

DONNA J. KING

Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide

An Exploration of
Coercive Control
and Lethality

ROUTLEDGE

The Routledge logo, featuring a stylized white 'R' shape on a dark background.

Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide

In the United States and most parts of the world, law, policy, policing, and prevention work addressing domestic and intimate partner violence is created and enacted based on a violence model. Likewise, it is generally believed that all victims of intimate partner homicide are victims of intimate partner violence, through physical abuse, prior to the incident of homicide, and that this violence is reported beforehand.

Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide takes a critical look at these misconceived notions and sheds light on multiple non-violent forms of controlling behavior that precipitate intimate partner homicide. The book bases its critical examination on a content analysis of court-filed Petitions for Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence. Through these records, as well as corresponding police and homicide reports, the accounts of the victims, and their relationships with their offenders, come to life. Recurring coercive control tactics are coded and analyzed across multiple accounts, including intimidation, isolation, and humiliation, to illustrate the ways in which individuals are threatened prior to homicide and the true extent of harm that happens in the absence of physical violence. Considering the victim's responses, as well as their interaction with law enforcement and the court system prior to their death, the author challenges current legal and policy initiatives made to address and protect victims from intimate partner violence and argues that non-violent controlling behaviors deserve more attention in lethality risk assessments that are utilized throughout the United States.

For practitioners, advocates, researchers, and students, this book provides an intimate and important account of the causes and consequences of intimate partner violence prior to homicide and a rare window into the victim's overall experience.

Donna J. King, Ph.D., J.D., is an IPV survivor and President/Director for Victims' Safe Harbor Foundation, Inc., a 501(c)3 social impact organization that provides legal, educational and policy services on domestic

violence and child abuse. She received her Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Central Florida, where her areas of expertise focused on domestic violence, social inequalities, law and society, gender, and criminology. She also holds a juris doctorate from the Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University College of Law and is a Florida licensed attorney in good standing.

“Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide grew out of Dr. King’s dissertation. It is an important addition to the literature in the area, as the depth of research exposes the seriousness of non-violent coercive control tactics and the part they may play as precursors to intimate partner homicide. Non-violent coercive control tactics must be included in the definition and as indicators of intimate partner homicide on lethality risk assessments.

Whether you are new to the study of intimate partner violence or have researched the area for years, by reading this book like me, you are bound to gain new insights into abusive relationships!”

Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine, *Emerita Professor,
Department of Sociology, University of Central Florida*

“Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide by Donna King, Ph.D., J.D., is a ‘must read’ for all domestic violence advocates. Its publication coincides with the unrolling of the White House National Plan to End Gender-Based Violence and will contribute substantially to the body of knowledge that will help to end family and intimate partner violence and murder.”

Connie Valentine M.S., *co-founder of California
Protective Parents Association*

“Systems interacting with targets of coercive controllers have skated along for a half-century, utilizing incomplete, outdated information to build stale practices, policies, and laws that have done more to endanger than to help. Family courts, the ultimate gatekeepers for victim safety, are behind decades in utilizing the available obsolete information; lives are being snuffed out in the information gap.

Enter *Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide*, the bible you didn’t know you need, to enumerate just how lethal coercive controllers are. The knowledge gained here is your ‘know better,’ so you can ‘do better.’ Lives everywhere are dependent on you doing just that.”

Kathy Jones, *Creator of The Maze of
Coercive Control, Mother Justice Network*

“*Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide* is one of the first of its kind to acknowledge and provide data regarding coercive control and its precursors to homicide in Domestic Violence. Domestic Violence is a complex and multidimensional issue and *Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide* brings darkness to light by providing extensive research on how coercive control is more dangerous than often acknowledged. A good read for those working with survivors, as well as those trying to create an understanding of Coercive Control.”

Linda L. Parker, Ph.D. *President and CEO of
Women In Distress of Broward County*

Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide

An Exploration of Coercive Control
and Lethality

Donna J. King

Designed cover image: Erich Martin

First published 2024

by Routledge

605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

and by Routledge

4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2024 Donna J. King

The right of Donna J. King to be identified as author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

ISBN: 978-0-367-56388-2 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-367-56386-8 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-09748-8 (ebk)

DOI: [10.4324/9781003097488](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003097488)

Typeset in Sabon

by KnowledgeWorks Global Ltd.

Details of the cases reported in this book are based upon facts available at the time of writing and readers should be mindful of any subsequent updates.

This book is dedicated to those who lost their lives to intimate partner homicide, as well as all the intimate partner violence victims who struggle every day to survive horrific acts of physical violence and non-violent tactics of coercive control.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | <i>xiv</i> |
| <i>List of Abbreviations</i> | <i>xv</i> |
| | |
| Introduction | 1 |
| <i>Davenport v. Davenport</i> | 1 |
| <i>Significance of the Research</i> | 8 |
| | |
| PART I | |
| The Gender Identity of Coercive Control | 19 |
| | |
| 1 Women’s Rights, Domestic Violence, and Intimate Partner Violence | 21 |
| <i>Explaining the Inexplicable: The Difficulty in Defining “Intimate Partner Violence”</i> | 21 |
| <i>Gender and Intimate Partner Violence: Legislating against Patriarchal Violence</i> | 23 |
| <i>The Gender Asymmetry of Coercive Control</i> | 28 |
| | |
| 2 Not All Intimate Partner Violence Is Created Equal | 33 |
| <i>Coercive Control’s Impact on the Intimate Partner Violence Victim</i> | 34 |
| <i>Intimidation</i> | 34 |
| <i>Isolation</i> | 37 |
| <i>Humiliation</i> | 39 |
| <i>Power and Control</i> | 40 |

Fearful of the Future 43
Resistance to Abuse 44
Abuser Mental Illness 45
Physical Violence 46

3 Assessing the Risk: Understanding an Intimate Partner Violence Victim's Risk of Death 51

The Risk of Leaving: She Knows He's a Threat, but Does Anyone Else? 51
The Role of Intimate Partner Homicide-Suicide in Intimate Partner Homicide 52
The Disillusionment of the Protections of an Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence: Why and When Are They Important to Intimate Partner Violence Victims? 54
Litigation Abuse or Judicial Terrorism®? 55
Gender Bias in the Courts 58
Litigation and Coercive Control: Not Every Petition for Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence Is the Same 59

4 Understanding Intimate Partner Homicide Victims from Their Own Data 64

Methodology for Data Collection: Sourcing Public Records 64
The Florida Department of Law Enforcement Uniform Crime Report-Supplemental Homicide Report Data 65
Florida Local Law Enforcement Agencies 66
The Florida County Courthouse 68
A Comparison of Intimate Partner Homicide Studies 69
Theorizing Intimate Partner Violence and Intimate Partner Homicide 73
Black's Theory of the Behavior of Law 74
Bellew's Explanation of the Intimate Partner Violence Socioeconomic Divide 75
Theoretical Implications from the Avakame et al. (1999) Study 76

| | |
|---|-----------|
| PART II | |
| Voices of Intimate Partner Homicide Victims | 83 |
| 5 The Torture of Coercive Control | 85 |
| <i>Intimidation</i> | 89 |
| <i>Animal Abuse</i> | 91 |
| <i>Harassment</i> | 93 |
| <i>Surveillance</i> | 95 |
| <i>Threats</i> | 96 |
| <i>Threatens Friends and Family</i> | 99 |
| <i>Weapons</i> | 101 |
| <i>Isolation</i> | 103 |
| <i>Economic Control</i> | 107 |
| <i>False Imprisonment</i> | 109 |
| <i>Financial Control</i> | 112 |
| 6 The Insidious and Omnipresent Coercive Control | 125 |
| <i>Humiliation</i> | 125 |
| <i>Degradation</i> | 126 |
| <i>Name Calling</i> | 128 |
| <i>Power and Control</i> | 130 |
| <i>Child Abuse</i> | 134 |
| <i>Violent Acts toward Family and Friends</i> | 137 |
| <i>Taking Children from Victim</i> | 137 |
| <i>Deprivation of Necessities</i> | 142 |
| <i>Psychologically Controlling</i> | 143 |
| <i>Verbal Abuse</i> | 147 |
| <i>Household, Clothes, and Personal Belongings</i> | |
| <i>Destroyed</i> | 149 |
| 7 When the Intimate Partner Violence Victim Resists the Abuse | 165 |
| <i>Fearful of the Future</i> | 165 |
| <i>Fear of Children's Safety</i> | 166 |
| <i>Pregnant</i> | 170 |
| <i>Resistance to Abuse</i> | 172 |
| <i>Helping Abuser</i> | 177 |
| <i>Separated or Estranged</i> | 181 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>Abuser Mental Illness</i> | 183 |
| <i>Drinking Alcohol</i> | 188 |
| <i>Drug Use</i> | 192 |
| <i>Paranoia</i> | 195 |
| 8 Physical Violence, the Ultimate in Power and Control? | 213 |
| <i>Physical Violence</i> | 213 |
| <i>Nonfatal Strangulation</i> | 217 |
| <i>Rape and Sexual Abuse</i> | 220 |
| <i>Familicide and the Family Annihilator</i> | 222 |
| <i>Judicial Terrorism® Revisited</i> | 232 |
| PART III | |
| Regulating Coercive Control: Lessons from Intimate Partner Violence and Intimate Partner Homicide Data | 255 |
| 9 The Frequencies of Coercive Control | 257 |
| <i>Demographics of Intimate Partner Homicide Victims</i> | 263 |
| <i>Native Americans</i> | 264 |
| <i>Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders</i> | 264 |
| <i>Multiple Petitions for Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence</i> | 265 |
| <i>Abuser Mental Illness Disclosed</i> | 266 |
| <i>The Intimate Partner Violence Victim's Resistance to Abuse</i> | 267 |
| <i>The Effectiveness of Orders of Injunctions for Protection Against Domestic Violence</i> | 268 |
| <i>The Interactions of Coercive Control Tactics</i> | 270 |
| <i>Qualitative Frequency Interactions</i> | 270 |
| <i>Quantitative Methods Results</i> | 271 |
| 10 Coercive Control Legislation and Reimagining Lethality Risk Assessment for Intimate Partner Violence | 293 |
| <i>Coercive Control Legislation in the United States</i> | 293 |
| <i>Addressing the Legislative Gaps of Coercive Control</i> | 293 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| | <i>Reimagining Intimate Partner Violence Lethality Risk Assessments</i> | 300 |
| | <i>Reallocating Intimate Partner Violence Resources</i> | 301 |
| 11 | Conclusion | 307 |
| | <i>Limitations to the Study</i> | 309 |
| | <i>Future Directions for Research</i> | 311 |
| | <i>One Final Word</i> | 313 |
| | <i>Appendix: Codebook – Coercive Control Themes and Subthemes</i> | 316 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 320 |

Acknowledgments

This study would not have been possible without the dedication and support of many extraordinary people. First, *Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine*, my major professor and dissertation chair, is the reason this book is a reality. Without her vision, this project would not have occurred. Second, I would like to thank Kathy Jones for her support since the time of my dissertation and for her fabulous *Maze of Coercive Control*. She has shaped my views on the non-violent tactics of coercive control since I was in law school.

My family, including my *mom, dad, stepmother, daughters, and stepsons*, was an incredible support system as I worked throughout my Ph.D. program and on this book. I could not have done any of it without their steadfast love and inspiration. I especially want to thank my husband, *Dayton King*, who has been my biggest moral supporter throughout the writing of this book. I also have many friends who have provided tremendous encouragement throughout this process, and I want to thank them as well. They know who they are, and I am forever indebted to them for all their undying support and encouragement.

To the many domestic violence and legal professionals who have encouraged and supported me as I have been writing this book, thank you. The work you do daily is critical, and I hope this book assists you in your endeavors.

Dad, this is my encore. I know you are watching.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Be-On-the-Look-Out | BOLO |
| Dissolution of Marriage Action | DOM |
| Domestic violence | DV |
| Florida Department of Law Enforcement | FDLE |
| Uniform Crime Report Supplemental Homicide Report | UCR-SHR |
| Florida Department of Children and Families | DCF |
| Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence [with Minor Children] | final injunction |
| Injunction Court | court |
| Intimate Partner Homicide | IPH |
| Intimate Partner Homicide-Suicide | IPHS |
| Intimate Partner Violence | IPV |
| Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, Intersex, Asexual, and (expanding) | LGBTQIA+ |
| National Crime Victimization Survey | NCVS |
| National Family Violence Surveys | NFVS |
| Office of Violence Against Women at the United States Department of Justice | OVW |
| Petition for Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence | petition for injunction |
| Temporary Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence | temporary injunction |
| Variance Inflation Factor | VIF |



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Introduction

Davenport v. Davenport

On March 29, 2004, Deborah Davenport filed a petition for injunction for protection against domestic violence [hereinafter *petition for injunction*] against her husband, Joseph.¹ In her petition, she explained that, on March 28, 2004, Joseph came home drunk and was angry because she did not have dinner ready for the family; they had three children.² He believed she should have had dinner ready when he got home.³ As she continued to describe in her petition, the family was sitting around the dinner table as Joseph commanded they do on a regular basis.⁴ But that night, he informed the children that the he and Deborah were getting a divorce and that he was moving to New Jersey without the children.⁵ Deborah recounted Joseph's demands that the family share how they felt about the situation in that moment, while they sat there eating dinner, whether they wanted to or not.⁶

As this continued to take place, Joseph became louder and more insistent that the family participate in his demands.⁷ To ensure their compliance, Deborah detailed in her petition how Joseph put a bullet to each one of their heads.⁸ He told the family which one of them would be killed first; his plan was youngest to oldest.⁹ But he planned to spare the oldest because she had a job.¹⁰ He would kill Deborah with two bullets because the divorce was her fault.¹¹ He told them he would try to shoot himself twice in the process of killing himself.¹² She explained that it was clear to her that the children were being tormented; but he continued even though they were all crying.¹³ He repeatedly stated the day and month and told them to remember the date on the calendar because it would be their last day on earth.¹⁴ He wanted them to know that their deaths would make front-page news the next morning and how their house would be a crime scene.¹⁵ But he went to use the bathroom; telling them "if [they] wanted to make a 'run for it', 'now would be the time.'"¹⁶ So, Deborah and the children ran out of the house and drove away to safety.¹⁷

2 Introduction

On March 29, 2004, the day Deborah's petition for injunction was filed, she was granted an *ex parte*¹⁸ temporary injunction for protection against domestic violence [with minor children] [hereinafter *temporary injunction*].¹⁹ On April 8, 2004, after notice to Joseph, a hearing was held in which the court entered a final judgment of injunction for protection against domestic violence [with minor children] [hereinafter *final injunction*], which did not expire without further order of the court.²⁰ Nevertheless, on April 21, 2004, Deborah filed a motion for modification of the injunction for protection she had against Joseph, stating that she wished to have the final injunction, issued just 13 days prior, changed because he received help for his alcohol and anger issues.²¹ She also explained that she wanted to work on her marriage.²² On April 8, 2004, her motion resulted in dismissal of the final injunction against Joseph.²³ Because the final injunction was dismissed, on July 1, 2004, Joseph received an order from the court releasing his firearms.²⁴

The couple lived together as husband and wife for the following eight years, seemingly without incident or any reports of physical violence to law enforcement or the court. However, on July 1, 2012, Deborah and the children, now much older, moved out of the marital residence because she was considering divorce and told Joseph she wanted one month to consider the situation.²⁵ But on August 1, 2012, during the early morning hours while she was leaving for work, Joseph kidnapped Deborah from the home where she was living with the children.²⁶ He drove her to the marital residence, shot, and killed her.²⁷ He died by turning the gun on himself.²⁸ Both Deborah and Joseph were found lying together in bed, face up, naked.²⁹ Deborah had several wounds that indicated she had been beaten prior to her death.³⁰

It is difficult to know exactly what type of relationship Deborah and Joseph experienced for the eight years between the dismissal of the final injunction and release of firearms in 2004 and their deaths in 2012. It is possible they lived free of physical violence and threats of physical violence during that time. However, it is also possible that, if there were such episodes of physical violence or threats thereof, they went unreported to law enforcement and the court. Other types of intimate partner violence (IPV)³¹ Deborah described in her petition for injunction, which are not related to physical violence or the threat thereof, are non-violent tactics of abuse that occur during the daily lives of abuse victims throughout the United States and the world.³² These tactics are utilized by the IPV abuser against their victim on an ongoing basis to invoke power and control, and, often, to terrorize their victim without the need for physical violence to accomplish the goal of exerting this power over their victim.³³

Victims of abuse, especially women, from all socioeconomic levels throughout the United States and the world, living with and without children, married and single, suffer ongoing, torturous abuse, that frequently

leads to death, often without being physically beaten by their abuser prior to the killing.³⁴ In 2020, the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control's Division of Violence Prevention at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported how common IPV is by explaining that millions of people each year, both men and women, are affected by it at some point in their lifetime.³⁵ Women experience IPV at a much higher rate than men, i.e., "1 in 4 women and 1 in 10 men experience sexual violence, physical violence and/or stalking by an intimate partner during their lifetime with 'IPV-related impact' such as being concerned for their safety, PTSD [post-traumatic stress disorder] symptoms, injury, or needing victim services."³⁶ When considering its many forms, women experience IPV at consistently higher rates than men each year throughout the United States.³⁷

A debate exists among experts regarding the experiences of IPV between the genders and its relative applicability to society's patriarchal gender norms.³⁸ The concept known as gender-symmetry, or conversely gender-asymmetry, is the cornerstone of this debate.³⁹ The debate about whether gender-symmetry or gender-asymmetry is applicable to a particular IPV situation is, generally, contextualized in relation to *situational couple violence* because the data for such are contained within general survey data.⁴⁰ But Johnson (2010) explains that biases exist within these "representative survey samples" that create the illusion of a gender-symmetric perpetration of violence between couples.⁴¹ Indeed, most researchers, practitioners, and academics understand IPV as a highly gendered combination of tactics of abuse, intended to exert power and control over another person, that may or may not include physical violence; in short, this continuum of abuse, used primarily by men, is known as *coercive control*.⁴² In fact, Barlow and Walklate's (2021) recent study regarding risk assessments and coercive control found that 95 percent of coercive control victims were women and 93 percent of its offenders were men.⁴³ And Dobash and Dobash (2015) explain that intimate partner homicide (IPH) across the world is asymmetrical.⁴⁴

This book acknowledges that both men and women, whether in heterosexual or same-sex relationships, experience IPV as victims and commit the same as offenders.⁴⁵ Indeed, this Introduction illustrates that family members can become collateral and/or covictims of coercive control, if not direct victims themselves. However, this book's focus, including its empirical research, is on IPV and IPH between heterosexual spouses. But this focus is not intended to minimize the effects of IPV or IPH within same-sex intimate relationships or among other forms of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, Intersex, Asexual, and (expanding) (LG-BTQIA+) intimate partner relationships.⁴⁶

IPV often presents in an ongoing, coercive, and controlling manner and has a much more devastating impact on its victim than physical violence alone, including the risk of lethality.⁴⁷ Many of the tactics utilized by an

4 *Introduction*

IPV abuser to control their victim, which do not involve the use of physical violence, include isolation, intimidation, harassment, and power and control.⁴⁸ However, these tactics are the broader range of “themes” that help to explain how an abuser invokes control in the daily life of their victim. This book provides empirical data relevant to these themes and their corresponding “subthemes” to help further explain how an abuser utilizes the non-violent tactics of coercive control to micromanage their victim’s everyday routine to eliminate their victim’s sense of autonomy and self-worth. These themes and subthemes help to elucidate the victim’s responses to their abuse, whether physical or non-violent, when attempting to free themselves from their abuser’s power and control.

There is a lack of consensus about the causes of IPV, which stems from differing worldwide cultural accounts and explanations.⁴⁹ Little progress is being made toward the elimination of this devastating social epidemic, leaving many victims and their children without the services they desperately need.⁵⁰ Additionally, abusers who want to improve their circumstances might find themselves lacking the resources available to them to do so.⁵¹ This is because, typically, abusers are only provided state funded intervention resources once they are under the court’s jurisdiction, which generally only happens when they become physically violent toward their victim.⁵² One reason for this is because there is little agreement among scholars, legislators, law enforcement, prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, advocates and IPV program employees about how to universally define the collective of behaviors attributed to IPV, as well as to how to respond to this social problem that is among the list of the most misunderstood crimes.⁵³

Understanding and classifying the types of physically abusive acts constituting physical and sexual abuse is easier achieved than accepting the concept of the continuum of behaviors that are the non-violent forms of IPV, also commonly referred to or known as financial, economic, mental, verbal, psychological, and/or emotional abuse, i.e., coercive control.⁵⁴ These intangible forms of coercive and controlling behaviors, which are continuously utilized by the abuser against the victim, have a very different and long-lasting effect on the victim when invoked through non-violent tactics rather than through physical violence or other criminal acts.⁵⁵ As a result, over time, the abuser is able to control the victim, even without being in the victim’s presence, due to the overwhelming effect these non-violent tactics have on the victim. Indeed, the abuser maintains a sense of omnipresence over the victim once the abuser’s coercive control is firmly established.

National, state, and local governments throughout the world employ different definitions in their recognition and prosecution of IPV or domestic violence (DV).⁵⁶ Many definitions include physical acts of violence because there is more universal agreement that IPV includes hitting, grabbing, choking, stabbing, etc.; and these acts are able to be easily legislated

as single, isolated incidents.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, a need for legislating the non-violent tactics of coercive control exists and advocates around the world have argued for the implementation of criminal and civil laws to assist in curtailing their use by abusers against victims and other covictims.⁵⁸ Wright (2013) explains that some governmental bodies – such as the Office of Violence Against Women at the United States Department of Justice (OVW) and the United Nations – agree that IPV manifests itself in physical, sexual, and psychological abuse, occurring concomitantly rather than in isolation.⁵⁹ The behaviors embodying these forms of abuse are not mutually exclusive; yet they are often legislated and enforced as though they occur discretely.⁶⁰ Still, a uniform, all-encompassing definition, inclusive of the multitude of behaviors encompassing the continuum of coercive control's non-violent tactics that is accepted throughout the United States at the federal and state level, remains elusive.

Most U.S. state statutes regulating “domestic violence,” “domestic abuse,” “family violence,” or “intimate partner violence” generally proscribe isolated incidents of physical violence, especially in the criminal law system.⁶¹ The majority of U.S. state statutes do not address behaviors by an abuser in which the abusive acts occur over an extended period of time whereby the physical acts of violence may be non-existent or pale in comparison to the overall non-violent abusive behaviors.⁶² Laws often utilize the terms DV, domestic abuse, family violence, or intimate partner violence interchangeably, adding to the difficulty of developing unity among governing bodies and law enforcement authorities to define all abusive behaviors, both violent and non-violent, occurring between intimate partners.⁶³ But, if any of these definitions included language covering the abusive behaviors that describe the non-violent tactics of coercive control, they might begin to protect the IPV victim who is suffering the torturous effects of this type of abuse that does not require physical violence for its effectiveness. And, in fact, a handful of civil U.S. state statutes are making advancements toward doing so; but there is much more work to be done.⁶⁴

To provide broader protection that encompasses all victims of IPV, including those who experience non-violent tactics without any physical violence, it is necessary for legislators to understand that the non-violent forms of abuse may be just as devastating to the victim, if not more so in some cases, than the physical acts.⁶⁵ Accordingly, it is reasonable to think that, with such an understanding, legislators would seek to protect their citizenry from non-violent forms of abuse, similarly to how they have from the physically violent forms. Thus, the main research question posed in this mixed-methods exploratory study seeks to determine whether coercive control, exclusive of a prior reporting of physical violence to law enforcement or the court, presents a significant risk of death due to the killing of the heterosexual spouse by the other spouse.

6 Introduction

Scholars from various academic disciplines and experts in related fields, including sociology, psychology, and law, have studied DV for decades, mostly focusing on its nonlethal forms; yet the murder of women by their intimate partners has attracted comparatively little attention.⁶⁶ During the last quarter of the 20th century, IPH research focused more on women as the perpetrators rather than as the victims, leading to the development of the battered women's defense.⁶⁷ But the problem of IPH of women persisted, as it does today.⁶⁸ Every day in the United States, three or more women are killed by an intimate partner, whether current, estranged, or former.⁶⁹ More recently, scholarly attention has started to focus on IPV and the potential of women as IPH victims.⁷⁰ Yet, the availability of reliable, unbiased, and generalizable data for studies about IPH is still difficult to obtain.⁷¹ Thus, IPV and the murder of women by their abusive intimate partners needs to be studied together because women are more likely to become the victim of an IPH than any other category of homicide.⁷²

The general notion is that an IPV victim, who is scared for their life from their intimate partner, would contact law enforcement or the judicial system to secure protection for themselves (including their children) from their abuser; but this may not always be the case.⁷³ It is often assumed that a physically violent event between intimate partners would result in an intervention by law enforcement or by the victim choosing to leave the abuser; however, this is not necessarily the outcome of IPV.⁷⁴ Indeed, there exists an abundance of research that explains that many IPV victims, including those who ultimately become victims of IPH, do not report every act, or multiple acts, of IPV.⁷⁵ Yet, there also exists a plethora of research and academic literature linking the social issue of IPV to arrest rates and whether the policing of IPV is positively affecting the lives of IPV victims, especially the prevention of their death from IPH, suggesting that the victim did seek law enforcement's intervention.⁷⁶ Contrarily, there is a dearth of research and academic literature analyzing the experiences between an offender and the victim of an IPH prior to the killing, especially focusing on the long-term effects of coercive control on a victim, which are understood to be much worse than physical abuse alone.⁷⁷ This study begins to fill the empirical gap where the research on IPV arrests ends and the research into the lives of IPV victims and offenders, who become the IPH victims and offenders, begins. Indeed, this book follows the cases to a conclusion with explanations of the aftermath of the killings.

The theoretical framework stemming from the predominant body of literature, focusing on the risk factors for the lethality of women in relationships where IPV is present, is based on the notion of recidivism, meaning those who are repeatedly arrested for IPV or violent crimes are the most at risk for committing re-abuse or IPH.⁷⁸ The research interest in arrest rates stemmed from early 1980s research that concluded arresting

abusers was the most effective method in reducing re-abuse, including over mediation and counseling.⁷⁹ Because of the implementation of mandatory arrest, mandatory prosecution, and proarrest policies, due to the passage of nationwide legislation against DV, many studies began to look at the efficacy of these policies.⁸⁰ However, these arrest-based studies only look to the impacts of the physical violence allegations between the intimate partners and the criminal justice response as opposed to their outcome-based implications on the IPV victim.⁸¹ Yet, researchers, academics, and social workers understand that events in the life cycle of abuse, such as separation or the threat of separation, increases the likelihood of IPH.⁸² Previous abuse, the presence of firearms, alcohol and drug abuse, jealousy and mental illness are just a few of the risk factors identified when determining lethality risks for victims of IPV; but much less is known about the risk factors for IPH.⁸³

Unquestionably, protecting IPV victims from non-violent tactics of coercive control is a challenging and unresolved proposition because it is difficult to measure coercive control when definitions and regulations rely upon traditional norms and standards of physical acts of violence.⁸⁴ In fact, coercive control is rarely recognized by courts; and, if it is, it is simply to inform the court about the likelihood of future physical harm to its victims rather than using it solely as a basis for issuing a civil injunction to protect an IPV victim.⁸⁵ Rarely do the U.S. criminal and civil justice court systems consider episodes of IPV that do not include physical violence as offenses worthy of punishment or deserving of protection for the victim.⁸⁶ It is due to this inherent disregard for the most devastating forms of abuse, i.e., the non-violent tactics of coercive control, that this study was developed.

One goal of this study was to contextualize and operationalize coercive control, using secondary data collected from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's (FDLE) Uniform Crime Report Supplemental Homicide Report (UCR-SHR), law enforcement records, and court documents for the years January 1, 2006, to June 30, 2016. Content analysis of the petitions for injunction between the IPH victim and offender spouses was conducted, employing NVivo 12 Pro, a qualitative social sciences software package. NVivo 12 Pro helped to analyze the petition for injunction narratives, filed with the clerk of courts throughout Florida by IPV victims, for the development of an understanding of the nature of the abusive intimate partner relationships between the heterosexual spousal couples involved in IPHs. Also, the raw data from the coding in NVivo Pro 12 were used in the quantitative phase of this study to determine the association between non-violent coercive control tactics and prior reporting of physical violence to law enforcement, as well as to the injunction court [hereinafter *court*]. Additional variables were also considered in the quantitative phase of the study using IBM SPSS®, an advanced statistical software analysis program.

8 Introduction

In furthering the notion that an IPH victim, involved in a heterosexual spousal relationship, may or may not have reported physical violence to law enforcement or the court prior to their death, Donald Black's (2010) theory of *the behavior of law* is instructive.⁸⁷

Significance of the Research

Prior to conducting this study, no large-scale, empirical study existed that documents coercive control rather than, or concurrent with, physical violence preceding an IPH.⁸⁸ Johnson (2010), in explaining the importance of examining the broader social context of IPV, “[made] a plea for an increased focus on qualitative research.”⁸⁹ Wydall and Zerk (2020), who conducted a qualitative study on twelve victim-survivors of coercive control, echoed Johnson’s sentiment by stating “there are very few qualitative studies that explore victim-survivors’ lived experiences of coercive control when attempting to seek protection from the police and other criminal justice agents.”⁹⁰ This study adds to the dearth of qualitative studies on IPV and coercive control by providing a comprehensive content analysis of the data derived from the petition for injunction narratives filed by IPV victims in sixty-two (62) cases filed with the clerks of court throughout Florida where the IPHs took place.

Block and Christakos (1995) explain that the particulars of an IPH rarely provide information about the intimate details of the relationship, as well as the events and circumstances that took place prior to the IPH.⁹¹ However, the aim of this study was to accomplish just that, meaning it traced each case to elucidate the IPV victim’s interactions with the abuser, as well as the criminal and civil justice system prior to the IPH. Since, historically, the IPH of women has received little academic attention because the focus was on physical violence, one goal of this study was to highlight the fact that emphasizing physical violence in an intimate partner relationship to identify high risk IPV victims may be misplaced.⁹² In fact, most of the research involving lethality risks for IPV victims stems from the abusers’ arrest data rather than from any type of IPH data.⁹³ This study distinguishes itself because it utilizes petitions for injunctions between the heterosexual spouses, meaning the IPV victims’ data, as one of its sources for data collection to understand the relationship between the IPH victim and offender. However, it is essential for a full understanding of the data to clarify that, although the spouses in each case remain the same, the IPV victim and offender may not always be the same as the IPH victim and offender. Meaning, in some cases, the IPV victim became the IPH offender because the IPV victim killed their abuser.

It is important that these data were collected and analyzed to assess the efforts, or lack thereof, made by IPV victims, law enforcement authorities,

and the judicial system, to protect victims prior to an IPH. Empirical literature analyzing the effects of legislation on IPV *beyond* the point of arrest is not readily available, if at all. Although recent literature is working to fill the voids, there is a dearth of information related to the non-violent tactics of coercive control and risk factors of IPH.⁹⁴ This lack of empirical literature also includes an analysis of enacted laws protecting against coercive control, including its non-violent tactics.⁹⁵ Most of the accessible research about coercive control legislation concerns the arguments for, or against, such laws rather than assessing the enforcement or efficacy of any such laws that are currently in place.⁹⁶ The goal of this study is to help fill the gaps in the existing empirical literature regarding IPV and IPH so that it will provide helpful data for future research into IPV and IPH, as well as coercive control for social science, legal, and criminal justice perspectives and implications.

Websdale (2010) describes the establishment of the National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative, a federally funded fatality review board established in October 1999.⁹⁷ He explains that many fatality review boards begin by examining intimate partner homicide-suicides (IPHSs).⁹⁸ However, Dobash and Dobash (2015) discuss the problems presented with conducting IPH case studies, in particular, including that of fatality reviews because of the inability to generalize the results.⁹⁹ They explain that in-depth details about a small sample size of cases may be useful for local policies and practices, but it is not possible to use the results for making any conclusions regarding the population studied as a whole.¹⁰⁰ But this study seeks to provide both IPH case studies, which includes cases of IPHSs, and empirical research results that are generalizable.

Similar to other DV fatality reviews overseen by the National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative, the Fatality Review Team was created in 2009 after a drastic increase in DV homicides in Florida.¹⁰¹ The purpose of the Fatality Review Team is to identify means to improve responses to DV and to “support community partners and systemic services in ongoing efforts to reduce and prevent domestic violence homicides in Florida.”¹⁰² The team provides a report of comprehensively reviewed selected DV homicide cases “*or near homicides*” [emphasis added] from the state’s complete set of DV homicide cases as provided by the FDLE’s Uniform Crime Report.¹⁰³ The 2019 Florida Domestic Violence Fatality Review report analyzed 31 homicides that occurred between 2009 and 2018.¹⁰⁴ The resultant report is quite detailed; however, it lacks in the volume of cases for generalizability to the population for an empirical study.¹⁰⁵ For instance, the report covered an IPHS, which seems to have been hand selected for the purposes of presentation in the report.¹⁰⁶ Due to the nature of the Florida Attorney General’s Statewide Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team, this is appropriate; however, it is possible that more IPHSs might need to be included in their sample of cases if the review team wants

it to reflect more accurate statistics regarding the potential prevalence of IPHS in Florida. Caman et al. (2017) explain that:

[a] deficiency in the scientific landscape of homicide is the systematic omission of homicide-suicide perpetrators from prominent datasets, as they are not charged or convicted. This results in increased risk of bias, especially related to IPH, as profound percentage of the IPH offenders commit suicide in connection to the homicidal act.¹⁰⁷

Thus, one of this study's contributions is to add to the body of work that the state of Florida currently has regarding IPHs and IPHSs. Indeed, fatality review teams serve a very important purpose in detailing DV homicides throughout the state each year. However, this study provides valuable information for key stakeholders because it provides detailed case studies, and it is generalizable.

Part I of this book provides a comprehensive introduction to the concepts of DV, IPV, and coercive control. Through detailed explanations for defining these concepts, the policies behind their current legislation, and the gender debate surrounding IPV, the difficulty in promoting change becomes evident. The themes and subthemes of coercive control, as derived from this study, are detailed, as well as the risks an IPV victim faces when leaving their abuser. IPHS is discussed to prepare the reader for the cases that follow in later chapters. The process of filing for and obtaining an injunction for protection against DV is examined, as well as the complex process of litigation between an IPV victim and their abuser, which may be referred to as judicial terrorism®. The concept of gender bias in the courts is covered, culminating in the notion that judges, who render discretionary decisions in injunction cases, do not necessarily provide the most impartial treatment toward IPV victims in their courts. Finally, in **Part I**, the methodology and theory behind this study is discussed in detail.

Part II provides the sixty-two (62) case studies, broken down by each coercive control theme and subtheme, resulting from the content analysis from the qualitative phase of the study. Throughout this part of the book, the voices of the IPV victims, the majority of whom became the IPH victims, tell their stories of how they came to the court to ask for protection from their abusers. Every theme and subtheme are discussed throughout this portion of the book to help contextualize the information learned from each case study. Each story is told to its ultimate conclusion, beyond just the point of arrest, so a more thorough understanding of the case and its complexities may be understood, including the ensuing criminal trial and sentencing if relevant. **Part III** presents this study's qualitative and quantitative results and findings. The lessons learned from the IPH victims and the voices of the IPV victims who provided the data for this empirical

research are reviewed and discussed. Additionally, the policy implications from these lessons are detailed so that progress toward improved protections for IPV victims may be accomplished, including changes in legislation and lethality risk assessments.

This study gives meaning to the lives of the IPH victims behind the incident report numbers on the FDLE's UCR-SHR and provides a deeper, richer understanding of the process law enforcement and judicial system personnel confront regularly in attempting to protect the IPV victim prior to an IPH. By doing so, it is possible to determine whether physical violence is the only, or even the most, important indicator of lethality risk for IPV victims, as is the current policy. The results of this study should have far reaching implications for lethality risk assessment policies for IPH and for IPV victims who request temporary and/or final injunctions or any other forms of legal assistance or protective services. Briefly stated, lives depend on finding answers to the questions posed in this book.

Notes

- 1 *See generally* Davenport v. Davenport, 2004-DR-1235 (2004) (Pet. for Inj. Against Dom. Viol.). In Florida, although the terminology may be different in other states, a civil court order for protection against domestic violence is referred to as an injunction for protection against domestic violence, which is obtained by filing a petition for injunction against domestic violence.
- 2 *See Id.* at 3.
- 3 *See Id.*
- 4 *See Id.*
- 5 *See Id.*
- 6 *See Id.*
- 7 *See Id.*
- 8 *See Id.*
- 9 *See Id.*
- 10 *See Id.*
- 11 *See Id.*
- 12 *See Id.*
- 13 *See Id.* at 4.
- 14 *See Id.*
- 15 *See Id.*
- 16 *Id.*
- 17 *See Id.*
- 18 BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 291 (Bryan A. Garner ed., 4th ed. 2011). "On or from one party only, usu. without notice to or argument from the adverse party" (BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 291 (Bryan A. Garner ed., 4th ed., 2011)).
- 19 *See* Davenport, 2004-DR-1235 (2004) <https://scorss.citrusclerk.org/case> (last visited August 21, 2021).
- 20 *See Id.*
- 21 *See Id.*; Davenport, 2004-DR-1235 (2004) (Motion for Modification of Inj. for Prot. Against Dom. Viol.).
- 22 *See Id.*

12 Introduction

- 23 See Davenport, 2004-DR-1235 (2004) <https://scorss.citrusclerk.org/case> (last visited August 21, 2021).
- 24 See *Id.*
- 25 See Ventimiglia, 2012-00137133 at 8.
- 26 See *Id.*
- 27 See *Id.*
- 28 See *Id.*
- 29 See *Id.*
- 30 See *Id.*
- 31 In this book, “domestic violence,” “domestic abuse,” “family violence,” and “intimate partner violence” are used interchangeably but predominately as “intimate partner violence,” unless otherwise indicated. Generally, DV is used to describe behavior between family members other than intimate partners whereas IPV is used, specifically, to describe behavior between intimate partners. See *infra* Chapter 1, Explaining the Inexplicable: The Difficulty in Defining “Intimate Partner Violence”.
- 32 See *About Us*, ICCV, <https://theccv.international/about-us/> (last visited Jan. 27, 2023).
- 33 See *Id.*
- 34 See R. Emerson Dobash et al., *Lethal and Nonlethal Violence Against an Intimate Female Partner: Comparing Male Murderers to Nonlethal Abusers*, 13 SAGE PUBLICATIONS 329 (2007) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077801207299204>; JODY RAPHAEL, SAVING BERNICE: BATTERED WOMEN, WELFARE, AND POVERTY (2000); EVAN STARK, COERCIVE CONTROL: HOW MEN ENTRAP WOMEN IN PERSONAL LIFE (2007); SUSAN WEITZMAN, “NOT TO PEOPLE LIKE US:” HIDDEN ABUSE IN UPSCALE MARRIAGES (2000); Sandra Walklate & Anna Hopkins, *Real Lives and Lost Lives: Making Sense of ‘Locked In’ Responses to Intimate Partner Homicide*, 14 ASIAN JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY 129 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11417-019-09283-2>; Sarah Wydall & Rebecca Zerk, “Listen to Me, His Behaviour is Erratic and I’m Really Worried for Our Safety . . .,” 21 CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 1 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895819898513>.
- 35 CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION, PREVENTING INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE (2020), https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/ipv/IPV-factsheet_2020_508.pdf. See also National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, *Domestic Violence* (2020) https://assets.speakcdn.com/assets/2497/domestic_violence-2020080709350855.pdf?1596828650457.
- 36 National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, *supra* note 35 at ¶ 4; accord CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION, *supra* note 35.
- 37 See WALTER S. DEKESEREDY & MARTIN D. SCHWARTZ, DANGEROUS EXITS: ESCAPING ABUSIVE RELATIONSHIPS IN RURAL AMERICA (2009); R. Emerson Dobash & Russell P. Dobash, *What Were They Thinking?: Men Who Murder an Intimate Partner*, 17 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 111 (2011) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077801210391219>; Joan B. Kelly & Michael P. Johnson, *Differentiation Among Types of Intimate Partner Violence: Research Update and Implications for Interventions*, 46 FAMILY COURT REVIEW 476 (2008) <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00215.x>; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, *supra* note 35; Brynne E. Sheehan et al., *Intimate Partner Homicide: New Insights for Understanding Lethality and Risks*, 21 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 269 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077801214564687>.

- 38 See DEKESEREDY & SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 37; MOLLY DRAGIEWICZ, EQUALITY WITH A VENGEANCE: MEN'S RIGHTS GROUPS, BATTERED WOMEN, AND ANTIFEMINIST BACKLASH (2011); Mary Ann Dutton & Lisa A. Goodman, *Coercion in Intimate Partner Violence: Toward a New Conceptualization*, 52 SEX ROLES 743 (2005) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-4196-6>; Michael P. Johnson, *Langhinrichsen-Rolling's Confirmation of the Feminist Analysis of Intimate Partner Violence: Comment on "Controversies Involving Gender and Intimate Partner Violence in the United States,"* 62 SEX ROLES 212 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9697-2>; Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling, *Controversies Involving Gender and Intimate Partner Violence in the United States*, 62 SEX ROLES 179 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9628-2>.
- 39 See Johnson, *supra* note 38; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, *supra* note 38.
- 40 See Johnson, *supra* note 38.
- 41 *Id.* at 213.
- 42 See, e.g., Gretchen Arnold, *A Battered Women's Movement Perspective of Coercive Control*, 15 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 1432 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209346836>; Dobash et al., *supra* note 34; Catherine Donovan & Rebecca Barnes, *Re-tangling the Concept of Coercive Control: A View from the Margins and a Response to Walby and Towers* (2018), 21 CRIMINOLOGY & CRIMINAL JUSTICE 242 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895819864622>; David Hirschel & Eve Buzawa, *Understanding the Context of Dual Arrest with Directions for Future Research*, 8 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 1449 (2002) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F107780102237965>; Johnson, *supra* note 38; Andy Myhill, *Measuring Coercive Control: What Can We Learn From National Population Surveys?*, 21 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 355 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077801214568032>; STARK, *supra* note 34.
- 43 See Charlotte Barlow & Sandra Walklate, *Gender, Risk Assessment and Coercive Control: Contradictions in Terms?*, 61 BRIT. J. CRIMINOL. 887 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azaa104>.
- 44 See R. EMERSON DOBASH & RUSSELL P. DOBASH, *WHEN MEN MURDER WOMEN* (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199914784.001.0001>.
- 45 See Johnson, *supra* note 38.
- 46 See Donovan & Barnes, *supra* note 42. See also Gender Sexuality Resource Center, *LGBTQIA+ 101*, <https://www.gsrc.princeton.edu/lgbtqia-101>.
- 47 See DRAGIEWICZ, *supra* note 38; Sheehan et al., *supra* note 37; STARK, *supra* note 34; Walklate & Hopkins, *supra* note 34.
- 48 See, e.g., Arnold, *supra* note 42; Donna J. King, *Naming the Judicial Terrorist: An Exposé of an Abuser's Successful Use of a Judicial Proceeding for Continued Domestic Violence*, 1 TENN. JOURNAL OF RACE, GENDER, & SOCIAL JUSTICE 153 (2012); STARK, *supra* note 34.
- 49 See CLARE DALTON & ELIZABETH M. SCHNEIDER, *BATTERED WOMEN AND THE LAW* (2001).
- 50 See, e.g., John R. Barner & Michelle M. Carney, *Interventions for Intimate Partner Violence: A Historical Review*, 26 J. FAM. VIOL. 235 (2011); DALTON & SCHNEIDER, *supra* note 49.
- 51 See Barner & Carney, *supra* note 50.
- 52 See *Id.*
- 53 See Hirschel & Buzawa, *supra* note 42; Daniel P. Mears, *Research and Interventions to Reduce Domestic Violence Revictimization*, 4 TRAUMA, VIOLENCE & ABUSE 127 (2003) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1524838002250764>; *Domestic Violence 101: How Should a Law Enforcement Agency Respond?*,

- 13 DISPATCH 10 (2020); Stephanie Riger et al., *Measuring Interference with Employment and Education Reported by Women with Abusive Partners: Preliminary Data*, 15 VIOLENCE AND VICTIMS 2 (2000) <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.15.2.161>; Claire Wright, *Torture at Home: Borrowing from the Torture Convention to Define Domestic Violence*, 24 HASTINGS WOMEN'S L. J. 457 (2013).
- 54 E.g., Marilyn McMahon et al., *An Alternative Means of Prosecuting Non-Physical Domestic Abuse: Are Stalking Laws an Under-Utilised Resource?*, in CRIMINALISING COERCIVE CONTROL: FAMILY VIOLENCE AND THE CRIMINAL LAW (Marilyn McMahon & Paul McGorrey eds., 2020) https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-0653-6_5; Julia Quilter, *Evaluating Criminalisation as a Strategy in Relation to Non-Physical Family Violence*, in CRIMINALISING COERCIVE CONTROL: FAMILY VIOLENCE AND THE CRIMINAL LAW (Marilyn McMahon & Paul McGorrey eds., 2020) https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-0653-6_6; Kristy Candela, *Protecting the Invisible Victim: Incorporating Coercive Control in Domestic Violence Statutes*, 54 FAMILY COURT REVIEW 112 (2016).
- 55 See Margaret E. Johnson, *Redefining Harm, Reimagining Remedies and Reclaiming Domestic Violence Law*, 42 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 1107 (2009); McMahon et al., *supra* note 54; Mears, *supra* note 53; STARK, *supra* note 34.
- 56 See Candela, *supra* note 54.
- 57 E.g., *Id.*; Quilter, *supra* note 54; Wright, *supra* note 53.
- 58 E.g., Candela, *supra* note 54; Quilter, *supra* note 54; STARK, *supra* note 34; Wright, *supra* note 53.
- 59 See Wright, *supra* note 53.
- 60 See McMahon et al., *supra* note 54; Wright, *supra* note 53.
- 61 Wright, *supra* note 53 at 465; accord Quilter, *supra* note 54.
- 62 See Candela, *supra* note 54; STARK, *supra* note 34; Wright, *supra* note 53.
- 63 See Wright, *supra* note 53; Mears, *supra* note 53; Quilter, *supra* note 54.
- 64 See *Coercive Control Codification Matrix*, BATTERED WOMEN'S JUSTICE PROJECT (2022) http://bwjp.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/CC_MATRIX.pdf.
- 65 See King, *supra* note 48; STARK, *supra* note 34.
- 66 See Mari L. Aldridge & Kevin D. Browne, *Perpetrators of Spousal Homicide: A Review*, 4 TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, & ABUSE 265 (2003) <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1524838003004003005>; CYNTHIA GRANT BOWMAN ET AL., FEMINIST JURISPRUDENCE: CASES AND MATERIALS (4th ed., 2011); DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44; R. Emerson Dobash et al., "Out of the Blue:" Men Who Murder an Intimate Partner, 4 FEMINIST CRIMINOLOGY 194 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085109332668>; Myhill, *supra* note 42; Kathryn E. Moracco et al., *Femicide in North Carolina, 1991–1993: A Statewide Study of Patterns and Precursors*, 2 HOMICIDE STUDIES 422 (1998) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1088767998002004005>; Mary Jane Mossman, *Feminism and Legal Method: The Difference it Makes*, in AT THE BOUNDARIES OF LAW: FEMINISM AND LEGAL THEORY (Martha Albertson Fineman & Nancy Sweet Thomadsen eds. (1991); STARK, *supra* note 34.
- 67 See DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44; Moracco et al., *supra* note 66; STARK, *supra* note 34. Contemporarily, battered woman's defense or battered woman syndrome (BWS) is a complex legal defense strategy that, along with expert testimony and possible diagnosis of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), helps to explain why a woman might kill her intimate partner even when, to another reasonable person, there appeared to be no imminent threat of

- physical harm at the time of the killing. See STARK, *supra* note 34; Jessica R. Holliday et al., *The Use of Battered Woman Syndrome in U.S. Criminal Courts*, 50 J. AM. ACAD. PSYCHIATRY LAW 1 (2022). DOI: [10.29158/JAAPL.210105-21](https://doi.org/10.29158/JAAPL.210105-21).
- 68 See, e.g., DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44; National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, *supra* note 35.
- 69 See Lisa A. Fontes, *Domestic Violence Isn't About Just Physical Violence – and State Laws are Beginning to Recognize That*, THE CONVERSATION (May 12, 2021).
- 70 See DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44; Moracco et al., *supra* note 66.
- 71 See DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44; Johnson, *supra* note 38; Moracco et al., *supra* note 66.
- 72 See Moracco et al., *supra* note 66; Walklate & Hopkins, *supra* note 34.
- 73 See Edem F. Avakame, “Did You Call the Police? What Did They Do?:” *An Empirical Assessment of Black’s Theory of Mobilization of Law*, 16 JUSTICE QUARTERLY 765 (1999) <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829900094361>; Kara Bellew, *Silent Suffering: Uncovering and Understanding Domestic Violence in Affluent Communities*, 26 WOMEN’S RIGHTS LAW REPORTER 39 (2005); Mears, *supra* note 53; Moracco et al., *supra* note 66.
- 74 See Avakame, *supra* note 73; Bellew, *supra* note 73; Mears, *supra* note 53; Moracco et al., *supra* note 66.
- 75 See Jacquelyn C. Campbell et al., *Intimate Partner Homicide: Review and Implications of Research and Policy*, 8 TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, & ABUSE 246 (2007) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1524838007303505>; Mears, *supra* note 53; Moracco et al., *supra* note 66; Nick Butto, *The Front and Back Eds of Domestic Violence Murder: An Exploration of the Avenues for Change and an Introduction of the Domestic Violence-Murder Doctrine*, 107 GEO. L. J. 457 (2019).
- 76 See Campbell et al., *supra* note 75; Lorena Garcia et al., *Homicides and Intimate Partner Violence: A Literature Review*, 8 TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, & ABUSE 370 (2007) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1524838007307294>; Nancy Glass et al., *Violence: Recognition, Management and Prevention: Non-fatal Strangulation is an Important Risk Factor for Homicide of Women*, 35 THE JOURNAL OF EMERGENCY MEDICINE 329 (2008) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemermed.2007.02.065>; Hirschel & Buzawa, *supra* note 42; Judith M. McFarlane, *Stalking and Intimate Partner Femicide*, 3 HOMICIDE STUDIES 300 (1999) <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1088767999003004003>; Mears, *supra* note 53; NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS IN LETHAL AND NON-LETHAL VIOLENCE: PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND ANNUAL WORKSHOP OF THE HOMICIDE RESEARCH WORKING GROUP (1992).
- 77 See Bellew, *supra* note 73; Moracco et al., *supra* note 66; Sheehan et al., *supra* note 37; STARK, *supra* note 34; Susanne Lohmann et al., *The Trauma and Mental Health Impacts of Coercive Control: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis*, 0 TRAUMA, VIOLENCE & ABUSE 1 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380231162972>.
- 78 See Dobash et al., *supra* note 66 (discussing the fact that “the best predictor of subsequent intimate partner violence is general criminal recidivism”); Laurie M. Graham et al., *The Danger Assessment: An Instrument for the Prevention of Intimate Partner Homicide*, in HANDBOOK OF INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE ACROSS THE LIFESPAN (R. Geffner et al. eds., 2019) https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62122-7_145-1; Hirschel & Buzawa, *supra* note 42;

- Radha Iyengar, *Corrigendum to “Does the Certainty of Arrest Reduce Domestic Violence? Evidence from Mandatory and Recommended Arrest Laws”* [JPubEc 93(1–2), pp. 85–89], 179 J. OF PUBLIC ECONOMICS 1 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2019.104098>; Andrew R. Klein, *Lethality Assessments and the Law Enforcement Response to Domestic Violence*, 12 J. OF POLICE CRISIS NEGOT.87 (2012) <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332586.2012.720175>; N. Zoe Hilton et al., *An Indepth Actuarial Assessment for Wife Assault Recidivism: The Domestic Risk Appraisal Guide*, 32 LAW HUM. BEHAV. 150 (2008) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-007-9088-6>.
- 79 See Klein, *supra* note 78.
- 80 See BOWMAN ET AL., *supra* note 66; Hirschel & Buzawa, *supra* note 42; Klein, *supra* note 78.
- 81 See BOWMAN ET AL., *supra* note 66; Hirschel & Buzawa, *supra* note 42; Klein, *supra* note 78.
- 82 See DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44; Sheehan et al., *supra* note 37; LENORE E. WALKER, *THE BATTERED WOMAN* (1979).
- 83 See Jacquelyn C. Campbell et al., *Risk Factors for Femicide in Abusive Relationships: Results From a Multisite Case Control Study*, 93 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH 1089 (2003) <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.93.7.1089>; Sheehan et al., *supra* note 37; Jill Theresa Messing et al., *The Arizona Intimate Partner Homicide (AzIPH) Study: A Step Toward Updating and Expanding Risk Factors for Intimate Partner Homicide*, 36 J. OF FAMILY VIOLENCE 563 (2021) <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10896-021-00254-9>.
- 84 See Myhill, *supra* note 42.
- 85 See Hirschel & Buzawa, *supra* note 42; STARK, *supra* note 34. See also *Coercive Control Codification Matrix*, *supra* note 64.
- 86 See *Coercive Control Codification Matrix*, *supra* note 64.
- 87 See generally DONALD BLACK, *THE BEHAVIOR OF LAW: SPECIAL EDITION* (2010).
- 88 See Bellew, *supra* note 73; DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44; Wydall & Zerk, *supra* note 34.
- 89 Johnson, *supra* note 38 at 216.
- 90 Wydall & Zerk, *supra* note 34 at 11.
- 91 See Carolyn Rebecca Block & Antigone Christakos, *Intimate Partner Homicide in Chicago Over 29 Years*, 41 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 496 (1995).
- 92 See Aldridge & Browne, *supra* note 66; DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44. Although much work still needs to be done, since the time of completion of this study, there has been a positive shift toward academic research and broader acknowledgement of the non-violent aspects of abuse and its harms, including adding to the research base of coercive control.
- 93 See Hirschel & Buzawa, *supra* note 42; Messing et al., *supra* note 83.
- 94 See Viveka Enander et al., *Before the Killing: Intimate Partner Homicides in a Process Perspective, Part I*, 5 J. OF GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE 59 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1332/239868020X15922355479497>; Jacqueline Harden et al., *Examining Attempted and Completed Intimate Partner Homicide: A Qualitative Synthesis*, 34 VIOLENCE AND VICTIMS 869 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.vv-d-18-00128>; Jennifer Chopra et al., *Risk Factors for Intimate Partner Homicide in England and Wales*, 30 HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE COMMUNITY E3086 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.13753>.
- 95 See Dee-Dee Kanhai, *Not All Bills are Created Equal: A Review of Coercive Control Legislation*, ACECC (Nov. 13, 2020).

- 96 See Kristin L. Anderson, *Gendering Coercive Control*, 15 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 1444 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209346837>; Arnold, *supra* note 42; Cheryl Hanna, *The Paradox of Progress: Translating Evan Stark's Coercive Control Into Legal Doctrine for Abused Women*, 15 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 1458 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209347091>; Evan Stark, *Re-Presenting Women Battering: From Battered Woman Syndrome to Coercive Control*, 58 ALB. L. REV. 973 (1995); STARK, *supra* note 34; Evan Stark, *Rethinking Coercive Control*, 15 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 1509 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209347452>.
- 97 See NEIL WEBSDALE, *FAMILICIDAL HEARTS: THE EMOTIONAL STYLES OF 211 KILLERS* (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195315417.001.0001>.
- 98 *See Id.*
- 99 *See* DOBASH & DOBASH, *supra* note 44.
- 100 *See Id.*
- 101 *See* Faces of Fatality, *Report of the Attorney General's Statewide Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team* (2019) <https://www2.myflfamilies.com/service-programs/domestic-violence/docs/FACES%20OF%20FATALITY%20IX.pdf>. *See also* About NDVFRI, *The National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative*, NDVFRI <https://ndvfri.org/about/> (last visited June 14, 2023).
- 102 Faces of Fatality, *supra* note 101.
- 103 *See Id.*
- 104 *See Id.*
- 105 *See Id.*
- 106 *See Id.*
- 107 Shilan Caman et al., *Trends in Rates and Characteristics of Intimate Partner Homicides Between 1990 and 2013*, 49 J. OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE 14, 19 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.01.002>.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>