 by the collaborating research team at the University of

Buenos Aires. Respondents were cis-gender males who were serving a prison sentence for "aggravated homicide due to femicide," intentional homicide (*homicidio doloso*), robbery with a weapon, robbery without a weapon, or drug crimes/dealing. The men who committed non-lethal crimes were categorized as "other crime perpetrators" for the purposes of data analysis. Of the 208 interviews, 94 were conducted in person and the remainder were completed over the phone. All interviews were conducted in Spanish, data were recorded in English and in Spanish. Within each facility, a list of prisoners was provided by authorities indicating the convicted crimes. Since the questionnaire was administered in the educational facilities of the prison (due to access permission and safety measures), contact was only established with inmates who were attending lectures, classes, or courses. Cases were randomly selected, and contacts were made over the period of 67 days, until COVID restrictions were implemented and terminated the fieldwork. The general response rate was of 84.8% (91% "aggravated homicide due to femicide,"89% intentional homicide (*homicidio doloso*), 82% robbery with a weapon, 83% robbery without a weapon, or 79% drug crimes/dealing).

Data Analysis and Instruments

Before analysis, data were cleaned and coded, and composite scores were created for each scale. Social capital and how it changes following imprisonment was examined as the key dependent variable in a sample of 208 men evenly distributed across four prisons located in Metropolitan Buenos Aires. All statistical analyses were conducted in SAS® 9.4. Independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA were conducted to test for difference in means between femicide, homicide, and other crime perpetrators. Regression modeling was used to produce adjusted least squares means to control for covariates age, socioeconomic status, and carceral institution. We analyzed five of the included scales: Pre-Imprisonment Social Capital Scale,

Post-Imprisonment Social Capital Scale, Perceived Neighborhood Cohesion Scale, Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE), and Adult Violence Exposure.

The questionnaire was informed by the different theoretical approaches of feminist scholars, sociologists, public health, and violence prevention practitioners. The questionnaire covered topics that are typically discussed as explanatory models of femicide perpetration such as sociodemographic measures, adverse childhood experiences, violence exposure, past violence perpetration within the index relationship, and past crime; alongside more novel topics such as perceived neighborhood cohesion, social network size and social capital. The questionnaire also included three open-ended questions, responses were coded inductively and quantified. The questionnaire was developed in collaboration with subject matter experts, Drs. Dabney P. Evans, Martín Di Marco, Jasna Podreka, and Gergo Baranyi. In 2020, Di Marco and Evans completed 24 life-narrative interviews with 12 femicide perpetrators to establish an archetypal analysis. Di Marco led the team that conducted these interviews and administered the questionnaire for this study. Independently, as formative research, cognitive interviews were conducted with Dr. Baranyi and Dr. Podreka. Baranyi studies local crime, disorder, and cohesion at the neighborhood level from a human geography perspective. Podreka's study of femicide analyzed crime as an acute symptom of society's patriarchal control over women.

The questionnaire consisted of a series of adapted scales. Each scale used was translated into Spanish with the translation software DeepL and revised by a speaker of Argentinian Spanish. The two scales measuring the dependent variable were the Pre- and Post-Imprisonment Social Capital Scales that were analyzed separately and used to create a Social Capital Difference variable which is the distribution of Pre scores subtracted from the Post scores. The possible range of Pre and Post scores were 0 to 9 with 0 indicating no social capital or network;

this individual could not name a friend, family member, co-worker, etc. with whom they are amicable. Inversely, the range of possible scores for Social Capital Difference was -9 to 9 with negative scores indicating a loss and positive scores a gain in social capital, and a 0 meaning no change. The Pre and Post scales were both adapted from scales included in the World Bank's "Integrated Questionnaire for the Measurement of Social Capital (SC-IQ)" (Grootaert, 2004). The questionnaire was originally designed to serve as a household survey in low-resource areas. We selected the most appropriate scales for our study and adapted the wording to ask about the individual's experiences before and after imprisonment. There were four questions included in the Pre-Scale and three in Post, but one question[2] was removed because of a high rate of missing data. This also allowed the three questions on each scale to have the same weight. Both scales have high internal consistency, the Pre-Scale has a coefficient alpha of .88 and the Post an alpha of .85.

The Perceived Neighborhood Cohesion Scale was also adapted from the World Bank's guidance on measuring social capital. Within the "Trust and Solidarity" module of the SC-IQ is a four-question scale assessing neighborhood cohesion. The scale provides a score measuring an individual's *perception* of neighborhood cohesion. To provide a more objective measure, a random selection of the neighborhood would need to respond to the questionnaire. Respondents' perception is sufficient for this work.

The original 1998 ten-question Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) scale has been updated and adapted by different bodies. In 2011, the Philadelphia ACE Research Committee developed a 40-question Expanded ACE Questionnaire. The committee found that the

---

[2] "Before being imprisoned most recently, who in your family did you speak to at least once every 2 weeks?"

demographics of Philadelphia were far different than the sample included in the study that helped to create the first ACE scale, participants were majority white, middle-class, and college-educated (Philadelphia ACE Project, 2015). Reflecting on this critique, the Philadelphia team sought to capture ACEs that may be experienced by a broader section of the population and included more community-level indicators of violence exposure outside the home. Of the 40-questions, we used 11 that focused on witnessing violence or being the victim of specific violent acts before the age of 18 within and outside the home. The Adult Violence Exposure Scale created for this study was simply an adapted version of these 11 questions but asked about the individual's experiences after the age of 18.

Finally, we included a measure of Prior Crime indicated by two questions that asked if the participant had ever been convicted of a crime before the age of 18 and after (other than the crime for which they were currently serving a sentence). A 'yes' to either question was coded as 1, so the possible range of score for this composite question was 0 to 2.

Ethical Considerations

This project was approved by Comité de Bioética Hospitalario "Vicente Federico de Giúdice," the Argentinian authority on research ethics. The study falls under a larger body of research, the "Narratives of Life and Death: Life Stories of Men Who Committed Homicide or Femicide in AMBA" (P.R.I R20-24). The Emory University Institutional Review Board also granted an exemption for my part in developing the questionnaire. Written, informed consent was obtained in Spanish from all participants before the questionnaire was administered. Following the established research guidelines, participants were given informed consent documents that described the purpose of the study, length of participation, and informed them that participation was entirely voluntary.

Results

We first present demographic information on the sample, then primary findings on social capital scores, and secondary findings on perpetrators' past experiences with violence and femicide perpetrators' thoughts on prevention.

Of the respondents, 71 were charged with femicide perpetration, 73 were homicide perpetrators, and 64 had committed a different type of crime (robbery with or without a gun and drug crimes) (Table 1). All were cisgender males. Most (85%, n=176) of the participants were classified as having a low socioeconomic background. Nearly all of the men were born in Argentina, while only 4.8% (n=10) were born in neighboring countries. More than a third (38.5%, n=80) had previously committed some other crime than the crime for which they were currently serving a prison sentence. Most (84%, n=174) received only a primary or secondary level of education at the time the crime was committed.

Table 1. Age and socioeconomic status of 208 men convicted of femicide, homicide or another crime in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

	Femicide (n=71)	Homicide (n=73)	Other Crime (n=64)	All (n=208)
Variable	*M (SD) or %(n)*	*M (SD) or %(n)*	*M (SD) or %(n)*	*M (SD) or %(n)*
Age	27.84 (11.21)	29.36 (10.92)	30.70 (11.81)	29.25 (11.30)
Low socio-economic status	89% (63)	89% (63)	84% (54)	85% (176)
Unemployed at time of crime	37% (26)	37% (27)	44% (28)	39% (81)
Highest education at time of crime Primary: Secondary: Tertiary: University/Graduate:	P: 45% (32) S: 38% (27) T: 10% (7) U/G: 7% (5)	P: 51% (37) S: 32% (23) T: 8% (6) U/G: 10% (7)	P: 55% (35) S: 31% (20) T: 8% (5) U/G: 6% (4)	P: 50% (104) S: 34% (70) T: 9% (18) U/G: 8% (16)

Among the femicide perpetrators, the sample was evenly split; almost half (n=36) of the men lived with the victim at the time of the femicide, and half (n=35) did not. Similarly, 34 of

the men killed an intimate partner with whom they were involved at the time of the murder, and 34 killed a former partner. Three of the men killed someone who was not an intimate partner; their victims were a sister-in-law, a sister, and a daughter. Nearly one third (31%, n=22) of the femicide perpetrators killed their current girlfriend, 27% (n=19) their ex-wife, 11% (n=8) a former sexual partner, 11% (n=8) killed their wife, 9.9% (n=7) their ex-girlfriend, and 5.6% (n=4) killed a current sexual partner.

How social capital of femicide perpetrators changes after the crime

We compared the social capital of femicide perpetrators with that of homicide perpetrators in the same carceral institutions. The group of other crime perpetrators serve as a control group. Prior to imprisonment, perpetrators of femicide and homicide reported statistically equal mean social capital scores of 5.1 and 4.9 (p-value = 0.5871), while perpetrators of other crimes report the lowest at 3.55. Following imprisonment, the average social capital scores of those who committed a different type of crime remain unchanged, but both femicide and homicide perpetrators' scores decreased (Table 2).

Table 2. Social capital scores for perpetrators of femicide, homicide and other crimes before and after the commission of the crime (*N* = 208)

	Femicide (n=71)				Homicide (n=73)				Other Crimes (n=64)			
	$\bar{x}$	$\tilde{x}$	Range	SD	$\bar{x}$	$\tilde{x}$	Range	SD	$\bar{x}$	$\tilde{x}$	Range	SD
Pre-Social Capital	5.10	6	1 – 9	2.10	4.90	6	1 – 9	2.20	3.55	3	1 – 6	1.66
Post-Social Capital	3.17	3	0 – 9	1.84	2.01	2	0 – 4	1.26	3.55	3	0 – 6	1.66
Social Capital Difference	-1.93	-2	-9 – +5	3.07	-2.89	-3	(*-9) -7 – +2	2.48	0	0	(*-6) -4 – +5	2.22

**Indicates an outlier*

After performing a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test (*p* <.0001) comparing the three groups, perpetrators of other crimes stood apart from femicide and homicide perpetrators on all social capital scores (pre, post, and difference). The other crime perpetrators had the lowest mean scores before imprisonment, but the highest after. Compared to other crime perpetrators, there was less variability between femicide and homicide perpetrators. Despite having nearly identical pre-imprisonment social capital scores, perpetrators of femicide and homicide diverge following imprisonment (Table 3). Homicide perpetrators' scores diminish by more than half. Femicide perpetrators' scores also dropped, however not nearly as dramatically. A t-test comparing the means of the social capital difference scores between the two groups yields a *p*-value of 0.0403.

Table 3. Unadjusted ANOVA (p<.0001) of social capital scores for perpetrators of femicide, homicide and other crimes before and after the commission of the crime

	Femicide (n=71)	Homicide (n=73)	*p*-Value t-test	Other Crime (n=64)	*p*-Value ANOVA
Pre-Social Capital	5.10	4.90	0.5871	3.55	<.0001***
Post-Social Capital	3.17	2.01	<.0001***	3.55	<.0001***
Social Capital Difference	-1.93	-2.89	0.0403*	0	<.0001***

* *p < 05*
*** *p < 01*

To control for potential variability in the sample, regression modelling was used with age, socioeconomic status (SES), and carceral institution as covariates. After adjusting for age, SES, and carceral institution, femicide perpetrators' social capital scores after imprisonment were significantly (*p* = 0.0342) higher than the post-imprisonment scores of homicide perpetrators (Table 4).

Table 4. Adjusted least squares means of social capital scores for perpetrators of femicide, homicide and other crimes before and after the commission of the crime controlling for age, SES and carceral institution

	Femicide (n=71)	Homicide (n=73)	*p*-Value
Pre-Social Capital	5.10	4.95	0.6860
Post-Social Capital	3.16	2.01	<.0001***
Social Capital Difference	-1.94	-2.95	0.0342*

Adjusted for age, socioeconomic status, and institution
$* p < 05$
$*** p < 01$

Prior Crime and Violence Exposure

We also examined Adverse Childhood Experience scores, Adult Violence Exposure scores, self-reported prior (to crime associated with current prison sentence) criminality, and the perpetrator's perceieved neighborhood cohesion as potential explanatory factors in the occurance, motivations, and risk factors for femicide perpetration. Within our sample each groups' mean score on these variables were statistically equivalent. Compared to homicide and other crime perpetrators, femicide perpetrators experience similar exposure to violence and trauma as children and as adults, lived in neighborhoods characterized by the same degree of cohesiveness (versus disorder) as other perpetrators, and committed or did not commit prior crime at similar rates (Table 5). For each scale, a score of 0 indicates the most positive experience where as greater exposure is indicated by a greater score (i.e. ACE=0, the individual did not report any ACEs; Neighborhood Cohesion=10, the individual reported a severe lack of trust and cohesiveness in the neighborhoods they lived in).

Table 5. Adverse childhood experience, adult violence exposure, prior crime, and neighborhood cohesion scores among perpetrators of femicide, homicide. and other crimes adjusted for age and SES

Variable	Range	Femicide (n=71)	Homicide (n=73)	*p*-Value	Other Crime (n=64)	*p*-Value
ACE	0 – 11	6.48	6.51	0.8165	6.41	0.9242
Adult Violence Exposure	0 – 9	4.25	4.61	0.2904	4.48	0.5631
Prior Crime	0 – 2	0.35	0.49	0.2889	0.60	0.0565
Neighborhood Cohesion	0 – 10	6.06	6.29	0.4328	6.32	0.2839

Adjusted for age and socioeconomic status

Perpetrators on Prevention

The survey insturument included three open-ended questions relevant to femicide perpetrators. One item asked “What do you think would have needed to be different for the woman (the victim of the femicide) to be alive today?” Of 71 perpetrators, 25 refused to answer or stated some variety of “I don’t know.” Over one third of respondents to the question (35%, n=16) said that education (including therapy or guidance/mentoship) on gender and healthy relationships would have changed the relationship and therefore the outcome. Four respondents directly blamed the woman they killed and one blamed the nature of the relationship but neither himself nor her. Most often, the men cited external factors. A quarter (26%, n=12) described lacking control; control over their own emotions (15%, n=7), abuse of drugs or alcohol (9%, n=4), or stress from working (2%, n=1). Some (15%, n=7) respondents blamed family, their fathers, their upbringing, or the “macho” culture they were raised in. Three (7%) of the men described their social class, economic stress, and/or social and economic exclusion as a driving factor for their crime.

We also asked perpetrators details about their relationships with the victim before her murder. While 40% (n=28) of the men had previously used a weapon against the victim during a

disagreement, 56% (n=40) had choked, strangled, or otherwise, cut off her breathing and a remarkable, 86% (n=61) had previously threatened to kill her. Nearly three-quarters, (73%, n=52) of the respondents had daily or weekly "disagreements or fights" with the victim while the remainder reported annual or monthly disagreements. Sixty-eight percent (68%, n=48) admitted to "convincing or coercing" her to have sex when she did not want to during a disagreement. Over eighty percent (85%, n=60) of the men could name at least one other person in their social network who also used violence as a means to settle disagreements and 11% (n=8) said "everyone" they knew used violence during disagreements. In terms of controlling behavior, 61% (n=43) of the perpetrators said they felt "constantly jealous" of the victim when they disagreed; four in ten (41%, n=29) told her how much money she could use during a disagreement. In a fight, 38% (n=27) told her when she could leave the house and 38% (n=27) told her with whom they thought she should be friends.

Limitations and Delimitations

The limitations of this study should be considered alongside the findings. We have no way to compare the men who choose to participate in the study with those men who chose not to. Potentially, the men's decision to participate or not might have some correlation with their social capital and social network size. Men with few social connections may have welcomed the opportunity to talk with someone new, or conversely, men who lack social connection may not have been agreeable to voluntary participation in the questionnaire. Either way, we cannot know, but we might assume that the reasons behind non-participation were universal and did not differ based on femicide, homicide, or other crime perpetration. It is also impossible to compare incarcerated femicide perpetrators with perpetrators who also committed suicide. These men may commit femicide fully understanding the consequences of their actions and choose not to live

with these consequences. The social networks for these men may differ significantly from those included in our study.

Some may argue that incarcerated men are inherently unreliable narrators, therefore any findings based on self-report are biased. Using the internal consistency between the scales as a proxy measure for earnest response, the high coefficient alphas for the scales give us no reason to doubt the veracity of the respondents' self-reports. Another limitation is that incarcerated men likely differ from men who have perpetrated crime but who have not been charged and incarcerated. This limitation has no bearing on the primary research question, which is focused on social capital before and following incarceration, but it may impact other aspects of the study and findings in ways that we cannot quantify.

There are also a few delimitations, most notably, respondents' Pre- and Post-Social Capital scores were informed by only a few questions each. We designed the questionnaire for this study to collect a wide range of information including specific details on the index relationship of femicide perpetrators and indicators of mental health and psychopathy of all respondents. Measures of social capital, social networks, community, and neighborhood factors all shaped the survey design, but time constraints limited how expansive each section could be. Also, because of the logistics of contacting inmates (permission and safety), the men we interviewed were all attending educational programs at their respective prisons. This may have biased the results as these men were all voluntarily pursuing further education limiting the generalizability of our findings.

Discussion

Through this work we assessed the social capital of different types of offenders and via self-report, we measured the felt response of offenders' social networks to their imprisonment. Prior to the commission of their crimes, femicide and homicide perpetrators' mean social capital scores were statistically equal (p =0.5871) while other crime offenders had significantly lower scores. Following imprisonment both homicide and femicide perpetrators experienced a significant decrease in their social capital scores, but other crime perpetrators did not observe any difference. Across the board we expected to see some decrease in social capital scores for two reasons 1) it is logistically difficult for imprisoned people to maintain relationships with the same frequency or intensity, and 2) because the withdrawal of social capital is a primary means of enforcing social norms. Perpetrators of other crimes were able to maintain the same degree of social interaction and kept members of their social network close even following imprisonment. Of the three types of offenders included in our sample, other crime perpetrators committed acts that were the most 'acceptable,' therefore it is possible members of their social network found it easier to continue their relationships with the perpetrator compared to the friends and family members of individuals who were revealed to have killed someone.

We recognize a person's ability to create and maintain a social network is not only influenced by the type of crime they committed, but also by individual characteristics such as age, socioeconomic status, and after imprisonment, influenced by the prison infrastructure and policy (i.e., visitation, distance from family, phone privileges, etc.). We adjusted for these potential covariates and came to similar results. The mean post-incarceration scores for homicide and femicide perpetrators were significantly different ($p < .0001$) both before and after adjustment and the same was true for the mean difference scores at the 0.05 significance level.

This allowed us to reject the null hypothesis that no difference exists between the mean social capital scores of femicide and homicide perpetrators.

Violence borne of misogyny and cis-sexism serves to deny women and girls the same dignity and humanity afforded to men. Patriarchal forces have so shaped world culture that women's lives are devalued, therefore a man who kills a woman has not committed the same transgression as a man who kills another man. Our findings indicate that while a femicide perpetrator can expect to lose some points in social capital, he will likely not face total isolation, rather he can expect to retain his social network. The same cannot be said for perpetrators of homicide. To explain this, we first consider the questions that led to the development of the thesis: why does he not kill his brother, male boss, or best friend? Why not another man? Why are women disproportionately murdered by men and most often their male intimate partners?

If the drivers of lethal violence could be explained entirely by individual factors, we would expect to see the same rates of women killing men as men killing women. We might also expect an even distribution of femicides across a country without spatial clustering. Overall, femicidal men choose to kill women they know, either an intimate partner or a family member. Femicide is a phenomenon that must be explored from a wider vantage than the individual as Podreka (2019, p.16) highlights, "femicides are basically a reflection of an extreme manifestation of male power and control over women and should be understood in the larger context of the unequal power relations between women and men in society." In her study on the stalking behavior of femicide perpetrators, Monckton Smith (2020) points to the construction of heterosexual love in popular discourse, jealousy, possessiveness, and violence are often viewed as powerful expressions of 'love.' Women are also constructed as untrustworthy, dishonest, and unfaithful (Monckton Smith, 2020, p. 1276). Rather than being viewed as autonomous

individuals, throughout history women have been considered the possessions of men; a man who cannot acquire and control a woman is not a man. Men still internalize these messages. In qualitative interviews with femicide perpetrators, Dobash and Dobash (2011, p. 112) found that while the men often claimed a "loss of control" they also had "clear objectives" for their use of violence against their partners; they wished to silence her, punish her, frighten her, or teach her a lesson. Podreka (2019, p. 22) argues men use violence to reconfirm their masculinity in their own eyes, the eyes of their partner and wider society. Countering the 'crime of passion' discourse, scholars have found evidence of premeditation among femicide perpetrators (Dobash & Dobash, 2015). Nagin and Paternoster (1994) take the economics perspective of rational choice theory to contextualize criminal offenders, claiming they must consider the legal and non-legal ramifications of their crimes and the social consequences they might face. As Argentinian feminists have also argued, Zara and Gino (2018) highlight the state's culpability in the incidence of femicide "many years of under prosecuted IPV incidents may have fostered an implicit license that it is somehow tolerable" to be violent towards an intimate partner. Our findings point to a similar degree of social impunity.

Browning (2002) uses the theories of Bursik (1988) and Bursik and Grasmick (1993) to support the argument that violent crime requires opportunity, a suitable target, and the absence of a supervisor. Violence that occurs in the home and against a female intimate partner meets each of these requirements. Rather than kill his male colleague of friend, a femicide perpetrator kills a woman not only because he has access to her, but because she is an acceptable target for whose murder he will not suffer the same social isolation (informal punishment) as he would were he to murder a man.

The significant difference between femicide and homicide perpetrators' post-imprisonment social capital scores indicates a degree of acceptability of GBV within the social networks of femicide perpetrators and thus insufficient social control to prevent femicide.

Prior Crime and Violence Exposure

In prior studies, men who murdered their intimate partners were found to be more conventional than other types of criminals or "had fewer problems as children and adults and were less likely to have had persistent criminal behavior" when compared to men who killed other men (Johnson et al., 2019; see also: Dobash et al., 2004; Lysell et al., 2016). In our work, we did not observe any significant differences between the mean scores of femicide, homicide, and other crime perpetrators on the ACE, Adult Violence Exposure, and Neighborhood Cohesion scales. Prior Crime was measured by asking if the respondent had been convicted of a crime before and/or after the age of 18 and was the closest among the individual indicators to being statistically significant with an ANOVA produced p-value of 0.0565. Considering each of these factors, one cannot easily identify a potential femicide perpetrator from a perpetrator of other crime or homicide based on these criteria. Collectively, these men's scores may differ significantly from the general Argentine population, but looked at in isolation, they are essentially equal.

Of the three groups, femicide perpetrators had the lowest mean score for prior crime which is in line with other studies that have found an "intense, though problematic" relationship is more predictive of femicide perpetration than criminality itself (Zara & Gino, 2018, p.7).

Perpetrators on Prevention

"Intense, though problematic" is an apt descriptor for relationships that end in femicide. Among our sample, an overwhelming 86% of the femicide perpetrators had threatened to kill the woman they murdered, over half had choked or strangled her, almost 70% admitted to "convincing or coercing her to have sex," and 73% said they had weekly or daily arguments with the victim. These findings are supported by previous research, perpetrators often have a history of violent behavior toward women and as Di Marco and Evans (2020) highlight, several studies have shown that IPV victimization is one of the strongest indicators of femicide (Campbell et al., 2003, p. 1091, 2007, p. 247). Even when violence is not observed, controlling behavior, extreme jealousy, and possessiveness are (Dobash & Dobash, 2015; Aguilar-Ruiz, 2018; Podreka, 2019, p. 20). Well over half (61%) of the perpetrators in our study reported feeling constantly jealous and well over a third dictated when she could leave the house, who she could be friends with, and how much money to spend. The degree of coercive control these men had over the women they killed is defined as intimate terrorism. Intimate terrorism "erodes personal freedoms and choice leading the victim to a state of subjugation" and dependence on the perpetrator (Monckton Smith, 2020, p. 1268; see also Stark, 2009).

Because there is no clear indication of what aspects generate an escalation from IPV to femicide, Altinöz et al. (2018, p.4175) argue that any incidence of IPV should be considered a precursor to intimate femicide. But globally, 27% of all women aged 15-49 are estimated to have experienced physical or sexual IPV (Sardinha, et al., 2022). Regional estimates indicate a lifetime prevalence of 25% in Southern Latin America (Sardinha, et al., 2022). It is untenable to develop a strategy for femicide prevention that relies on monitoring the relationships of one-quarter of all women. But there are other options that may help to reduce violence between both

intimates and non-intimates. Most (85%) of the femicide perpetrators in our sample could name at least one other person in their social network who they knew to be violent and 11% could list multiple. In a Senegalese sample, Sandberg et al. (2021) found that a 10% point higher probability of IPV acceptability within a social network was associated with a 4.5% higher probability of an individual member in the social network finding IPV acceptable, in many cases this association even surpassed individual characteristics. Within social networks, people are effectively taught what is and is not socially acceptable. When asked, "What do you think would have needed to be different for the woman to be alive today?" 35% of respondents answered with some variety of education, both formal (in school or with a therapist) and informal (in the family or non-familial mentorship). The femicide perpetrators we interviewed desired education on gender roles in society and how to balance a healthy relationship with the stressors of life. All those who responded 'education' were not necessarily taking responsibility for the murder, but they did recognize themselves as the perpetrator and considered how if something in their life had been different if their influences and education had been more positive and helpful, perhaps the victim would still be alive.

Implications & Recommendations

As suggested by perpetrators of femicide, education, and education at the community level to change norms around violence and acceptable behavior between intimate partners could prove impactful in reducing the incidence of femicide. This is supported by studies that focus on engaging men and boys in preventing violence against women (Jewkes, Flood, & Lang, 2015). Femicide has primarily been examined by identifying risk factors of victimization and estimating the prevalence and incidence of this phenomenon. Bridging sociological theory and public health practice, we consider individual-level risk factors and widen the scope to analyze potential

drivers of violence from the community and society level. Our findings indicate factors further upstream than the individual that legitimize GBV. Future study should test these findings with more extensive measures of social capital both before and after imprisonment. Further, a control group of non-offending men living in the same neighborhoods as matched participants who are incarcerated for femicide perpetration could better illuminate the role of an individual's social network.

The community is a crucial point of entry for interventions aimed at changing norms before violence is committed. We agree with the directive offered by Zara et al. (2019, p.1296) "if the aim is to tackle IPV at its bud, then attention should be devoted to the risk processes that foster a proviolence attitude, the exploitation of women, and interpersonal violence between heterosexual intimate partners and between same sex couples." Intervention at the community level should seek to modify norms around violence and help develop the public view on GBV and IPV as deviant acts. In *Network Interventions,* Valente (2012) agrues that achieving a "threshold level of awareness" on a certain topic is both possible and necessary to catalyze norm change within a problematic social network. As discussed in the literature review, Sandberg et al. (2012) draw on Valente's wotk to suggest two different methods of achieving change, by both tailoring intervention to community leaders and high-threshold adoptors, or those who hold regressive beliefs on GBV most closesly. Cure Violence, a Chicago based anti-violence and public health organization has used epidemic control methods for violence prevention to some degree of success. Health workers identify areas of highest 'transmission' and close contact of individuals exposed to violence (individuals' social networks). Working to address trauma and prevent retaliation, and/or re-injury, Cure Violence saw a 56% decrease in killings in a Baltimore

intervention neighborhood over a two-year period and a 63% reduction in shootings in the Bronx over a four-year period (Slutkin, Ransford, and Zvetina, 2018).

Future interventions could emulate the success of Cure Violence and integrate a social network intervention approach. Rather than relying on traditional forms of prevention for IPV that focus on the individual, public health professionals can exploit the system of social control and sanctions that people already build within their social networks. In Argentina, where a registry of femicides is maintained and an active and valiant women's movement exists, there may be both logistical and popular support for deploying a community-based, educational intervention focused on behavior and norm change.

References

Aguilar-Ruiz, R. (2018). Tipologías de feminicidas con trastorno mental en España. *Anuario De Psicología Jurídica*, *28*(1), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.5093/apj2018a4

Akçomak, İ. S., & ter Weel, B. (2012). The impact of social capital on crime: Evidence from the Netherlands. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, *42*(1-2), 323–340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2011.09.008

Alexiou, A. S. (2006). *Jane Jacobs: Urban Visionary*. New Brunswick: Rutgers

Altinöz, Ş. T., Altinöz, A. E., Utku, Ç., Eşsizoğlu, A., & Candansayar, S. (2018). Femicide: Psychosocial Characteristics of the Perpetrators in Turkey. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 62(13), 4174–4186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18763765

Benson, M. L., Fox, G. L., & DeMaris, A. (2003). Neighborhood disadvantage, individual economic distress and violence against women in intimate relationships. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 19*, 207-235

Beyer, K. M., Layde, P. M., Hamberger, L. K., & Laud, P. W. (2013). Characteristics of the residential neighborhood environment differentiate intimate partner femicide in urban versus rural settings. *The Journal of rural health : official journal of the American Rural Health Association and the National Rural Health Care Association*, *29*(3), 281–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-0361.2012.00448.x

Beyer, K., Wallis, A. B., & Hamberger, L. K. (2015). Neighborhood Environment and Intimate Partner Violence: A Systematic Review. Trauma, *Violence, & Abuse, 16*(1), 16–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838013515758

Browne, A., Williams, KR., Dutton, DG. (1999). Homicide between intimate partners. In M.D. Smith & M.A. Zahn (eds). *Homicide: A Sourcebook of Social Research* (pp. 149–164). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Browning, C. R. (2002). The span of collective efficacy: Extending social disorganization theory to partner violence. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(4), 833-850.

Burchfield, K. B., & Mingus, W. (2008). Not in My Neighborhood: Assessing Registered Sex Offenders' Experiences With Local Social Capital and Social Control. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*(3), 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854807311375

Bursik, R. J., Jr. (1988). Social disorganization and theories of crime and delinquency: Problems and prospects. *Criminology, 26*, 519–551.

Bursik, R. J., Jr., and Grasmick, H. G. (1993). *Neighborhoods and crime: The dimensions of effective community control.* New York: Lexington Books.

Campbell, J. C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C., Campbell, D., Curry, M. A., Gary, F., Glass, N., McFarlane, J., Sachs, C., Sharps, P., Ulrich, Y., Wilt, S. A., Manganello, J.,

Xu, X., Schollenberger, J., Frye, V., & Laughon, K. (2003). Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: Results from a multisite case control study. American Journal of Public Health, 93(7), 1089–1097. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.93.7.1089

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. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838007303505

Campbell, J., Webster, D., & Glass, N. (2009). The danger assessment: validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24,* 4653-674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508317180

Corradi, C., Marcuello-Servós, C., Boira, S., & Weil, S. (2016). Theories of femicide and their significance for social research. *Current Sociology, 64*(7), 975–995. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392115622256

Clarín. (2016, December 9). *Prisión Perpetua Para Vásquez por el crimen de Wanda Taddei*. Clarín. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.clarin.com/sociedad/prision-perpetua-vasquez-wanda-taddei_0_r12bubEjDml.html

Contini, V. E. (2013, August 20). *Femicidio: una forma de extrema violencia contra la mujer*. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from http://www.saij.gob.ar/valerio-emanuel-contini-femicidio-una-forma-extrema-violencia-contra-mujer-dacf130232-2013-08-20/123456789-0abc-defg2320-31fcanirtcod

Cornell University. (n.d.). *Social Networks*. Department of Sociology Cornell Arts & Sciences. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://sociology.cornell.edu/social-networks-#:~:text=Social%20network%20analysis%20is%20a,as%20perceptions%20of%20each%20other.

Cremona, M. F., Actis, M. F., & Rosales, M. B. (2013). Representaciones del cuerpo femenino en el discurso mediático: la experiencia del Observatorio de Medios, Comunicación y Género. *X Jornadas De Sociología*. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://cdsa.aacademica.org/000-038/717.pdf.

Di Marco, M. H., & Evans, D. P. (2021). Society, Her or Me? An Explanatory Model of Intimate Femicide Among Male Perpetrators in Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Feminist Criminology, 16*(5), 607–630. https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085120964572

Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., & Lewis, R. (2004). Not an ordinary killer—Just an ordinary guy when men murder an intimate woman partner. *Violence Against Women, 10,* 577-605. doi:10.1177/1077801204265015

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (2011). What were they thinking? Men who murder an intimate partner. *Violence Against Women, 17*(1), 111–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210391219

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (2017). When women are murdered. In F. Brookman & E. R. Maguire (Eds.), The handbook of homicide (pp. 131–149). Wiley Blackwell.

Dutton, M. A., & Goodman, L. A. (2005). Coercion in intimate partner violence: Toward a new conceptualization. *Sex Roles, 52*, 743-756.

Echeburúa, E. & Fernández-Montalvo, J. (2007). Celos en la pareja: una emoción destructiva. Barcelona: Ariel

Echeburúa, E., Fernández-Montalvo, J., de Corral, P., & López-Goñi, J. J. (2009). Assessing Risk Markers in Intimate Partner Femicide and Severe Violence: A New Assessment Instrument. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(6), 925–939. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508319370

El Tribuno. (2013, February 16). *Desde la muerte de Wanda Taddei, Hubo 132 Mujeres Quemadas*. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.eltribuno.com/salta/nota/2013-2-16-1-4-0-desde-la-muerte-de-wanda-taddei-hubo-132-mujeres-quemadas

Evans, D.P., DeSousa, W. N., Wilkins, J.D., Chiang, E. D., Manders, O. & Vertamatti, M.A.F. (2018) He said he was going to kill me; Case studies of attempted intimate femicide in São Paulo, Brazil. *Journal of Comparative Social Work,13*(1). https://doi.org/10.31265/jcsw.v13i1.159

Evans, D.P., Di Marco, M.H., Narasimhan, S., Vieytes, M.M., Curran, A., & White, M.S. (in press). Male perpetrators' accounts of intimate femicide: A global systematic review. In: M. Dawson & S. Mobayed (Eds.), The Routledge International Handbook of Femicide and Feminicide. Routledge.

Fabiano, P. M., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health*, *52*(3), 105–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480309595732

Gago, V. (2020). *Feminist international: How to change everything*. (L. Mason-Deese, Trans.). Verso.

Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V. N., & Woolcock, M. (2004). World Bank Working Paper No. 18: Measuring Social Capital. Washington, DC; World Bank.

Jewkes, R. (2002). Intimate partner violence: Causes and prevention. *The Lancet, 359*, 1423-1429. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08357-5

Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2015). From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequities in gender relations: A conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *The Lancet*, *385*(9977), 1580–1589. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(14)61683-4

Johnson, M. P. (2008): A Typology of Domestic Violence: Intimate Terrorism, Violent Resistance, and Situational Couple Violence. Boston, Northeastern University Press.

Johnson, H., Eriksson, L., Mazerolle, P., & Wortley, R. (2019). Intimate Femicide: The Role of Coercive Control. Feminist Criminology, 14(1), 3–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085117701574

Kellermann, A. L., & Mercy, J. A. (1992). Men, women, and murder: gender-specific differences in rates of fatal violence and victimization. *The Journal of trauma*, *33*(1), 1–5

Kirst, M., Lazgare, L. P., Zhang, Y. J., & O'Campo, P. (2015). The effects of social capital and neighborhood characteristics on intimate partner violence: a consideration of social resources and risks. *American journal of community psychology*, *55*(3-4), 314–325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-015-9716-0

Koppa, V., & Messing, J. T. (2021). Can Justice System Interventions Prevent Intimate Partner Homicide? An Analysis of Rates of Help Seeking Prior to Fatality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(17–18), 8792–8816. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519851179

Lafferty, L., Chambers, G.M., Guthrie, J. et al. (2015). Indicators of social capital in prison: a systematic review. *Health Justice 3*,(7). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-015-0020-8

Lanier, C., & Maume, M. O. (2009). Intimate partner violence and social isolation across the rural/urban divide. *Violence against women*, *15*(11), 1311–1330. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209346711

Lederman, D., Loayza, N., & Menéndez, A. M. (2002). Violent crime: Does Social Capital matter? *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, *50*(3), 509–539. https://doi.org/10.1086/342422

Liem, M. (2013). Homicide offender recidivism: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *18*(1), 19–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.08.001

Liu, S., Pickett, J. T., Baker, T. (2016). Inside the Black Box: Prison Visitation, the Costs of Offending, and Inmate Social Capital. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 27*(8), 766-790. https://doi.org/10.1 177/0887403414562421

Lysell, H., Dahlin, M., Långström, N., Lichtenstein, P., & Runeson, B. (2016). Killing the Mother of One’s Child: Psychiatric Risk Factors Among Male Perpetrators and Offspring Health Consequences. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *77*(3), 342–347.

McEvoy, C. & Hideg, G. (2017) Global Violent Deaths 2017. Small arms survey. https://www.smallarmssurvey.org/resource/global-violent-deaths-2017-time-decide.

McFarlane, J., Campbell, J. C., & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate partner stalking and femicide: urgent implications for women's safety. *Behavioral sciences & the law*, *20*(1-2), 51–68. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.477

McQuestion, M. J. (2003). Endogenous social effects on intimate partner violence in Colombia. *Social Science Research*, *32*(2), 335–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0049-089x(02)00062-5

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). *Social Control Definition & meaning*. Merriam-Webster. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/social%20control

Miles-Doan, R., & Kelly, S. (1997). Geographic concentration of violence between intimate partners. *Public health reports*, *112*(2), 135–141.

Ministerio de Seguridad de la Nación. (2021, September 10). *Bases de Datos de Estadísticas Criminales*. Goberino de Argentina . Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.argentina.gob.ar/seguridad/estadisticascriminales/bases-de-datos

Monckton Smith, J. (2020). Intimate Partner Femicide: Using Foucauldian Analysis to Track an Eight Stage Progression to Homicide. Violence Against Women, 26(11), 1267–1285. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219863876

Nagin, D. S., & Paternoster, R. (1994). Personal capital and social control: The deterrence implications of a theory of individual differences in criminal offending. *Criminology, 32*, 581-606.

Ni Una Menos. (2017, June 3). *Carta Orgánica*. Ni Una Menos. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from http://niunamenos.org.ar/quienes-somos/carta-organica/

Observatorio de Seguridad Ciudadana. (2017). *Homicidios en Argentina. ¿Cómo estamos?* Observatorio de Seguridad Ciudadana. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from http://www.seguridadciudadana.org.ar/recursos/articulos/homicidios-en-argentina-como-estamos

Oficina de la Mujer. (2020). *Registro Nacional de Femicidios de la Justicia Argentina (RNFJA) Oficina de la Mujer: Corte Suprema de Justicia de la Nación (OM-CSJN)*. Corte Suprema de Justicia de la Nación. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.csjn.gov.ar/omrecopilacion/omfemicidio/homefemicidio.html

Office to End Domestic and Gender-Based Violence. (2020). *Introduction to domestic violence & GBV*. New York City Government. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www1.nyc.gov/site/ocdv/services/introduction-to-domestic-violence-and-gender-based-violence.page#:~:text=Gender-based%20violence%20is%20a,unequal%20power%20relationships%20between%20genders.&text=Gender-based%20violence%20can%20impact,violence%2C%20stalking%20and%20human%20trafficking.

Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.). *Social capital English definition and meaning*. Lexico Dictionaries. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/social_capital

Peker, L. (2012, June 22). *Violencia emotiva*. Página 12. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/suplementos/las12/13-7326-2012-06-22.html

Philadelphia ACE Project. (2015). *Survey access: Philadelphia ACEs*. ACEs Philadelphia. Retrieved March 31, 2022, from https://www.philadelphiaaces.org/philadelphia-ace-survey/data-survey-access

Podreka, J. (2019). Characteristics of Intimate Partner Femicide in Slovenia. *Annales Series Historia Et Sociologia*, 15–26. https://doi.org/10.19233/ASHS.2019.02

Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Raghavan, C., Mennerich, A., Sexton, E., & James, S. E. (2006). Community violence and its direct, indirect, and mediating effects on intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 12*, 1132–1149.

Raghavan, C., Rajah, V., Gentile, K., Collado, L., & Kavanagh, A. M. (2009). Community violence, social support networks, ethnic group differences, and male perpetration of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 1615–163

Rubio, M. (1997). Perverse Social Capital: Some Evidence from Colombia. *Journal of Economic Issues*, *31*(3), 805–816.

Russell, D. E. H., & Harmes, R. A. (2001). Femicide in global perspective. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sá, Y., Moi, P., Galvão, N. D., Silva, A., & Moi, G. P. (2021). The geography of femicide in Sergipe, Brazil: matriarchy, human development, and income distribution. *Revista brasileira de epidemiologia = Brazilian journal of epidemiology*, *24*(suppl 1), e210016. https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-549720210016.supl.1

Sandberg, J. F., Delaunay, V., Boujija, Y., Douillot, L., Bignami, S., Rytina, S., & Sokhna, C. (2021). Individual, Community, and Social Network Influences on Beliefs Concerning the Acceptability of Intimate Partner Violence in Rural Senegal. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(11–12). https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518805778

Sardinha, L., Maheu-Giroux, M., Stöckl, H., Meyer, S. R., & García-Moreno, C. (2022). Global, regional, and national prevalence estimates of physical or sexual, or both, intimate partner violence against women in 2018. *The Lancet*, *399*(10327), 803–813. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(21)02664-7

Segato, R. L. (2013). La escritura en el cuerpo de las mujeres asesinadas en Ciudad Juárez Territorio, soberanía y crímenes de segundo estado. Buenos Aires; Tinta Limón.

Sherretts, N., Boduszek, D., Debowska, A., & Willmott, D. (2017). Comparison of murderers with recidivists and first time incarcerated offenders from U.S. prisons on psychopathy and

identity as a criminal: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *51*, 89–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.03.002

Slutkin, G., Zvetina, D., & Ransford, C. (2018). How the health sector can reduce violence by treating it as a contagion. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, *20*(1), 47–55. https://doi.org/10.1001/journalofethics.2018.20.1.nlit1-1801

Sociology Dictionary. (n.d.). *Sanction*. Open Education. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://sociologydictionary.org/sanction/

Stark, E. (2009). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

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. *Lancet (London, England)*, *382*(9895), 859–865. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61030-2

Tolson, D., & Klein, J. (2015). Registration, residency restrictions, and community notification: A social capital perspective on the isolation of registered sex offenders in our Communities. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *25*(5), 375–390. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2014.966221

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2018). *Global Study on Homicide: Gender-related killing of women and girls*. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/GSH2018/GSH18_Gender-related_killing_of_women_and_girls.pdf

United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime. (2020). *Argentina*. United Nations. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://dataunodc.un.org/content/Country-profile?country=Argentina

United Nations Office of Drugs and Crimes. (2021). Killings of women and girls by their intimate partner or other family members. https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/statistics/crime/UN_BriefFem_251121.pdf

Uthman, O. A., Moradi, T., & Lawoko, S. (2011). Are individual and community acceptance and witnessing of intimate partner violence related to its occurrence? Multilevel structural equation model. *PLoS One, 6.*

Valente T. W. (2012). Network interventions. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *337*(6090), 49–53. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1217330

World Health Organization. (2021, March 9). *Violence against women*. World Health Organization. Retrieved March 28, 2022, from https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women

Zara, G., & Gino, S. (2018). Intimate partner violence and its escalation into femicide. frailty thy name is "violence against women." *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01777

Zara, G., Freilone, F., Veggi, S., Biondi, E., Ceccarelli, D., & Gino, S. (2019). The Medicolegal, psycho-criminological, and epidemiological reality of intimate partner and non-intimate partner femicide in north-west italy: Looking backwards to see forwards. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, *133*(4), 1295–1307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00414-019-02061-w

Zolotor, A. J., & Runyan, D. K. (2006). Social Capital, family violence, and neglect. *Pediatrics*, *117*(6). https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2005-1913