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Introduction

In the winter of 2017, a graduate sociology class (SOC*6550: Principles and Practices of Community Engaged Scholarship) at the University of Guelph (UOG) partnered with the Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Houses (OAITH) and the College of the North Atlantic (CNA) on a femicide\(^1\) project. What follows is an overview of the project, the methodology we used, what we found, and how we mobilized the findings.

The Community Campus Partnership (CCP)

Marlene Ham, the Provincial Coordinator for OAITH, and Associate Professor Mavis Morton, Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the University of Guelph, developed a mutually beneficial community campus partnership over the last number of years to work on projects related to violence against women in Ontario. Throughout this period and based on a request and a need that OAITH identified, Mavis and her undergraduate and graduate students worked with OAITH to track and record information for OAITH’s annual Femicide List, which they use as part of their education and advocacy about the prevalence and seriousness of violence against women. In 2015, Mavis met Darin Brooks, an instructor with College of the North Atlantic (CNA), at a community engaged conference (C2UEXpo). Upon meeting, Mavis and Darin realized the potential for community engaged learning projects that would benefit OAITH as well as the CNA and UOG students. Thus, the relationship between these three partners was established prior to the academic term, and continues. The project described below was scoped as a realistic and appropriate opportunity for graduate students as part of a sociology graduate class on community engaged scholarship (CES) to learn about and enact the principles and practices of CES by becoming part of the CCP, given the time, skill, and resources available.

Community Engaged Scholarship and Community Engaged Learning

This project is an example of community engaged scholarship (CES) and community engaged learning (CEL). Community engaged scholarship “… encompasses intellectual and creative activities that generate, validate, synthesize and apply knowledge through partnerships with people & organizations outside of the academy (Rewarding CES: Transforming University Policies & Practices, 2011)” (Seifer 2012). Community engaged learning is a broad term used to describe an activity with a community, based on a reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship, that addresses societal needs (Taylor et al. 2016) and includes the meaningful

\(^1\) Femicide is commonly defined as the intentional murder of women by a man because they are women (Garcia-Moreno, Guedes and Knerr 2012, Ferrara et.al. 2015). Femicide defined as the killing of women by men is used by Dawson (2016) given its prevalence especially in international quantitative research but acknowledges the ongoing debate about definition and conceptualization. Intimate partner femicide (IPF) is the murder of a woman by her intimate partner (e.g., husband/ex-husband, common law spouse/ex-spouse, boyfriend/ex-boyfriend and date) (Sheehan et al 2015). Most women in the 2015-2016 list are examples of IPF.
integration and application of classroom curriculum and learning outcomes. The purpose of community engagement is the “... partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good” (Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching 2010). Strand et al. (2003) categorized the process of CES into three main stages:

1) Entering partnerships
2) Conducting partnerships
3) Outcomes of partnerships

Using this framework and the criteria used to evaluate the quality of CES (purpose, process and products) (Howard 2007), we summarize our journey and outcomes.

**Entering our CC Partnership: Purpose, goals, and relationships**

The partnership between OAITH (Ham) and Morton (UOG) was not new, but as members of a graduate class\(^2\), we entered into the partnership and project in the winter term of 2017. We were informed of the existing relationship between Professor Morton, OAITH and CNA including the general purpose and goals of the current project. This information was communicated and discussed in the classroom with Professor Morton, as well as via phone calls, virtual conversations, and emails with OAITH (M. Ham) and CNA (Instructor D. Brooks). The history and additional context was further obtained by reviewing background CEL and OAITH reports (e.g., the 2016 report documenting the femicide CEL project completed by Professor Morton’s undergraduate class) and materials posted on the course website.

As is common in CES, understanding, clarifying and scoping our piece of the project was ongoing and iterative. Given our assessment of the needs of the community partner and our resources (i.e., skills and time), we planned to contribute to two pieces of the femicide project:

1) a critical feminist femicide media analysis and
2) an analysis comparing Ontario Coroner and OAITH Femicide Data from 2009-2014.

**E1. Femicide Media Analysis Project**

**E1.1 Background**

There is a plethora of research on the representation of crime in mainstream news and a growing body of studies have analyzed how femicide, and violence against women more broadly, is portrayed by the media (Bullock 2007; Gilchrist 2010; Gillespie 2013; Richards, Gillespie and Smith 2011; Taylor 2009; Vives-Cases et al. 2016). Media coverage has the potential to “[shape] and [reinforce] societal understanding of these crimes specifically and violence against women generally”, and can “help set the political and policy agenda concerning criminal justice” (Fairbairn and Dawson 2013, 148). It is this influence that media

---

\(^2\) Our class (SOC 6550 01 W17) consisted of six graduate students from four different programs/disciplines. There were three PhD students (sociology, geography and psychology) and three MA students (sociology and criminology criminal justice policy).
reporting can have that is of particular relevance to OAITH.

Relying solely on media sources for their data, OAITH has been documenting and recording femicides in Ontario for 25 years\(^3\). Over the last couple of years, they have been particularly interested in critically examining these media reports and the impact this may have on the way the issue of femicide is understood and addressed. Based on OAITH’s interest and request, this work was started as part of a CEL project with Professor Morton’s 4th year undergraduate sociology classes in 2014.

**E1.2 Project Goals**

The main goal was to create a knowledge mobilization tool that communicated our findings to help OAITH inform different audiences (e.g. Ontario shelter staff, the general public, government, journalists etc.) about how Ontario media sources report and portray the issue of femicide. This was done by reviewing existing research on media portrayals of femicide and using results of the literature review as a framework through which to analyze current news reports on the 29 women who had been victims of femicide in 2015-2016 as identified by OAITH.

We wanted to explore potential differences in the media portrayals of femicides across three types of news outlets (i.e., national news, local news, and TV news sources). Further, it was our goal to identify some key areas in which the news media outlets were successful in reporting, and areas in which there could be an improvement in their reporting. Ultimately, it was our goal to bring attention to the fact that news media outlets use various frames in their reporting, which can ultimately influence the way the public understands and therefore responds to the issue of femicide.

**E1.3 NewsSeek: OAITH Article Search Software Background & Goals**

Part of the media analysis project is the development of a software program able to be used by OAITH to search for femicides via the news. Annually and for 25 years, OAITH spent a lot of time manually scouring local and national news sources in an effort to find and record Ontario femicides. OAITH also relied on local shelter information about women they knew in their communities who were killed by intimate male partners. Each year OAITH compiled and disseminated their femicide list but were unsure that their list was complete or accurate and knew that it likely did not capture all the femicides that occurred throughout Ontario in any given year. In 2014, OAITH partnered with Professor Morton and her 4th year sociology class on women and the criminal justice system to help them find and document Ontario femicides. In addition to searching via the Internet, and other online resources, the students accessed newspaper databases (i.e. Factiva, Canadian Newsstand) through the university library. Despite these additional tools, the 4th year sociology students’ reported (Polson et al. 2014) that the most significant challenge faced in developing a list of femicide victims was “searching through the multitude of articles” spanning across multiple databases. With the list of femicides spanning a whole year, the search was “time consuming and difficult”. Also noted in the report was the challenge of evenly distributing the search task among the students, and coordinating

---

\(^3\) The list of femicides that OAITH has compiled over the last 25 years via mainstream news sources, and information from Ontario shelters is the information referred to later in the report as the OAITH femicide datasets.
an effective search strategy. In order to assist with this process and lessen search challenges, a software program was developed by a student in our class and his colleague.

The NewsPeek:OAITH\(^4\) (NP:O) is an automated article search engine designed to help mitigate the aforementioned challenges. The software develops a database of articles of relevance to femicide by automatically searching through Ontario and national news websites every day. The database can be examined for further analysis by student researchers at a future date. The goals of the software are to:

- Limit the “search space” for student researchers by producing fewer and more relevant articles to search through
- Identify articles from lesser known/smaller local newspapers
- Identify articles not directly relevant to femicide, but of interest to our community partners.

**E2. Ontario Coroner & OAITH Femicide Data Analysis Project**

**E2.1 Background**

OAITH has used their annual femicide list for education and advocacy for the last 25 years. More recently they wanted more of an analysis of this information to compare it to findings from other sources and other femicide research. OAITH also wanted to compare their media sourced femicide information with a more official and reliable source. This lead our CCP to apply for and receive ethics clearance from the University of Guelph to request the use of secondary data from the Ontario Coroner’s Office. OAITH, CNA, Professor Morton and her students entered into an agreement with the Coroner’s Office to access limited Coroners' Information System (CIS) data as well as Domestic Violence Death Review Committee (DVDRC) reports between 2009-2014. The CIS data provides information such as victim and perpetrator age, sex, cause and location of death, and the DVDRC reports offers information about the history of the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator as well as more information about risk factors and events leading up to the death.

**E2.2 Project Goals**

By examining the 2009-2014 Ontario Coroner and OAITH femicide datasets, we aimed to evaluate the extent to which the information that has been gathered by and for OAITH via media reports is consistent with more formal and official data. Specifically, we sought to answer the following research question, which we generated collaboratively with our partners:

*How do the Ontario Coroner and OAITH 2009-20014 data compare with respect to:*
  a. Demographic and risk factors (e.g., sex, age, relationship status, location of death)
  b. Death factors (e.g., blunt force trauma, stabbing, and shooting)\(^5\)
  c. Geographic trends

Our plan involved several sub-goals:

\(^4\) NewsPeek:OAITH is a version of a software tool NewsPeek, developed independently by MiDataLabs. MiDatalabs is a Michigan based data science startup co-founded by one of the graduate students students in this course.

\(^5\) This means that the study will examine the comparison of data from both sources for the stated variables.
1. Prepare the 2009-2014 Ontario Coroner dataset for CNA GIS mapping by researching and adding any missing postal codes to indicate the location of murder for each femicide victim.

2. Clean and conduct descriptive statistics to compare and explore trends in the Coroner and OAIT/F datasets independently.

3. Compare frequencies and patterns across both dataset results to identify the similarities and discrepancies between media and Coroner tracking and reporting of femicide cases in Ontario.

4. Compare frequencies and patterns of results from both Ontario datasets with previous femicide research.

5. Mobilize findings via conference presentations, social media, written reports, and visualizations.

**Conducting Our CC Partnership: Plan, Process & Findings**

We used a Google Doc Workplan as a collaborative planning tool to outline the project goals, methods, deliverables, activities, member responsibilities, and timelines. We shared this document with our community partners to communicate the ongoing thinking, decision making, and direction of our work. Despite this tool, questions and uncertainties were revealed about larger partner goals, decision making and authority, communication and negotiation issues etc. The preparation, design and steps used to complete the femicide media analysis part of the project are outlined below.

**C1.1 Femicide Media Analysis Project Methodology**

We began with a scoping review of the research surrounding media portrayals of femicide cases. Studies were identified using a combination of terms, including variations of “femicide”, “media” and “representation” using University of Guelph library databases. The identified studies were uploaded to Mendeley, a reference management software, which we further sorted for relevance. This process resulted in a total of 20 studies (see Appendix A for a bibliography). Once read, we summarized each study using a Google docs table that captured the purpose, methodologies, and findings of each article.

We used the summary table and the original academic articles to write individual literature reviews. The purpose of these reviews was to extract the most common frames through which femicide is represented across the media. Upon completing these individual literature reviews, we compared and contrasted the identified frames to determine commonalities and areas of divergence. Collectively, we identified four common positive and four negative frames. These include:

**Positive Frames:**

1. **Victim humanized:** Describing and remembering the victim positively and acknowledging how she impacted the lives of others.

2. **Labelled a femicide:** Labelling the murder as a femicide or an example of violence against women.

3. **Picture of victim:** Including a picture of the femicide victim in the news report.
4. **Gendered social problem**: Contextualizing the femicide as a social or political problem rooted in gender inequality and women’s subordinate status.

**Negative Frames:**
1. **Victim blaming**: Attributing blame to the victim directly by emphasizing her role in the femicide, or indirectly by excusing/justifying the perpetrator’s actions.
2. **Voice of authority**: Relying on traditional voices of authority, such as law enforcement, for interviews over the voices of friends, family or violence against women (VAW) experts.
3. **Individualized**: Portraying the incident as an isolated or seemingly random event.
4. **Violence against women (VAW) history undocumented**: Failing to address any history of power and control, abuse, and/or violence by the perpetrator. This is particularly relevant, as research suggests that history of violence is one of the most significant risk-factors for femicide.

Following these preliminary steps, we utilized these eight frames as codes to analyze current media portrayals of femicide. A total of 29 Ontario femicide cases in 2016-2017 were examined by studying 73 news items from three media sources (i.e., mainstream national newspapers, local newspapers, and TV news). To assess inter-rater reliability in our coding, we randomly assigned 20% of the data (6 femicide cases) for review by the first six authors. We found high inter-rater reliability (Cohen’s Kappa = .82), calculated using the “irr” package in R (Gamer and Lemon 2015). Any inconsistencies flagged in the coding were then discussed between the raters and revised based on a consensus score.

**C1.2. NewsPeak: OAUTH Article Search Software Plan & Process**

NP:O was originally designed to automatically “crawl” (explore by jumping from hyperlink to hyperlink) through local and provincial Ontario news websites, “scraping” (searching) newly published articles for information related to femicide and logging “hits” (articles likely about femicide) in an Excel file. However, this was very difficult to program in a general way, since each news agency’s website is organized differently. Because nearly all news agencies now use social media to promote stories, Twitter was chosen to bypass news agencies’ front pages and jump directly to news articles. Furthermore, the 140-character limit on tweets means that the tweet text is typically a concise, representative summary of the contents of the linked article, meaning that the tweet itself can also be scraped for relevant information.

Two lists of Ontario news Twitter accounts, one local⁵ and one province-wide⁶, were compiled by a combination of Google and Twitter searches for “Ontario news,” resulting in 71 separate news outlets. The latest version of NP:O, NP:Ov7 (NP:O version 7), performs a keyword search on all tweets containing links to news articles. Because the ultimate goal is to locate articles related to femicide, the keywords are divided into two lists: one identifying a female by her gender (words like woman, girl, daughter, girlfriend), and one identifying an act of violence (words like killed, murder, homicide, fatal). Keywords were developed through guesstimates,

---

⁵ Local news twitter list - [https://twitter.com/MiDataLabs/lists/local-ontario-news](https://twitter.com/MiDataLabs/lists/local-ontario-news)
⁶ Non-local news twitter list - [https://twitter.com/MiDataLabs/lists/ontario-news](https://twitter.com/MiDataLabs/lists/ontario-news)
qualitative analysis of previous femicide articles collected by OAIITH and discussion with classmates.

If at least one gender keyword and at least one violence word (e.g. girlfriend+homicide) are present in a scraped article, then the tweet (text, hyperlink, and timestamp) is saved to the “low confidence” tab of the Excel file. If this condition is true for both the article text and the tweet text, then the tweet is saved to the “high confidence” tab (see chart on next page).

C1.3. Femicide Media Analysis Findings

Across all three types of Ontario and Canadian media sources (i.e., mainstream national newspapers, local newspapers, and TV news), negative femicide frames were pervasive and appeared at twice the rate as positive media frames. Per news article, there was at least one and an average of two negative frames used, compared to an average of less than one positive frame. In terms of negative frames:

- VAW history was undocumented in 96% of articles, followed by
- voice of authority (53%),
- individualized narratives (48%), and
- victim blaming (7%).

Conversely, the most common positive frame:

- victim humanized, only appeared in 42% of articles, followed by
- providing a picture of the victim (36%),
- presentation of a gendered/societal problem (4%), and
- labelling as a femicide (1%).
For a full breakdown of percentages across and within media sources see Table 1 below.

Table 1. Means and percentages of each media frames represented in local, national, TV, and total media sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Frame</th>
<th>Media Source Type</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Humanized</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of Victim</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendered/Social Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labelled a Femicide</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Frames per Article</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Blaming</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAW History Undocumented</td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Frames per Article</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local news outlets appear to have done the best job of using positive frames (mean of 1.1 positive frames per article). For example, 55% their stories reported the homicide in a way that humanized the woman, and 41% included a picture of the female victim. Local papers did not document any history of previous violence against the woman by the perpetrator in most cases (90%), which is better than both TV sources and national newspapers which did not report this information in 100% of cases.

Compared to the other forms of media, TV sources fared poorly in most aspects of homicide reporting and showed the highest rate of negative frame use overall (average of 2.18 negative frames per article). For instance, TV sources did not humanize victims often (only 22% of articles), compared to local (55%) or national news reports (53%). Further, none of the TV sources contextualized homicide as a larger gendered social problem, nor did they identify homicide as an example of violence against women. Moreover, none of the TV sources in our
analysis reported on the history of violence against the woman by the perpetrator. Further, 55% of the time, these reports relied on traditional voices of authority for interviews and to provide expert opinions. Despite these limitations, TV sources engaged in less victim blaming (4%) compared to local (7%) or national newspaper reports (12%). However, these results are in part due to the shorter length of TV reports in general.

Similar to local newspaper reports, 53% of the national newspapers reported the femicide in a way that humanized the woman. However, only 33% included a picture of the victim. Moreover, similar to TV sources, national newspapers never reported on history of violence against the victim by the perpetrator. Further, national newspapers blamed the victim more frequently than either of the other media outlets; however, overall instances of victim blaming remain relatively low across all sources. 54% of these newspapers also individualized the femicide, while none identified the femicide as part of a larger gendered social problem. These newspapers further failed to use the term femicide, or report the incident as an example of violence against women.

C2.1 Ontario Coroner & OAITH Femicide Data Project Methodology

To explore and compare Ontario femicide trends between the years of 2009-2014, we analyzed data from the Coroners’ Information System (CIS) provided by the Office of the Chief Coroner (2014) (i.e., Coroner’s data), and OAITH records of femicides reported in the media (OAITH 2014).

To highlight trends in the Coroner’s data, we analyzed:
- victim’s sex,
- age,
- death type (i.e., suicide or homicide),
- cause of death,
- environment in which the death occurred,
- First Nations/Aboriginal status
- location of death

We binned a total of 14 types of environments in which deaths occurred into four main categories, including:
1. rural outdoors,
2. urban outdoors,
3. residence
4. other

We binned 22 listed causes of death in the Coroner’s data into four overarching categories, including:
1. trauma (i.e., stabbing and blunt force)
2. shooting, asphyxia (i.e., suffocation, strangulation, and choked)
3. other (i.e., drowning, fire, and unknown cause of death)

These causes of death categories were chosen based on previous research that identifies
stabbing, shooting and asphyxia as the most common. Last, the victims’ ages were grouped into four categories, including:

1. children/adolescents (0-17 years)
2. young adults (18-35)
3. older adults (36-54)
4. adults over 55 years of age

These categories were chosen based on research that identifies women between the ages of 36-54 at risk (Jordan et al. 2010; Fong et al. 2016) as well trends in femicide of women in Canada 55 and older (Sutton and Dawson 2017; Jordan et al. 2010).

To highlight trends in the OAITH data, we binned categories for relationship between the perpetrators and victims, death factors (cause of death), victims ages, and whether or not the victims had any children. The binned categories for relationships between the perpetrators and the victims included:

- boyfriend
- ex-partner (ex-boyfriend, ex-spouse, estranged husband, estranged partner, separated husband)
- husband/common-law
- other (family, stranger, acquaintance, and miscellaneous)

These categories were chosen because they are the most common relationship types associated with femicide based on previous femicide research (Dawson 2016; Jordan et al. 2010; Mufic 2012; Juodis et al. 2014; Beyer et al., 2013). The other category includes unknown relationships, casual acquaintances, and individuals known to the victim who were not intimate partners or family (such as friends, co-workers, neighbours, military commanders, family members’ ex-spouses). Death factors and victim ages were binned into the same categories as described in the Coroner’s data above.

By binning the two data sets, we were able to compare the data sets and identify trends in the aforementioned categories. We analysed descriptive statistics using Microsoft Excel (see Appendix C and D) and generated visualizations of trends using Tableau visual software.

The second component of this project included GIS mapping based on the first 3 digits of postal codes of femicide victims. This will be used to visually show where femicides occur geographically throughout Ontario. This project was conducted by students and the instructor at The College of the North Atlantic (our other community partner for this project). Our class was able to assist in this project by helping to find some of the postal codes of femicide victims based on the OAITH reports.
C2.2 Ontario Coroner Femicide Data Results & Analysis

The Coroner’s data reported on 229 deaths in Ontario from 2009-2014 who were involved in intimate partner violence. This dataset is comprised of 62% female’s deaths (90% homicides, 10% suicides), and 38% male’s deaths (34% homicides, 66% suicides).

We analyzed a subset of 129 female homicide reports, consistent with our definition of femicide. Results from our descriptive statistics suggest that Ontario femicide trends are consistent with a breadth of previous literature. Victim age ranged from 2 months to 88 years (4% aged 0-17, 33% aged 18-35, 42% aged 36-55, 21% aged 55 years and over).

Six victims (5% of this subset) were listed as having First Nations or Aboriginal status. No additional race or ethnicity information was recorded in the Coroner’s data.

Women were most frequently murdered in a residence (77%), other locations included hospitals or vehicles (9%), urban outdoors (8%), or rural outdoors (6%).

Trauma was the most likely cause of death (54%), followed by shooting (21%), and other causes such as falls from heights, drowning, and burns (14%), and asphyxia (11%).

Findings suggest that women aged 36-54 are at the highest risk, particularly for trauma deaths
(i.e., cuts, stabs, and assaults) occurring in residences.
C2.3 OAITH 2009-2014 Femicide Data Results & Analysis

The victims’ ages ranged from 4 months to 85 years (6% aged 0-17, 33% aged 18-35, 41% aged 36-55, 20% aged 55 years and over). Half (50%) of femicide victims had at least one child at the time of death.

The most common death factor present in femicide cases was trauma, which occurred in 50% of the cases. “Other” was the second largest death factor category, which comprised of 28% of cases. This category included less frequent miscellaneous death factors such as drowning, falls from heights, vehicle collisions, and fires often in conjunction with trauma. Death factors involving a shooting comprised the third largest category (16%), followed by asphyxia (6%). Cases in which the death factor was not indicated in the media reports were excluded from this analysis (9% of the dataset).

Through an analysis of the binned death factors, age factors and in conjunction with type of relationship, we were able to identify some trends. Women between the ages of 36-54 were killed more frequently by their ex-partners, husbands, common-law partners, and family members. Out of our 176 cases, 34 (21% of victims) were killed by their current husband and 33 (19% of victims) were killed by an ex-partner. In comparison, victims aged 18-35 were killed more frequently by their boyfriends, strangers, and/or acquaintances. Lastly, perpetrators who were well-known to the victim (in the misc. category), but not spouses or family were most likely to kill victims aged 55 and over.
Half (50%) of victims were killed by some form of trauma (i.e., stabbing, blunt forced trauma) Across all relationship categories except “Other”, trauma was the most common form of murder and shooting was only the dominant method of killing by acquaintances.

C2.4 GIS Femicide Mapping Data Results & Analysis

The following are examples of the maps that were produced with the information available from the Coroner’s Office and OAITH. Previous research (Dawson) identified a knowledge gap in being able to document what resources are available for victims of violence against women, where they are, and who they serve (2010, 4). In the 2010 Victims of Crime Research Digest report Dawson points to studies in the UK (Coy, Kelly and Foord 2009) that used GIS to map the extent of specialized services such as refuges and Rape Crisis Centres as a way to help identify underserved areas.

The GIS mapping that was conducted as part of our project offers a preliminary example of questions that this methodology might help answer in the future. Below are just a few of the maps that were developed and at this point, which lead us to ask more questions for future research rather than provide us with definitive answers. The first map below identifies the number of femicides (2009-2014) using five colour shades to map the location of between one (blue) to five (red) femicides within Ontario postal codes.
The next two maps below identify cities and towns in Ontario in relation to the number of femicides. Since we only used the first 3 digits of each postal code to map the number of femicides, we are not able to link this to population or the number of femicides per capita. However, as we would expect, the map below indicates that a higher number of femicides occurred in areas with higher population densities.⁷

---

⁷ The population densities associated with the language of “town” and “city” have been replaced by Statistics Canada to small, medium and large population centres. The previous designation of town could refer to either a small population centre (1,000 to 29,999) or medium population centre (30,000 to 99,999) while the definition of a city could now refer to a medium or large urban population centre (100,000 or greater). A population centre is defined as an area with a population of at least 1,000 and a density of 400 or more people per square kilometre. All areas outside population centres will continue to be defined as rural area (Statistics Canada 2011, 65).
The fourth map below overlays violence against women shelters (n=97) that are funded by the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) with the number of Ontario femicides\(^8\). These resources have been defined as shelters (purple), second stage housing (blue), violence against women services provided but not as part of a shelter (yellow) and unknown (grey) which indicates some kind of violence against women services for victims but

\(^8\) MCSS funded shelters and violence against women services are the only services identified on these maps and do not take into account non MCSS funded violence against women services.
the exact nature of the organization is unknown.

Although this map does not provide enough information to make any links between the location of violence against women shelter services and femicides which have occurred, it does illustrate how far many, especially rural women, would have to travel to access an MCSS funded shelter.

Further to the issue of women’s access to MCSS funded shelter services, the map below shows that, aside from the single shelter approx. 10kms from the geographic center of the postal code area with the highest number of femicides (which is geographically between Brampton (population approximately 599,000) and Mississauga (population approximately 761,000), there are no other MCSS funded shelters within 30 kms in any direction and the one shelter that does exist in this geographic area has capacity for 54 shelter beds (Region of Peel 2011).
NB. As with previous maps, • indicates the existence of a shelter, ● second stage, ○ non shelter and ◦ unknown.

These maps serve to increase our interest in looking further into the geography of femicides (i.e. urban, suburban, rural) as well as things like the connection between geography and cause of death. For example, were the 16% of women in our sample who were killed by a gun living primarily in rural or urban areas? By comparison, the Ontario DWDRC report 2015 indicates that between 2002-2013 43% of deaths were caused by trauma (e.g. cuts/stabs and beating/assault) and 26% of deaths were the result of either a handgun, rifle, shotgun or other kind of gun (Office of the Chief Coroner 2015). Illustrating links or the lack of links between geography and cause of death could have an important impact on the way risk assessments, court orders, restraining orders and safety plans are addressed since the abuser’s access to guns has been an important risk factor to consider. Other questions about the context within and surrounding femicides and their relation to available services and supports arise once we are able to visually represent these factors.

Outcomes of Our CC Partnership: Products & Presentation

The majority of the products created and disseminated by our CC partnership can be characterized as knowledge mobilization (KMb). Although KMb has been defined in different ways, we like this definition: “Getting the right information to the right people in the right format at the right time so as to influence decision making” (Levin 2008). The outcomes related to the femicide media analysis resulted in four knowledge mobilization products and three presentations that have been disseminated to different audiences using various strategies.
**0.1.1 Femicide Media Analysis Project KMb Products**

We sought to create KMb products that were visually pleasing, creative, and accessible to our audiences. To determine these outputs, we consulted with our community partners as well as individuals with expertise in Community Engaged KMb products such as the KMb coordinator at CESI, University of Guelph as well as academic and grey literature on knowledge mobilization. We decided to report the findings from the news reports in a format described as a “Heat Map”.

**Femicide Heat Map**

The above heat map is a visual representation of the media analysis from the three types of news sources, the names of the victims of femicide and the positive and negative frames identified from each news article. This Heat Map was our initial KMb product that eventually sparked ideas for additional KMb products.

The second KMb product that we created emerged from the Heat Map and was a 3-panel poster that displayed our findings (see below). The key pieces of analysis on this poster were...
the pie chart bubbles we created that represented the percentage of news articles that used positive frames or negative frames in their reporting. This served to be the most visually engaging and simultaneously informative, way of presenting the findings of our Media Framing Analysis. The poster displayed the pie chart bubbles for local papers, national papers, and TV news in order to show the differences between each news source. Further, the poster included a legend describing each frame that was used in the analysis.

3-Panel Conference Poster

This above poster was presented at three conferences (OAITH 2017 Training Day, Toronto and the ENGAGE Graduate Student Conference, University of Guelph & an annual Ontario women’s shelter meeting called Let’s Talk, Ingersoll, ON) between March and May.
Left to right: Abhilash Kantamneni, Ann Westbere, Ekaterina Pogretsova, Anne Simpson
The other KMb products that were developed as a result of this media framing analysis included
an executive summary detailing the purpose, process, findings, positive and negative
implications of this investigation as well as recommendations for future reporting. This
Executive Summary was then shortened into a 2-page summary (see Appendix B) that outlined
the strengths and areas to improve with regard to media reporting, the positive and negative frames used by the media and the recommendations for future reporting. The heat map and executive summary has been available on OAITH’s website since mid April and was used as part of a media release about the reporting of femicides. The media release is accessible via this link: http://www.oaith.ca/Media%20Advisory_When%20the%20Motive%20is%20Domestic%20Violence_Final_April%202013%202017.pdf and the interactive femicide media analysis heat map is accessible from the OAITH website at the following URL: https://public.tableau.com/profile/publish/OntarioFemicideMediaAnalysis/Story1#!/publish confirm

Finally, the fourth KMb product that we developed was a “Positive and Negative Femicide Story” example. This involved creating a mock news article that detailed the ways of reporting femicide that are beneficial, and the ways of reporting femicide that journalists could aim to avoid in future articles. Ultimately, these suggestions were based on the findings of our literature reviews. Due to the discussion that we had about our lack of experience or expertise
of journalism and our lack of consultation with journalists or violence against women experts on this product, we decided that we would send our draft to the above stakeholders for feedback before finalizing and disseminating this KMb product to OAITH.

**O2.2 OAITH and Ontario Coroner Femicide Data KMb Products & Strategies**

**O2.2.1 Visualizations via Tableau**
The first product provided visualizations of the OAITH and Coroner’s data using a program called Tableau which is accessible via OAITH’s website. As discussed in C2. above, the data from the OAITH compiled dataset were binned into categories including cause of death, age of victim, presence of children and relationship to offender. The data from the Coroner’s reports were also binned into similar categories including cause of death, age of victim and the environment in which the deaths occurred. The binned data was then processed in a program called Tableau. This program allowed us to sort the data in a visual manner, allowing us to compare the data when possible (i.e., most common age of death), and examine trends. These visualizations provided a clear and concise way to present the data and interesting trends.

**O2.2 Geographic information system (GIS) Mapping**
The second product is a GIS mapping of femicides (that came from the Coroner and from information from the OAITH dataset) in Ontario based on the first 3 digits of postal codes of femicide victims. The GIS Mapping project was conducted by Darin Brooks and his students at The College of the North Atlantic. Marlene from OAITH provided Darin with an excel spreadsheet that contained 215 locations of violence against women shelters funded by MCSS (as of February 2017). At this point in the project there is no plan for OAITH to disseminate these maps to others but instead use them as a tool to reflect on what other questions might be asked and possibly answered using GIS methodologies in the future.

**O2.3 NewsPeek:OAITH Article Search Software Product & Outcomes**
NP:O software underwent several iterative upgrades for improving performance between version 1 (NP:Ov1) and version 7 (NP:Ov7). NP:Ov1 used a single-stage keyword search, requiring only one word from a single short list (gender and violence words combined) for the tweet to be logged as a hit. The original intent was to rank articles based on the number of occurrences of each keyword, e.g. death mentioned 10 times, woman mentioned 6 times, etc. However, using this method meant that nearly 100% of the results were false positives, with logged hits including everything from local arts and crafts shows to wars across the globe. NP:Ov7 improves substantially on the original NP:Ov1. Adding the constraint that one gender and one violence word must be present in the document (see chart below), and especially in the tweet, significantly reduced the number of false positives.

**NP:Ov7**
NP:O has been running without interruption since late February 2017, checking a very large number of tweets and scraping tens of thousands of articles. Over 33,000 low confidence hits have been logged, although nearly all of these are “false positives” (articles falsely labeled as relevant) due to the pervasive presence of sensational words like murder in the headlines of related articles linked to the scraped article.

However, nearly 600 high confidence hits have been registered since scraping began, and roughly 40% of these are true positives. These high confidence hits will be uploaded to a shared Dropbox folder to be manually curated weekly by sociology students in the fall of 2017 as part
of Professor Morton’s next community engaged learning project with OAITH in the fall of 2017. In the future, this final step of manual curation could be fed back into NP:O and used to further improve the algorithm, “teaching” it what constitutes an article about femicide by using modern artificial intelligence techniques.

Discussion

The combined components of the projects provide insight into femicide in Ontario that is consistent with previous research. By examining sex, age, risk factors, victim/perpetrator relationship, and death factors we were able to see that there was consistency in information on femicide cases between 2009-2014 across both the Coroner and OAITH data sets. Trends that were common between the OAITH data and the Coroner’s office data include:

- the gendered nature of domestic related homicides (i.e. femicide) (Johnson and Dawson 2011; Dawson 2016; Caman, Kristiansson, Granath and Sturup 2017).
- the likelihood of women being killed by their ex-partners, husbands, common-law partners (Glass et al. 2008, Shackelford and Mouzos 2005, Elisha, Idisis, Timor, and Addad, 2010; Dawson 2016, Gartner, Dawson and Crawford 1998; Juodis et al. 2014; Koziol-McLain et al. 2006; Sheehan et al. 2015; Muftic 2012; WHO 2012; Jordan et al. 2010; Office of the Chief Coroner for Ontario 2015). This is in line with other research showing that in Canada, women are about three times more likely to be victims of an intimate partner homicide than men (Fairbairn and Dawson 2013)
- the most common age of death for femicide victims was between 36-54 (Jordan 2010; Fong et al. 2016; Muftic and Baumann 2012; Elisha, Idisis, Timor, and Addad, 2010)
- the most common cause of death was trauma, which includes cuts, stabs and assault (Fong et al, 2016; Ferrara et al. 2015)

History of Violence

Because intimate partners are most likely to commit femicide, reviewing the Domestic Violence Death Review Committee reports gave us insight into the most common risk factors for intimate partner femicides between 2009 and 2016 (Office of the Chief Coroner for Ontario). The most common risk factor identified was a history of intimate partner violence (IPV) (Approximately 43 or 70% of the cases). This is also consistent with other research that previous abuse in the relationship is one of the most important risk factors for femicide (Sheehan 2015; Fong 2016; Fairbairn and Dawson 2013, Office of the Chief Coroner for Ontario 2015). However, despite the important recognition of the connection between a history of domestic violence and femicide, our femicide media analysis discovered that a history of IPV is very rarely reported (4% of the time) in intimate partner femicide cases (Gillespie, Richards, and Smith 2013, 2014). This is an important omission in contemporary media reporting. Further, we were also able to identify other frames that could potentially misinform the public regarding what constitutes the societal issue of femicide, and what the risk factors of femicide are. For example using the language of “femicide” instead of the gender-neutral term “homicide” helps to understand reveal important details of this extreme form of violence against women (Marcuello-Servós et al. 2016) and can be used to help produce changes in the social order that
“legitimized or tolerated” these deaths (Corradi et al. 2016, 976). Evidence to support the importance and impact media reports have on issues like femicide is prevalent. “The media influences the public’s perceptions and preferences of political events, issues and actors (Entman, 2004; Lyengar, 1991; Page and Shapiro, 1992; Zaller, 1992)”(Major 2015, 485). Our attention to the media’s framing of femicide as influencing the way in which the issue is defined and addressed also aligns with previous research about the impact that media’s representation of an issue can have (Easteal, Bartels, Nelson and Holland 2015). For example, Major argues that “Frames serve as a way to define a problem, evaluate it, and suggest a remedy. News frames make aspects of an issue or event more salient over other equally relevant aspects” (2015, 485). As we found in our research, what is highlighted as well as what is omitted requires a critical analysis. “The power of the frame is in the details that are highlighted as well as in what is omitted (Entman, 2004).”(Major 2015, 485). Further, in order to report important information, it must be identified and recorded. This gap leads to our analysis of race and intersectionality.

**Invisibility of Race**

Issues surrounding what is recorded and how femicide data is documented has been identified previously (Weil 2016). One concern identified is the collection or lack of collection and release of race based information (Wortley 2003). Currently, the only race based information that is tracked and recorded in the Ontario Coroner’s data is “First Nations”. In the Ontario Coroner’s data 2009-2014, seven out of 143 domestic violence-related death victims were identified as “First Nations”. Given that Aboriginal peoples include First Nations, Inuit and Metis, this language is narrow and the lack of a broader term such as Aboriginal or Indigenous does not take into account women who identify as Metis or Inuit (and potentially non-status First Nations). In addition, the Ontario Coroner’s Office does not record information on any other races. Due, in part, to the lack of recording of raced based information, femicide statistics do not track race in a comprehensive way. This may conceal the levels of violence against women who belong to ethnic minorities, specifically Aboriginal women (Mulligan, Axford, and Solecki 2016). The risk of femicide faced by Aboriginal women is disproportionately high (Alani 2010; Brownridge 2008; Daoud et al. 2013; Muftic 2012, Regoezzi 2001). Aboriginal women and girls represent approximately 10% of all female homicides in Canada and yet they make up only 3% of the female population (NWAC 2010, 3). Among female victims, the rate of homicide of Aboriginal females was six times that of non-Aboriginal females (4.80 per 100,000 compared to 0.77) (Mulligan, Axford and Solecki 2016). Collecting race related statistics for femicides is also important in order to understand intersectionality and the intersecting workings that race, gender and other identities play in victimization and crime (Potter 2013).

In addition to the potential of being missed in official femicide data, the deaths of indigenous women often get missed by mainstream news as well. Research on media representation identify race as a critical factor in determining whether specific instances of femicide are newsworthy (Collins 2013; Gilchrist 2010; Jiwani and Young 2006; Stillman 2007). White victims are generally subject to sensationalized media coverage, a phenomenon referred to as “missing white girl syndrome” (Stillman 2007, 492). This is particularly evident when compared to the coverage of black and Aboriginal women, whose stories are often omitted or underreported.
Despite their overrepresentation as victims (Collins 2013; Gilchrist 2010; Jiwani and Young 2006). This lack of representation in the media is referred to as “strategic silences”, which removes the voices of victims and contributes to biases against racial minorities (Jiwani & Young 2006, 899). Due to the issues mentioned above, including underreporting, strategic silencing, and lack of official data, we were unable to reach any definitive conclusions about how the media reports on race during this project. Future research in this area is required.

**Moving Forward: Considerations**

Arising from our research below we offer considerations for journalists, OAIcH, coroners and researchers including CES scholars related to current gaps and/or opportunities for extending future research/work.

**Considerations for the Media/Journalists**

Based on the findings in our Ontario femicide media framing analysis, we identified four positive reporting practices that media could employ when reporting on femicide.

1. Identify each case as a femicide and as violence against women in order to help contextualize the gendered violence as part of a larger societal problem.

2. If identified, report on any history of intimate partner violence.

3. Provide personal information about the victim, in order to humanize each case.

4. Use sources of information such as family, friends, and violence against women experts, instead of relying on traditional voices of authority such as police and government officials.

Based on previous research and our findings, we believe that the above four reporting practices will improve the way media reports femicide because it will help to educate the public on issues such as what femicide is, risk factors for femicide, types of domestic violence, and how violence against women constitutes a societal issue.

**Considerations for OAIcH**

During the research process, we reviewed literature on the media reporting of femicide cases. During this review, we read an article that discussed steps taken in the United States to educate journalists on how their reporting of femicide cases impacts victims. One of these steps was to create an emotional literacy training program for journalists. This program teaches reporters how to sensitively interact with victims’ families, enabling more participation in media coverage. This program includes “translat[ing] victims’ rights claims about the press into specific training protocols, modes of conduct, and forms of victim identification for reporters” (Rentschler 2007, 228). Based on our research, a future project for OAIcH, researchers, and other service providers could include creating a similar program for journalists in Ontario and Canada. We believe this could enhance interactions between journalists and victims’ families,
as well as change how journalists report on femicide cases.

As discussed above the “Positive and Negative Femicide Story” mock news article that details ways that reporting femicide that are beneficial, and the ways of reporting femicide that journalists could aim to avoid in future articles is still in draft form. We would like to see a collaboration of relevant stakeholders (i.e. OAITH, journalists, other VAW experts/agencies) come together to work on this or something like this that is determined to be useful for training and education purposes.

Considerations for Coroners

As part of our research, we examined the Coroner’s data, and compared it to the OAITH data and other research. During this process, we found that our analysis could be strengthened if we had access to information on the race of femicide victims. **We recommend that the Ontario Coroner’s Office record the race of each victim (when possible).** This could provide key information on whether certain racial groups are underrepresented in media reporting of femicide cases, as well as provide key information for statistical analysis for services like Statistics Canada.

Consideration for Researchers

Based on the feedback received at the OAITH 2017 Provincial Training Day and the ENGAGE Graduate Student Conference at the University of Guelph, as well as ideas created via class discussions and through personal reflection, we have compiled a list of three potential future research projects in the area of media reporting and femicide.

1. At the OAITH Provincial Training Day, we received feedback that a detailed examination of how different racial groups are represented in media reporting of femicide would be beneficial. Based on this feedback, **we recommend conducting a study that focuses on the different ways that race is represented in the media.** Some areas that this research could investigate include: the underrepresentation of certain racial groups in reporting on femicide cases, and how these racial groups are framed in media reports. This research could lead to future considerations for media reporting, expanding on the considerations listed above.

2. At the ENGAGE Graduate Student Conference, University of Guelph, we received feedback from a CBC reporter. Her feedback educated us on particular issues that reporters face when writing articles on femicide cases, one of which being policies that prevent the use of certain language. Based on this feedback, we recommend that a study be conducted to examine the policies in place for media reporting of femicide cases, including national mainstream news, TV news, and local news. This research could lead to future considerations for reporting based on restrictions outlined in policy, and/or potential policy change recommendations that would allow for different styles of reporting.
3. As part of our current research project, we coded whether or not the media reports included information about a history of intimate partner violence in femicide cases. This factor was identified as important via our review of the literature on femicide media reporting, and through an examination of the Domestic Violence Death Review Committee (DVDRDC) data. The DVDRDC data also highlighted other common risk factors associated with intimate partner femicide cases. The top five risk factors include:
   a. history of intimate partner violence
   b. actual or pending separation
   c. sexual jealousy
   d. prior threats to commit suicide by the perpetrator
   e. the victims’ fear of the perpetrator (Office of the Chief Coroner 2016).

Based on these common risk factors, we recommend that research be conducted to examine if and/or how the top five risk factors linked to intimate partner femicide are reported in the media. This research could lead to future considerations for media reporting, expanding on the considerations listed above.

4. Previous research e.g. *Map of gaps 2: The postcode lottery of violence against women support services* (Coy, Kelly and Foord 2009) and our preliminary examination of the GIS component of the project highlights interesting and unanswered questions about whether there is a relationship between femicides and geography. Future research could ask the following questions:
   a. Do links exist between geography and cause of death? For example, were the 16% of women in our sample who were killed by a gun living primarily in rural or urban areas?
   b. To what extent might geography and cause of death impact the way risk assessments, court orders, restraining orders and safety plans are addressed as important risk factors?
   c. To what extent is the availability/accessibility of services and supports for victims of violence related to the geography of a femicide?

**Conclusion**

This report documents the process and outcomes of a community-campus partnership between the University of Guelph (graduate students and a faculty member within a sociology graduate course on the principles and practices of community engaged scholarship), the College of the North Atlantic (students and instructor) and a non-profit community partner (OAIITH). We came together to conduct a critical media analysis of the way in which current Ontario femicides are reported on by mainstream news, to compare trends in femicide data (2009-2014) between the Ontario Coroner data and the data OAIITH has collected and to assess the mainstream news as a source for OAIITH to continue to use to collect and analyze Ontario femicides for their ongoing education, training and advocacy of violence against women.

Our work together resulted in opportunities for us as graduate students to learn about as well as do and reflect on community engaged scholarship via a set of principles and processes
identified in the academic literature. Implementing these principles and best practices included opportunities to present our process and our results to multiple audiences and to develop our abilities to communicate, collaborate, and create knowledge mobilization products with our community partners that are relevant and meaningful to them. OAITH is already using some of the knowledge mobilization products we developed in collaboration with them and they have received positive feedback about these products from shelters and other partners. We developed some recommendations for reporting on femicide cases, considerations for the Coroner’s Office related to recording race related information and future research relevant for OAITH and other audiences based on our analysis.

We reflect on the CES project that was scoped, planned, implemented and mobilized collaboratively in 12 weeks by bringing together six graduate students who had never worked together before from four different programs/disciplines and were at different stages of a master's or doctoral program with a range of community engaged scholarship experience; one faculty member and two community partners. This diversity of members presented challenges but more importantly provided opportunities for all of us to be teachers and learners throughout the project. Our collaboration confronted many of the issues and challenges identified by other CCPs including time constraints, power and decision making issues including ownership and authorship, shared input, division of labour and commitment etc. Because of the diversity of members, level of engagement, collaboration and passion, the partnership and the project was successful and provides an excellent foundation for future work and engagement.
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Appendix B

Executive Summary shortened into a 2-page summary

How Ontario Media Reports Femicide\[1\]
Prepared for OAITH as a part of work done in a graduate course on community engaged scholarship 2017: Alexa MacKenzie-Cooper, Annie Simpson, Ann Westbere, Carleigh Smith, Ekaterina Pogrebitsova, Abhilash Kantamneni, Mavis Morton, University of Guelph, Marlene Ham, OAITH.

The following summary provides an analysis of the way mainstream media reported on Ontario femicides during 2015-2016. A total of 29 femicide cases were examined by studying 73 news items from three media sources (i.e., mainstream national newspapers, local newspapers, and TV news). Findings were categorized in terms of positive or negative framing, as identified through previous research.

Strengths (Positive Frames):\(^2\)

- 42% Victim Humanized
- 36% Picture of Victim

Areas to Improve (Negative Frames):\(^3\)

- 96% VAW History Undocumented
- 53% Voice of Authority
- 48% Individualized

Reporting Trends Comparing The Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Houses’ (OAITH) Femicide Lists (1990- 2015 and 2015-16)

\(^1\)Femicide is commonly defined as the intentional murder of women because they are women (Garcia-Moreno, Guedes and Knerr 2012). Intimate partner femicide (IPF) is the murder of a woman by her intimate partner (e.g. husband/ex-husband, common law spouse/ex-spouse, boyfriend/ex-boyfriend and date) (Sheehan et al 2015). Most women in the 2015-2016 list are examples of IPF.

\(^2\) “Victim Humanized” includes sympathizing with the victim and acknowledging how the woman impacted the
lives of others. “Picture of Victim” indicates that the news source provided a picture of the femicide victim. 3 “Violence Against Women (VAW) History Undocumented”: The femicide is not contextualized by providing information about the woman’s experience of a history of power and control, abuse, and/or violence by the perpetrator. “Voice of Authority” refers to the use of traditional voices of authority for interviews, such as police, instead of close family or friends. “Individualized” refers to the portrayal of violence against women as an individualized problem rather than a gendered societal problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+ Positive &amp; - Negative Framing</th>
<th>1990-2015 Analysis</th>
<th>2015-2016 Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanize Victims</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture of Victims</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>47% Individualized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4% Societal/Gendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim blaming</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuse of traditional voices of authority</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**X** Use of negative frames like the ones above tends to reinforce gender and racial stereotypes that result in inaccurate information about femicide and violence against women. Lack of knowledge can negatively impact the public’s support for important public policy and resource allocation.

**X** Leaving out the social context of femicide and women’s experiences of a history of violence by the perpetrator fails to educate people about important risk factors and femicide prevention. According to the Ontario Domestic Violence Death Review Committee (2009-2016), an average of 70% of women who were killed via an intimate partner had a history of domestic violence (Office of the Chief Coroner for Ontario 2016). However, this is not reflected in the media coverage, as 96% of the cases we analyzed fail to acknowledge a history of violence.

**Recommendations for Future Reporting:**

- **Identify each case as a femicide & as violence against women.**
- **If identified, report on any history of intimate partner violence, & contextualize the gendered violence as part of a larger social problem.**
- **Provide personal information about the victim (to humanize each case).**
- **Use sources of information such as family, friends, violence against women experts, instead of relying on traditional voices of authority such as police and government.**
- **Add information about available resources & supports for those experiencing intimate partner abuse/violence.**
Bibliography:
* No "individualized" framing analysis was provided in the OATH 1990-2015 report (Byrne et al. 2015).
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Ontario Coroner’s Data

Cause of Death
- Other: 14%
- Asphyxia: 11%
- Shooting: 21%
- Trauma: 54%

Age Groups
- 0-17: 4%
- 18-35: 33%
- 36-54: 42%
- 55+: 21%

Environment
- Other: 9%
- Rural Outdoors: 6%
- Urban Outdoors: 8%
- Residence: 77%
Appendix D

OAITH Data

**Cause of Death**

- Other: 28%
- Asphyxia: 6%
- Shooting: 16%
- Trauma: 50%

**Age Groups**

- 0-17: 6%
- 18-35: 33%
- 36-54: 41%
- 55+: 20%

**Have Children**

- Unknown: 38%
- No: 10%
- Pregnant: 2%
- Yes: 50%
Femicide victims (by age) and causes of death

% of Total Number of Records

Unknown | No | Pre. | Yes

relationship
- Boyfriend
- Ex-Partner
- Common-law
- Husband
- Stranger
- Acquaintance
- Family
- Misc.

% of Total Number of Records

Relationship
- Boyfriend
- Ex-Partner
- Common-law
- Husband
- Stranger
- Acquaintance
- Family
- Misc.