

Article type:
Original Research

Assistant Professor, Literature Faculty, Selcuk
University, Türkiye.

Comparative Analysis of Domestic Femicides in Türkiye: A Study of Monument Counter Data (2015–2017 and 2022–2024)

Corresponding author email address:
heken@selcuk.edu.tr

Eken. Hurigül 



Article history:

Received 23 Jan 2026
Revised 28 Feb 2026
Accepted 12 March 2026
Published online 01 Apr 2026

How to cite this article:

Hurigül, E. (2026). Comparative Analysis of Domestic Femicides in Türkiye: A Study of Monument Counter Data (2015–2017 and 2022–2024). *International Journal of Body, Mind and Culture*, 13(4), 122–136.



© 2025 the authors. This is an open-access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study presents a comparative analysis of domestic femicides in Türkiye across two periods (2015–2017 and 2022–2024) using data obtained from the Monument Counter (Anıt Sayaç) digital platform. The research aims to identify temporal changes in patterns of domestic femicide by examining variables such as perpetrator–victim relationship, motives, method of killing, protection requests, victim age, and judicial outcomes.

Methods and Materials: The study is designed as a retrospective descriptive comparative analysis. A total of 335 domestic femicide cases were identified for the period 2015–2017, and 774 cases for 2022–2024, based on predefined inclusion criteria focusing on family-related perpetrator–victim relationships. Data were coded and analyzed using descriptive statistics and chi-square tests to assess differences between periods.

Findings: Legally married spouses remain the primary perpetrators in both periods. Divorce and separation processes constitute a persistent risk factor. While arrest rates for perpetrators increased significantly and cases involving unidentified perpetrators decreased in the later period, the rate of protection requests remained consistently low. An increase in the proportion of minor victims was also observed.

Conclusion: Given that the data source is a media-based civil initiative rather than official judicial records, findings should be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, the results suggest continuity in patriarchal patterns of violence within the domestic sphere, alongside partial changes in judicial responses over time.

Keywords: Domestic femicide, Violence, Women, Gender inequality, Türkiye

Introduction

Femicides, as one of the most visible forms of gender inequality, represent a persistent structural form of violence in modern societies. This phenomenon, expressed in the literature as femicide, is defined as the killing of women because of their gender (Podreka, 2025). Femicides are not considered individual acts of violence, but rather manifestations of gender-based power relations deeply embedded within the social system. In this sense, femicides are one of how the patriarchal social order reproduces itself, and a concrete reflection of the control mechanisms employed by the male-dominated structure to ensure its continuity.

Patriarchy is defined as a system in which social relations are organized around gender-based hierarchies, reproducing male dominance at the institutional level. Throughout history, women have been relegated to secondary positions in production relations, family structure, law, and cultural representations; this has led to the identification of masculinity with concepts of power and superiority. Connell (2020) states that gender is not composed of biological differences, but of power relations established through social practices. Masculinity has become the criterion of dominance within these relations; femininity, on the other hand, has been constructed as a passive, dependent, and secondary category. Giddens (1984) emphasizes that social structure is reproduced through individual actions, revealing how patriarchal norms are maintained in everyday practices. From this perspective, femicides are seen not as a product of individual anger, but as a product of a power relationship aimed at preserving social order.

Turkish social structure contains all aspects of the patriarchal system defined by Walby, to varying degrees of intensity. Although the legal rights granted to women through the reforms of the Republican era have led to significant progress in formal equality, the realization of these rights in social life has remained limited (Altnay & Arat, 2007). Despite progress in education, employment, and political participation, traditional values that determine women's social position persist. Every time women gain visibility in the public sphere, the patriarchal structure produces new mechanisms to limit this visibility. Women's attempts to make decisions about divorce, work, or their own lives are seen as

behaviors that threaten the stability of the patriarchal order and often result in violence (Erden & Akdur, 2018). The global literature on femicide varies according to the historical, economic, and cultural context of each society. In Latin America, femicide has been linked to a culture of impunity, poverty, and the state's inadequacy in combating violence (Boira et al., 2017). In Europe, despite the existence of gender policies at the legal level, shortcomings in implementation processes make it difficult to prevent femicides. Corradi et al. (2016) have shown that factors such as the fragmented structure of data collection systems, the lack of gender sensitivity in judicial processes, and the ineffectiveness of protection mechanisms in European countries create structural obstacles in the fight against femicides. This situation demonstrates that femicides are a multi-layered phenomenon with not only individual or cultural but also institutional and political foundations. In Türkiye, femicides occur at the tension line between the demands for equality that come with social modernization and the areas where the traditional patriarchal structure resists. Increased access for women to education and employment opportunities, greater economic independence, and strengthened public representation have led to the questioning of patriarchal norms (Üzümçeker & Akfırat, 2018). The persistence of femicides lies at the intersection of social change and patriarchal resistance.

A study by Erden & Akdur (2018) on the role of women in domestic violence and femicide in Türkiye presents an examination of victims (women killed in femicides) in Türkiye between 2014 and 2015. The study analyzes the characteristics of both perpetrators and victims. Based on data from the digital memorial site AnıtSayac, the research evaluated data from 335 female victims and 318 male perpetrators. The results show that their husbands or former partners killed the vast majority of women, and that most perpetrators and victims were under 50 years old and had low levels of education. Arguments, jealousy, and allegations of infidelity were prominent motivations for the murders. The research identified low levels of education, economic difficulties, and the patriarchal societal structure as risk factors in femicides. In the study "Women as Perpetrators of Crime" – Orhan (2023), review article), the reasons why

women are inclined to commit crimes are examined from a historical and theoretical perspective. Although the act of committing crimes is generally associated with men, it has been emphasized that women have also committed crimes with various motivations throughout history. According to [Orhan \(2023\)](#), female convicts most frequently receive sentences for substance-related crimes, theft/fraud, and the murder of individuals within their family or close relationships. The background of female crime often involves multifaceted factors such as past abuse, trauma, economic disadvantages, and psychological problems. Another review article by [Rozant \(2010\)](#), [Akduman et al. \(2016\)](#), and [Truong et al. \(2023\)](#) analyzed the gender of victims of domestic homicides, revealing victim-perpetrator relationships in the phenomenon of domestic homicides, even without directly examining female perpetrators. In this study, conducted with 93 male convicts, the personality and demographic structures of those who committed domestic homicides (killing their spouse, child, etc.) were compared with those who committed non-domestic homicides. The findings show that 45% of victims in domestic homicides are women, while the percentage of women among victims of non-domestic homicides remains at 18%. It has been noted that the most common type of murder within a family is against a spouse, while the rarest is against a sibling.

The Monument Counter platform, since 2008, has become a digitally recorded resource for documenting the collective memory of femicides in Türkiye, and is increasingly referenced in academic research. While the inadequacy of official statistics limits the visibility and social discussion of femicides, the Monument Counter functions as a digital memory that partially addresses this deficiency. By providing micro-level data, including details such as the names of the murdered women, the reasons for their deaths, their relationships with the perpetrators, and the legal processes of the events, the platform has created a unique space for both social awareness and academic data production. In this respect, the Monument Counter has been used as a subject or data source in many academic studies in recent years. [Uyanık & Seymen \(2024\)](#) analyzed platform data in the context of media representations, examining how femicides are presented in the press and how news report language shapes this phenomenon. [Beşe \(2024\)](#), drawing on Messerschmidt's theory of masculinity, used

the Monument Counter data to classify perpetrator-victim relationships on a gender basis and analyzed the structural dimensions of femicides through the concept of the crisis of masculinity. Similarly, [Olcay & Almaçık \(2025\)](#), while examining the digital advocacy practices of feminist movements in Turkey, treated the Monument Counter as a digital resistance space where the names of murdered women and the statements of the perpetrators are recorded. Furthermore, [Atalay et al. \(2025\)](#), in their study comparing the representations of femicides in Turkish and Portuguese media, used Monument Counter data to analyze media discourses, and [Anavatan & Kayacan \(2024\)](#) presented the statistical distribution of femicides in Turkey based on annual data. [S. Bozkurt \(2025\)](#) also drew attention to the lack of reliable official data, using the Monument Counter as a feminist tool. Although these studies used the Monument Counter as a data source, they were generally limited to single-period or representative analyses. While some research in the literature covers domestic femicides, these mostly focused on a single year and did not make periodic comparisons. In this context, the present research comparatively examines the Monument Counter data covering the periods 2015–2017 and 2022–2024, thereby conducting both a quantitative trend analysis and a sociological evaluation of how femicides intersect with gender relations within the family context.

This study aims to determine the changes between two periods based on indicators of domestic femicide obtained from the Monument Counter data, and to interpret these changes by relating them to transformations in the social structure, the continuity of patriarchal norms, and the breakdown of gender roles. This study treats the Monument Counter data not only as a public awareness tool but also as a usable social dataset for quantitative analysis, comparatively examining domestic femicides across the periods 2015–2017 and 2022–2024. The main objective of the research is to statistically analyze the trends of increase or decrease in domestic femicides in Türkiye over time, based on variables such as the reasons for the killings, the degree of closeness between the perpetrators and the victims, the methods of killing, whether protection was requested, and data on the judicial processes, and to identify the differences between periods. Accordingly, the study aims to obtain measurable indicators

regarding the structural dimension of violence against women in Türkiye by statistically evaluating the data on femicides. This study aims to reveal the changing trends in domestic femicides in Türkiye over time using statistical data, and to evaluate, from a sociological perspective, how these changes can be interpreted within the context of gender relations, patriarchal norms, and transformations in family structure. The primary objective of this study is comparative statistical analysis; sociological interpretation is developed as a secondary analytical layer.

Methods and Materials

Study Design

This study employs a retrospective, comparative, cross-sectional design using secondary data analysis. Some distinctive features of descriptive research include its descriptive nature and its quantitative nature as a research method that attempts to collect measurable information for statistical analysis of a population sample. This method aims to explain the phenomenon under investigation in detail, reveal existing trends, and identify related factors. In accordance with the study's objective, data collected from the platform via a data collection form were processed and analyzed using complementary statistics.

The primary data source for this research is the Anıt Savaş (Monument Counter) digital memorial site, which provides detailed and up-to-date data on femicides. This research is designed as a retrospective and descriptive study to comparatively examine domestic femicides in Turkey between the periods 2015–2017 and 2022–2024. The study aims to reveal the causes of femicides, their relational characteristics with the perpetrators, and the changes in the methods of killing between the two periods. The research population consists of all femicide cases between 2015–2017 and 2022–2024 as listed on the Anıt Savaş platform. The sample is limited to cases selected from news reports during these periods that are characterized as violence against women or femicide. Data were collected from Anıt Savaş records through a data collection form created by the researcher. The variables included in the form are: Date, Name, Age, Province, Reason for Killing, Relationship to the Perpetrator, Request for Protection, Method of Killing, Perpetrator's Status (Legal Process), Perpetrator's

Gender, and Link to the News Source. These variables were selected to understand the individual and relational characteristics of the events. Data collection was carried out through the systematic scanning of records published on anitsayac.com. The platform has a separate page for each woman; these pages contain information about who killed her, why, and how; the perpetrator's gender and legal process; and links to news articles about the event. This structure makes the Monument Counter not only a data source but also a digital archive that reflects social memory through media representations. The Monument Counter is a civil initiative created as a social response to the lack and difficulty of accessing official statistics on femicides in Türkiye. Launched in 2013 by artist Zeren Gökten as part of her conceptual art project "Counter," this digital platform has grown over time through contributions from volunteers and women's organizations, transforming into a public memory space (Çağlar & Ayranpınar, 2025). Due to limited data sharing from institutions such as the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Family and Social Services, and the General Directorate of Security, the platform compiles news reports on femicides through media scans. These scan results are verified by comparison with data from the "We Will Stop Femicides Platform" (Anavatan & Kayacan, 2024; Beşe, 2024). The method used by the Monument Counter not only records the numbers but also creates symbolic resistance against the anonymization of femicides by making each case visible with its identity. In this respect, the platform is defined in international literature with the concepts of "digital monument" and "feminist data practice" (Olcay & Alnaçık, 2025).

The data source is media-based and therefore includes only events reported in the national press, resulting in limited representation. Cases of femicide that did not receive national media attention or where the perpetrator remains unknown are not included in the system. Nevertheless, the Memorial Counter data provides a unique resource for raising social awareness, increasing visibility, and producing collective memory. The data obtained in this study were evaluated from this awareness perspective, and the relationship between patterns of femicide between the two periods and the dynamics of social change was examined.

Data Validity and Reliability Considerations

The Monument Counter (Anıt Sayaç) database is a media-based civil initiative rather than an official judicial registry. Therefore, several methodological limitations must be acknowledged. First, the dataset may be subject to media-selection bias, as cases receiving national media coverage are more likely to be included. Second, underreporting may occur in rural or less visible regions. Third, the accuracy of variables depends on the consistency of media reporting.

In this study, each case was independently reviewed prior to coding. Duplicate cases were identified through cross-checking name, date, and province information and were removed before analysis. When contradictory or insufficient information was detected, the case was excluded from variable-specific analysis. These procedures were implemented to enhance internal consistency and reduce classification error.

Data Coverage and Selection

The two periods (2015–2017 and 2022–2024) were selected to allow comparison between a pre-pandemic phase and a recent post-pandemic phase. This temporal distinction enables examination of potential structural changes in domestic violence patterns over time within a broader socio-political context. In this context, cases where the perpetrator had a relationship with the victim as a spouse, ex-spouse, partner, father, brother, or other close relative were included in the study. Murder cases that did not meet this criterion (such as non-family murders or cases where the relationship was not specified) were excluded from the study.

Operational Definition of Domestic Femicides

For this study, domestic femicide was operationally defined as cases in which the perpetrator had a documented familial or intimate relationship with the victim. These relationships included: legally married spouse, religious marriage partner, former spouse, cohabiting partner (when specified in media reports), father, son, brother, father-in-law, brother-in-law, or other first-degree relatives.

Cases in which the perpetrator–victim relationship was not specified in media reports were excluded from the domestic category but documented separately. This

exclusion may result in a conservative estimation of domestic femicide prevalence.

Analysis

A structured coding framework was developed prior to data extraction. All variables were operationally defined to ensure internal consistency. The researcher conducted coding, and a secondary review of a randomly selected subset (10%) of cases was performed after initial coding to enhance reliability and reduce classification inconsistencies. Descriptive-complementary statistics were chosen for data analysis. Case information obtained from the Anıt Sayaç website was individually processed from the platform into MS Office Excel files using a data collection form. Each case was coded according to the perpetrator–victim relationship (spouse, ex-spouse, father, brother, other relative), the location of the murder (home, workplace, street, etc.), the method of murder (knife, firearm, assault, etc.), and the reason for the murder (divorce request, jealousy, argument, etc.). The coded data were analyzed using SPSS v24, revealing period-specific trends and differences. The data were then interpreted using descriptive analysis and frequency statistics.

Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were used to summarize categorical variables. Differences between the two periods were tested using chi-square tests of independence. Assumptions of chi-square analysis were evaluated, and categories with expected cell counts below five were combined where necessary to meet test requirements.

Effect sizes were calculated using Cramér's V to assess the magnitude of significant associations. Given the multiple comparisons conducted, statistical findings were interpreted cautiously, emphasizing patterns demonstrating both statistical and substantive relevance.

This study is limited to secondary media-based data and does not constitute a comprehensive census of all femicide cases in Türkiye. The findings should therefore be interpreted as indicative of observable patterns within recorded cases rather than definitive national prevalence rates. Multivariable modeling and causal inference were beyond the scope of this descriptive comparative design.

Findings and Results

The findings section presents statistical results without interpretative or policy-based discussion. Interpretations and theoretical contextualization are developed in the subsequent Discussion section. This structural distinction aims to preserve analytical clarity and avoid conflating empirical reporting with normative implications.

During data cleaning, an initial count of 774 potential domestic cases was identified for the period 2022–2024. However, after applying operational inclusion criteria and excluding cases with missing or ambiguous perpetrator–victim relationship data, the final analytical sample comprised 774 cases. All statistical analyses in this study are based on the cleaned and operationally defined dataset.

Data from 2015-2017 revealed a total of 940 cases, of which 335 were identified as domestic homicides. Table

1 presents the data on domestic homicides from 2015-2017.

To improve clarity and reduce duplication, kinship categories were standardized and merged into consistent labels. For example: “His son (Öz)” was recoded as Biological Son; “Son (Step)” was recoded as Step-Son; Repeated “Brother-in-law” entries were merged; “Family Assembly” was reclassified under Extended Family Members.

All categories were reviewed to ensure consistency in translation and comparability across periods.

Cause-of-death categories were grouped into broader analytical clusters to enhance interpretability. Motives, situational triggers, and contextual descriptors reported in media sources were consolidated into the following analytical categories: Divorce/Separation-related; Jealousy/Relationship conflict; Economic conflict; Honor/Tradition; Family conflict, and Undetermined.

The large “Undetermined” category reflects cases in which media sources did not provide sufficient motive-related detail.

Table 1

Distribution of Domestic Femicides with Data from 2015-2017

Domestic murder	335 cases	n	%
Near degree	Her husband (Official)	183	54.63%
	Her husband (Religious marriage)	3	0.90%
	Ex-Husband (With Child Relationship)	30	8.96%
	His father	31	9.25%
	Older brother/younger brother	17	5.07%
	His son (Öz)	22	6.57%
	Son (Step)	3	0.90%
	Family Assembly	2	0.60%
	Father-in-law	2	0.60%
	Brother-in-law	8	2.39%
	Groom	18	5.37%
	Brother-in-law	9	2.69%
	Uncle/Aunt	2	0.60%
	Cousin (Uncle's son)	1	0.30%
	Grandchild	2	0.60%
	Cousin-Nephew	2	0.60%
Request for Protection	None	310	92.54%
	There is	25	7.46%
Age	Minor (under 18)	9	2.69%
	Adult	326	97.31%
Cause of Death	Protecting Relatives (Mother/Sister/Sibling)	21	6.27%
	Property - Property Division - Inheritance	9	2.69%
	Discussion (Economic Reasons - Debt and Credit - Unemployment)	19	5.67%
	Rejection of the reconciliation request	6	1.79%
	Deception / Suspicion of Deception	4	1.19%
	Jealousy	15	4.48%
	Divorce - Divorce Request - Separation Request	56	16.72%
	Seeing reasons for divorce - inability to accept divorce	2	0.60%
	Baby crying	2	0.60%

	Family Reasons	1	0.30%
	Substance Addiction	3	0.90%
	Frequent contact with his mother	1	0.30%
	No food was given	1	0.30%
	Accident - joking	3	0.90%
	Revenge	3	0.90%
	Request to see his children	3	0.90%
	Forced prostitution	1	0.30%
	Disliking the lifestyle	2	0.60%
	Honor and Tradition	15	4.48%
	Discussion (Undetermined)	168	50.15%
Murder Weapon - Method	Firearm	190	56.72%
	Choke	13	3.88%
	Assault	12	3.58%
	Cutting Tool	108	32.24%
	Torture, Sharp Instruments, Beating, Burning	3	0.90%
	Incineration	3	0.90%
	Falling from a height	4	1.19%
The perpetrator's situation	Striking instrument	2	0.60%
	Wanted - Fugitive - Fugitive - Arrest warrant	29	8.66%
	Unknown - Could not be determined.	138	41.19%
	Detention/Supervision (Minor)	5	1.49%
	Suicide	51	15.22%
	Prisoner	112	33.43%

Note: The high proportion of "Undetermined" cases reflects limitations of media-based reporting rather than the absence of motive. This category should be interpreted cautiously.

Table 1, which presents the distribution of domestic femicides in Türkiye between 2015 and 2017, contains striking findings regarding the perpetrators, reasons, and methods used. Of the 335 cases examined, more than half were committed by legally married spouses (54.63%), with a significant portion also perpetrated by ex-spouses (8.96%), fathers (9.25%), and biological sons (6.57%). This clearly demonstrates that the closest family members mostly perpetrate femicides. The extremely low rate of requests for protection (7.46%) indicates that women, despite being under threat of violence, either do not seek protection mechanisms or face obstacles in doing so. While the vast majority of victims are adults (97.31%), the presence of minor victims (2.69%) suggests that domestic violence also involves children. When examining the reasons for the murders, it is noteworthy that unspecified disputes account for a high percentage (50.15%). Furthermore, the high rate of cited reasons for murder (16.72%), such as divorce or separation, can be interpreted as resistance from the male-dominated mindset against women's right to independent decision-making. Honor or tradition (4.48%), jealousy (4.48%), and economic reasons (5.67%) remain significant contributing factors. Regarding methods of murder, firearms (56.72%) and bladed weapons (32.24%) are frequently used. This

indicates that the murders are generally planned and involve severe violence. Looking at the perpetrators, a significant portion remain unidentified or unknown (41.19%), while only 33.43% are in custody. Additionally, the fact that 15.22% of perpetrators commit suicide after the murder highlights the psychological dimension and dramatic impact of these events. The findings from 2015-2017 reveal that femicides in Turkey are prevalent within the context of close family relationships, that significant risk factors exist during divorce and separation processes, and that protection mechanisms are inadequate. These results clearly highlight the need to strengthen protective policies in the fight against femicide.

A survey conducted between 2022 and 2024 identified a total of 1274 cases. Analysis of these cases, based on the criteria of domestic violence, revealed that 774 occurred within the family. Table 2 shows the distribution of domestic femicides that occurred between 2022 and 2024.

To ensure comparability with the 2015–2017 dataset, variable categories were harmonized across periods. Where new or expanded labels appeared in media reports, they were recoded into previously defined analytical clusters. This harmonization allows valid cross-period statistical comparison.

Table 2*Overview of domestic femicides between 2022 and 2024.*

Domestic murder N=774	n	%
Near degree		
Her husband (Official)	387	56.33%
Her husband (Religious marriage)	15	2.18%
Ex-Husband (With Child Relationship)	68	9.90%
His father	60	8.73%
Older brother/younger brother	46	6.70%
His son (Öz)	24	3.49%
Son (Step)	1	0.15%
Family Assembly	3	0.44%
Father-in-law	8	1.16%
Brother-in-law	18	2.62%
Groom	31	4.51%
Brother-in-law	11	1.60%
Uncle/Aunt	9	1.31%
Cousin (Uncle's son)	1	0.15%
Grandchild	3	0.44%
Grandfather	2	0.29%
Request for Protection		
None	634	92.29%
There is	53	7.71%
Age		
Minor (under 18)	42	6.11%
Adult	645	93.89%
Cause of Death		
Protecting Relatives (Mother, Sibling, etc.)	20	2.91%
Property - Property Division - Inheritance	12	1.75%
Discussion (Economic Reasons - Debt and Credit - Unemployment)	17	2.47%
Rejection of the reconciliation request	23	3.35%
Deception / Suspicion of Deception / Betrayal	11	1.60%
Jealousy	24	3.49%
Divorce - Divorce Request - Separation Request	124	18.05%
Substance Addiction (Alcohol, drugs)	4	0.58%
Dependent living (Disability), Refusal to provide care	5	0.73%
Revenge (Longing for the father, believing he caused the separation)	3	0.44%
Honor and Tradition	9	1.31%
Extortion - Refusal of loan request - Withholding allowance - Hostility	18	2.62%
Accidental (playing with a weapon, joking around)	3	0.44%
Magic, exorcism, and religiously based beliefs	2	0.29%
Discussion (Undetermined)	412	59.97%
Murder Weapon - Method		
By running him over with the vehicle	3	0.44%
Firearm	383	55.75%
Choke	44	6.40%

	Assault	24	3.49%
	Cutting, striking, and piercing tool	25	3.64%
	Torture, stabbing, beating, rape, and burning	3	0.44%
	Incineration	7	1.02%
	Falling from a height	6	0.87%
	poison	1	0.15%
	Undetectable - uncertain	191	27.80%
The perpetrator's situation	Wanted - Fugitive - Fugitive - Arrest warrant	47	6.84%
	Suicide attempt	33	4.80%
	He died	1	0.15%
	Suicide	145	21.11%
	Prisoner	453	65.94%
	Investigation	4	0.58%
	Free	1	0.15%
	Undetectable - uncertain	3	0.44%

Note: The analytical sample (N=774) comprises cases that meet operational domestic classification criteria after data cleaning.

Note: The relatively large proportion of "Undetectable/Uncertain" categories for weapon and perpetrator status reflects incomplete reporting in media sources and may influence trend interpretation.

Table 2 presents data on domestic femicides between 2022 and 2024, showing an approximately twofold increase in the number of cases (774 cases) compared to the previous period (2015–2017). It is noteworthy that the murders are still mostly committed by legally married spouses (56.33%). This indicates that spouses continue to be the main perpetrator group in domestic homicides, and the risk is closely related to the marital bond. Former spouses (9.90%), fathers (8.73%), and brothers (6.70%) also constitute a significant group of perpetrators. The fact that the rate of protection requests remains very low (7.71%) shows that victims' access to legal protection mechanisms remains limited. Furthermore, the increased rate of minor victims (6.11%) reveals that violence poses a threat to children and young women. Among the reasons for the murders, unspecified arguments remain a high factor (59.97%). The fact that divorce requests and separation requests stand out as the primary motive for murder (18.05%) shows that women's attempts to establish independent lives and make decisions continue to be a point of conflict, resulting in homicide. Additionally, jealousy

(3.49%), rejection of reconciliation requests (3.35%), and economic reasons (2.47%) also persist as motivations for murder. Regarding methods of murder, the use of firearms remains high (55.75%), and there is a noticeable increase in cases where the perpetrator's identity or methods could not be determined (27.80%). The increase in strangulation methods (6.40%) may indicate a strengthening of the personal and physical dimensions of violence in these murders. The most significant development regarding perpetrator situations is the marked increase in the arrest rate of perpetrators (65.94%). However, the rise in the suicide rate among perpetrators (21.11%) reflects the magnitude of the psychological and social crisis following the murder. Studies in Turkey show a recent increase in domestic femicides, with perpetrators mostly coming from the women's closest circles, insufficient use of legal protection mechanisms, and violence often triggered by the woman's desire for an independent life. A comparison of studies from 2015-2017 and 2022-2024 is presented in Table 3.

Table 3*Comparison of Domestic Femicides Between 2015–2017 and 2022–2024*

Variables	2015–2017 (n=335) (%)	2022–2024 (n=774) (%)	χ^2	p-value	
The Perpetrator's Degree of Relation	Legally Married Spouse	54.63	56.33	0.26	0.61
	Religious Marriage Partner	0.9	2.18	2.03	0.154
Request for Protection	Former Spouse	8.96	9.9	0.23	0.629
	Father	9.25	8.73	0.08	0.782
	Son	6.57	3.49	4.91	0.027
	Older brother/younger brother	5.07	6.7	1	0.316
	There is	7.46	7.71	0.02	0.902
Victim's Age	None	92.54	92.29	0.02	0.902
	Minor (<18 years old)	2.69	6.11	5.33	0.021
Reason for the Murder	Adult (≥18 years old)	97.31	93.89	5.33	0.021
	Divorce Request/Separation Request	16.72	18.05	0.27	0.605
Method of Murder	Undetermined Argument	50.15	59.97	8.86	0.003
	Economic Reasons	5.67	2.47	6.85	0.009
	Jealousy	4.48	3.49	0.59	0.442
	Honor/Tradition	4.48	1.31	9.81	0.002
	Rejection of Reconciliation Request	1.79	3.35	1.95	0.163
	Firearm	56.72	55.75	0.08	0.772
	Cutting Tool	32.24	3.64	126.8	<0.001
The Status of the Perpetrator	Choke	3.88	6.4	2.72	0.099
	Undetermined	0	27.8	112	<0.001
	Prisoner	33.43	65.94	96.36	<0.001
	Suicide	15.22	21.11	4.86	0.027
	Fugitive/Escapee	8.66	6.84	1.08	0.299
	Not detected	41.19	0.44	285.9	<0.001

*Chi-square test was used.

Statistically significant changes (p<0.05) are considered valid.

Statistical significance was evaluated at $p < 0.05$. Effect sizes (Cramér's V) are reported to assess the magnitude of associations. Given the presence of large "undetermined" categories in certain variables, results should be interpreted as indicative rather than definitive structural shifts.

Although statistically significant differences were observed in several variables, the magnitude of certain associations was modest. Given potential coding instability and media-based data limitations, findings should be interpreted as reflecting general trends rather than precise structural measurements.

As shown in Table 3, there was a significant decrease in the rate of murders committed by sons with increasing degree of kinship to the perpetrator ($p=0.027$). There was a significant increase in the rate of minor victims ($p=0.021$). Among the reasons for murder, there were significant changes in undetermined disputes ($p=0.003$) and economic reasons ($p=0.009$). The rate of honor-related murders decreased significantly ($p=0.002$). In terms of murder methods, the use of sharp instruments decreased dramatically ($p<0.001$), while the rate of undetermined methods increased ($p<0.001$). Regarding the perpetrator's status, there was a significant increase in the arrest rate ($p<0.001$), a significant increase in the suicide rate of the perpetrator ($p=0.027$), and a very significant decrease in the rate of unidentified perpetrators ($p<0.001$).

There was no significant change in other degrees of closeness, such as a legally married spouse, an ex-spouse, a father, an older brother/sister, or a religiously married spouse. The rates of protection requests were similar across both periods and did not differ significantly. No significant differences were found in reasons such as jealousy and rejection of reconciliation requests, and in methods such as the use of firearms.

There are significant differences and statistically significant findings between the periods compared. Changes in the age of the victims, the reasons and methods of the murders, and the status of the perpetrators indicate that intervention policies regarding femicides need to be re-evaluated.

It should be emphasized that the statistical results presented above reflect patterns within the analyzed dataset and do not necessarily represent causal relationships or definitive national prevalence trends. The presence of large "undetermined" categories and limitations in media-based reporting may influence the distribution of certain variables.

Discussion and Conclusion

Gender theory emphasizes that femicides cannot be explained solely by individual anger or pathological conditions, but are a result of patriarchal structures controlling women's bodies (Connell, 2020), 42. Examining the methods of murder, the perpetrator's identity, and the reasons for the killings reveals that violence is most often perpetrated in the private sphere and by the closest male relatives. The fact that 54.63% of cases in 2015–2017 and 56.33% in 2022–2024 were committed by legally married spouses demonstrates that the private sphere serves as a control mechanism for maintaining male power. As Walby (1990) points out, patriarchy is reproduced not only in economic or public relations but also within the family. The fact that women's attempts at divorce, separation, or individual decision-making result in murder (16.72% and 18.05%) is indicative of the resistance shown at the societal level to women's demands for autonomy, confirming Butler & Trouble (1990) observation that gender is a performative construction. When masculinity is identified with power, control, and authority, female subjectivity is constantly suppressed in this construction process, and violence is reactivated during moments of crisis for this power. Femicide is the most extreme form of violence that masculinity resorts to when it is vulnerable. Kandiyoti's (1988) concept of "patriarchal bargaining" is important in explaining this structure because, as women try to expand their limited areas of freedom during the transformation of social structures in countries like Turkey, the male-dominated system develops harsher methods to suppress this challenge. The fact that the number of murders approximately doubled between the periods 2015–2017 and 2022–2024 shows that the visibility of this social struggle has increased, but the structural nature of inequality persists. Femicides have not only a sociological but also a legal dimension. While the judicial system in Türkiye seemingly uses egalitarian language between genders, as Smart (1990) points out, the law centers on the male experience. It evaluates the violence experienced by women at the individual level. References in judicial decisions regarding femicides to the perpetrator's remorse, the victim's behavior, or traditional norms clearly reveal the patriarchal structure of the law. This situation shows that femicides are not

only a criminal phenomenon but also an arena where social norms are reproduced in the legal sphere (Bosch-Fiol & Ferrer-Perez, 2020).

The fact that 33.43% of perpetrators were arrested and 15.22% committed suicide between 2015–2017, while the arrest rate rose to 65.94% and the suicide rate to 21.11% between 2022–2024, indicates significant changes in both the application practice of the legal system and the behavior of perpetrators. The increase in the arrest rate shows that public pressure and civil society's influence are reflected in the law. In contrast, the rise in suicide rates reveals the process of the disintegration of the normative structure of masculinity. As H. Bozkurt (2025) argues in her critical legal approach, the fact that the perpetrator's social position results in a reduction of the sentence shows that masculine norms gain indirect legitimacy in judicial practice. The inadequacy of the judiciary in protecting women's right to life proves that the law lags behind social transformation. In this study, the fact that protection request rates remained at similar levels across both periods (7.46% and 7.71%) indicates that legal mechanisms have failed to build trust among women. This rate shows that women hesitate to seek legal protection even under the threat of violence; this proves that the legal system maintains its sexist structure not only at the normative level but also at the level of social perception. From the perspective of feminist legal theory, the claim of legal neutrality is nothing more than a mask for the male-dominated social order (Rhode, 2013). Therefore, femicides indicate not only a violation of the law but also a way in which the legal system reproduces social inequalities.

According to penal statistics, female prisoners constitute approximately 4% of the entire convicted population, while about 13% of female convicts are incarcerated for "homicide." This indicates that while the number of homicide cases where women are the perpetrators is lower compared to those where men are, they do exist. Official authorities have stated that while the application of mitigating circumstances, such as provocation and good conduct, in femicide cases is a subject of debate, stricter measures have been taken in recent years, particularly to prevent the perception of impunity in cases of violence against women. When the criteria are female victim (domestic homicide) and female perpetrator (domestic homicide), it is observed

that women constitute a significant portion of the victims of domestic homicides (e.g., 45% of victims in spousal homicides are women). Looking at perpetrators of homicides within the family, the vast majority are male, with female perpetrators making up only a small percentage of all homicide cases. Female victims are mostly between 18 and 50 years old, married, or in the process of divorce. In the case of child victims, the perpetrator is generally the father or a first-degree relative on the father's side. The victims are generally the husbands/partners (spousal murders) or children/relatives (such as mothers who kill their children) of female perpetrators. Female perpetrators are mostly middle-aged, some are long-term abusive wives, and some are mothers with mental health issues. From a case study and background perspective, the murders often stem from motives such as arguments, disagreements, jealousy, honor killings, and economic problems. The pressure of patriarchal values and the rejection of requests for divorce often lead to the murder of women. Risk factors include the woman wanting to separate, the man's unemployment/addiction problems, and pressure from traditional customs. Women who kill their husbands often act out of a desire to escape violence or for self-defense. In some cases, however, psychological breakdown or acute insanity is present. A significant number of female perpetrators have experienced violence as victims or shown signs of mental health problems before committing the murder.

Male perpetrators are generally given harsh sentences (such as life imprisonment), but in practice, mitigating circumstances such as provocation and good conduct have drawn public criticism. In recent years, there has been an observed increase in unmitigated, aggravated life sentences for perpetrators of femicide. In trials of female perpetrators, self-defense and provocation may come to the forefront. Courts have been more lenient towards women who have experienced continuous violence (there are examples of acquittals in self-defense cases). On the other hand, in cases such as mothers who kill their children, mental health assessments are conducted, and their criminal responsibility is restricted. These cases generate debate in society, and the judiciary's stance is closely monitored.

The increase in femicides has highlighted the problem of gender inequality and patriarchal violence, a topic widely discussed in both academia and the media. Cases

where women are the perpetrators, while few in number, are noteworthy and require evaluation within their own specific circumstances. Judicial authorities have begun to reconsider traditional approaches in their decisions regarding female perpetrators.

The findings regarding domestic femicides in Türkiye between 2015-2017 and 2022-2024, consistent with existing academic literature and official statistics, indicate the prevalence and persistence of violence against women in Turkish society. One of the most striking points revealed in the research is that domestic femicides were predominantly perpetrated by legally married spouses in both periods (54.63%; 56.33%). This result aligns with the findings of [Erden & Akdur \(2018\)](#), clearly demonstrating that conflicts between spouses and ex-spouses escalate into the most tragic form of violence, costing women their lives. When the reasons for the murders were examined, it was found that murders resulting from requests for divorce or separation were at high rates in both periods (16.72% and 18.05%). This situation demonstrates the continued patriarchal reaction to women's freedom to make decisions about their own lives, a point frequently emphasized in the literature ([Üzümçeker & Akfırat, 2018](#)). The rejection or violent suppression of divorce and separation attempts by the male-dominated structure emerges as a major trigger for conflicts that result in murder.

The rates of protection requests were extremely low in both periods (7.46% and 7.71%). This finding, indicating that women's access to protection mechanisms is limited or ineffective, reveals that legal and social policies in the fight against violence against women are still not sufficiently effective. Indeed, statistics from the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Interior similarly indicate that protection request rates are low and implementation is limited. In terms of age group, the increase in the number of minor victims (from 2.69% to 6.11%) shows that domestic violence is increasingly threatening younger individuals. This finding is consistent with the literature emphasizing the need to prevent domestic violence through early intervention and protection programs starting in childhood ([Çalışkan & Çevik, 2018](#)). Looking at the methods of murder, the high rate of firearm use continued in both periods (56.72% and 55.75%), while there was a dramatic decrease in the use of bladed

weapons (from 32.24% to 3.64%). This suggests that the methods of murder have changed and that perpetrators have altered their methods of violence. In particular, the significant increase in cases where the method could not be determined (from 0% to 27.80%) indicates increased uncertainty in the investigation phase of murders. It shows the need to make judicial investigation processes more effective. Significant improvements were observed in the status of perpetrators. The increase in arrest rates (from 33.43% to 65.94%) and the decrease in cases where the perpetrator could not be identified (from 41.19% to 0.44%) are positive developments. However, the increased suicide rates among perpetrators (from 15.22% to 21.11%) highlight the significant psychological and social dimensions and the two-way traumatic consequences of violence (Rozant, 2010).

The digital recording of femicides represents a transformation of social memory. Halbwachs (2020) argues that memory is not an individual but a social construct, and that current social needs always reshape the past. In this sense, the Memorial Counter is not merely a data platform, but a space for social witnessing. The permanent digital presence of women's names, faces, and stories creates a form of social resistance to forgetting. As Yang (2022) defines it, such digital spaces become "memory spaces."

The Monument Counter's inception in 2013 as a digital art project demonstrated that feminist knowledge can be combined with artistic and political forms of representation. The platform's transformation into a database over time reveals that information in digital form has gained the function of public memory. The fact that a significant portion of perpetrators remained unidentified between 2015–2017 (41.19%), while this rate decreased to 0.44% between 2022–2024, shows that access to information and public oversight have strengthened with increased digital awareness, proving that digital memory is not only an archive but also a part of the search for justice. In this context, Assmann's (2011) concept of cultural memory comes to mind. Digital memory not only stores data but also serves as a tool for understanding social traumas. Digital records of femicides create a symbolic ground for social change by making previously suppressed stories visible. The differences between the two periods examined in this study point not only to an increase in violence rates but also to an increase in awareness. The increased public

discussion of femicides, their prominence in the media and academia, suggests that digital memory strengthens the capacity for social transformation. Gender represents the crisis of masculinity; law represents the sexist functioning of the justice system; feminist knowledge production represents the effort to liberate knowledge from power; and digital memory represents the resistance of social witnessing. In this context, quantitative changes between the periods 2015–2017 and 2022–2024 bear the traces of qualitative transformations. The continued persecution of murders by the closest male relatives indicates that the gender hierarchy remains unchanged. At the same time, the increase in the arrest rate of perpetrators and the decrease in ambiguous cases demonstrate the impact of digital awareness and public pressure on the legal system. Our findings show that in the 2015–2017 period, violence was most intense within the family, and protection mechanisms were ineffective; while in the 2022–2024 period, despite increased judicial response, cultural codes threatening women's right to life persisted. In Türkiye, where official data is insufficient and often censored for political reasons, the act of a collective of citizens documenting femicides reflects a part of Harding's (1991) definition of feminist epistemology, which centers women's experiences in knowledge production and questions the claim to objectivity. This is significant in that it contributes to the democratization of knowledge production. In this sense, the Monument Counter, by moving knowledge production outside of male-dominated institutions and archiving the names, ages, reasons for death, and perpetrators of murdered women in detail—representing the active form of feminist knowledge—reflects the impression that feminist epistemology has transformed into a statistical and ethical politics of memory. In this respect, it is seen as consistent with Code (2018), which defines feminist epistemology not only as alternative knowledge production but also as a form of knowledge through resistance. Our findings show that the rate of unidentified discussions increased from 50.15% in the 2015–2017 period to 59.97% in the 2022–2024 period, indicating that the causes of violence are systematically rendered invisible. The memorial counter, as a representation of feminist knowledge production, is important because it combats this invisibility, reinterpreting the reasons for women's

murders within a network of social relations, presenting them not as individual acts but as cultural constructs. However, while this platform, which opens a new window when the names of deceased women are clicked, containing information such as who killed the woman and "why," whether she requested protection, the manner of her death, and news reports about her, also creates a memory containing data on how the media reflected the events, how the related legal processes progressed, and the ratio of case numbers over the years, it is limited only to news reflected in the national press. This leads to limitations in the analysis.

This study comparatively examined domestic femicides in Türkiye across two periods (2015–2017 and 2022–2024) using media-based Monument Counter data. The findings indicate continuity in perpetrator–victim relationship patterns, with legally married spouses remaining the predominant perpetrators. Divorce and separation processes persist as recurring contextual factors. A significant increase in arrest rates and a decrease in the number of unidentified perpetrators were observed in the later period, while protection request rates remained consistently low.

An increase in the proportion of minor victims was also detected. However, large “undetermined” categories, particularly regarding motives and certain methods, limit the precision of interpretation.

Given the media-based and secondary nature of the dataset, the results should be interpreted as indicative patterns rather than definitive measures of national prevalence. Future research using official judicial data, mixed-method designs, or multivariable modeling would provide deeper structural insights.

Acknowledgments

The authors express their gratitude and appreciation to all participants.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

The study protocol adhered to the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki, which provides guidelines for ethical research involving human participants.

Ethical considerations in this study were that participation was entirely optional.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently, with personal funding, and without financial support from any governmental or private institution or organization.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contribute to this study.

References

- Akduman, İ., Çelik, D., & Tiftik, N. (2016). Female murderers: examination of the relationship between childhood traumatic experiences and anger expression. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(1), 1873-1886. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v13i1.3712>
- Altınay, A. G., & Arat, Y. (2007). Türkiye'de kadına yönelik şiddet. <https://research.sabanciuniv.edu/id/eprint/7029/>
- Anavatan, A., & Kayacan, E. Y. (2024). Investigation of femicide in Turkey: modeling time series of counts. *Quality & Quantity*, 58(3), 2013-2028. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-023-01619-6>
- Assmann, A. (2011). *Cultural memory and Western civilization: Functions, media, archives*. Cambridge University Press. <https://archive.org/details/culturalmemorywe0000assm>
- Atalay, G. E., Pehlivan, B. M., & Ribeiro, F. (2025). Multiple Shades from the Same Mirror: Femicide Representations in the Portuguese and Turkish Media. *Comparative Sociology*, 24(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15691330-bja10129>
- Beşe, G. G. (2024). Messerschmidt'in Tasnifi ve Dijital Anıt Savaş Üzerinden Türkiye'de 2024 Yılı Kadın Cinayetleri. *Akdeniz İnsani Bilimler Dergisi*, 14(2), 119-137. <https://doi.org/10.13114/mjh.1551722>
- Boira, S., Tomas-Aragones, L., & Rivera, N. (2017). Intimate partner violence and femicide in Ecuador. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 13(3), 30-47. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.13.3.03>
- Bosch-Fiol, E., & Ferrer-Perez, V. A. (2020). Femicide, intimate partner violence and legal complaints in Spain. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 29(2), 187-201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2019.1616537>
- Bozkurt, H. (2025). *Finding the Man in the Court: A Critical Legal Approach to Good Conduct Abatement*, Central European University.
- Bozkurt, S. (2025). Speaking from the margins: An autoethnography of motherhood, culture, gender and criminalisation. *Incarceration*, 6, 26326663251347449. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26326663251347449>
- Butler, J., & Trouble, G. (1990). Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. *Gender trouble*, 3(1), 3-17.

- https://selforganizedseminar.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/butler-gender_trouble.pdf
- Çağlar, A., & Ayranpınar, S. K. (2025). Toplumsal Travmaların Kavramsal Sanat Üzerinden İfadesi. *Yedi*(34), 191-202. <https://doi.org/10.17484/yedi.1648001>
- Çalışkan, H., & Çevik, E. İ. (2018). Kadına yönelik şiddetin belirleyicileri: Türkiye örneği. *Balkan Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(14), 218-233. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/bsbd/article/449297>
- Code, L. (2018). *What can she know?: feminist theory and the construction of knowledge*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501735738>
- Connell, R. W. (2020). *Masculinities*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003116479>
- 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>
- Erden, G., & Akdur, S. (2018). Türkiye’de kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet ve kadın cinayetleri. *Journal of Clinical Psychology Research*, 2(3), 128-139. <https://doi.org/10.31828/kpd2602443808092018m000003>
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Univ of California Press. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jonathan-Turner/publication/249173703_The_Theory_of_Structuration_The_Constitution_of_Society_Outline_of_the_Theory_of_Structuration_Anthony_Giddens/links/5ed31d87299bf1c67d2cb40d/The-Theory-of-Structuration-The-Constitution-of-Society-Outline-of-the-Theory-of-Structuration-Anthony-Giddens.pdf
- Halbwachs, M. (2020). *On collective memory*. University of Chicago press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/O/bo3619875.html>
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?: Thinking from women's lives*. Cornell University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt1hhfmg>
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & society*, 2(3), 274-290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124388002003004>
- Olçay, Ö. A., & Almaçık, A. (2025). Feminist movements in Turkey: Advocacy in the face of government backlash. In *Feminist movements in time and space: A European perspective* (pp. 255-282). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-77274-0_9
- Orhan, G. (2023). Şuçun Faili Olarak Kadın. *Uluslararası Ekonomi, Siyaset, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(4), 346-365. <https://doi.org/10.59445/ijephss.1342029>
- Podreka, J. (2025). Femicide. In *Encyclopedia of Diversity* (pp. 1-13). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-95454-3_591-1
- Rhode, D. L. (2013). Feminist critical theories. In *Feminist legal theories* (pp. 109-130). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315051536-5/feminist-critical-theories-deborah-rhode>
- Rozant, R. (2010). *Aile içi ve aile dışı cinayet işlemiş failerin kişilik yapılarının karşılaştırılması*. Maltepe University (Turkey). <https://doi.org/10.46629/jms.2020.3>
- Smart, C. (1990). Law's power, the sexed body, and feminist discourse. *JL & Soc'y*, 17, 194. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1410085>
- Truong, M., Yeganeh, L., Cartwright, A., Ward, E., Ibrahim, J., Cuschieri, D., Dawson, M., & Bugeja, L. (2023). Domestic/family homicide: A systematic review of empirical evidence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 24(3), 1908-1928.
- Uyanık, A., & Seymen, Ö. (2024). Medyadaki Kadın Cinayetlerinin Dijital Platformlara Yansması: Anıt Savaş Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Sağlık Bakım ve Rehabilitasyon Dergisi*, 2(3), 1-8. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/sabared/article/1408570?issue_id=82774
- Üzümçeker, E., & Akfırat, S. (2018). Kadın cinayetlerine yönelik atfların cinsiyet grubuyla özdeşleşme, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve siyasi ideolojilerle ilişkisi. *Studies in Psychology*, 38(1), 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.26650/SP372013>
- Walby, S. (1990). From private to public patriarchy: the periodisation of British history. *Women's Studies International Forum*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(90\)90076-A](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(90)90076-A)
- Yang, E. (2022). *Collectivizing Justice: Transmedia Memory Practices, Participatory Witnessing, and Feminist Space Building in Nicaragua*. University of Southern California. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/0d8d7fe2370f8c08ea1351d9b4ca8ed6/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>