

2019

I Decide when You Die: A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence for Intimate Partner Homicides by Heterosexual Spouses in Florida

Donna King
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Domestic and Intimate Partner Violence Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

King, Donna, "I Decide when You Die: A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence for Intimate Partner Homicides by Heterosexual Spouses in Florida" (2019). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6516.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/6516>



I DECIDE WHEN YOU DIE: A MIXED-METHODS ANALYSIS OF PRIOR REPORTING
OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE FOR INTIMATE PARTNER HOMICIDES BY
HETEROSEXUAL SPOUSES IN FLORIDA

DONNA J. KING

B.S. University of Central Florida, 1990

J.D. Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University College of Law, 2012

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2019

Major Professor: Lin Huff-Corzine

© 2019 Donna J. King

ABSTRACT

It is generally believed that a victim of an intimate partner homicide, who faced ongoing physical violence prior to the killing, would have contacted authorities for assistance or protection some time prior to their death. However, the results of this study show that this notion that a victim of ongoing abuse will, more than likely, request help is a misconception. Through qualitative and quantitative methods analysis, this study reveals the dearth of prior reporting of physical violence to law enforcement or the court when an intimate partner homicide takes place between heterosexual spouses in Florida between 2006 and 2016. Additionally, “coercive control,” a term that is not nearly as recognizable as domestic violence or intimate partner violence but that should be understood and regulated, was conceptualized and operationalized using NVivo Pro 12, a qualitative social sciences software package. By constructing an original data set from secondary data from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Uniform Crime Report Supplemental Homicide Report, multiple law enforcement agencies from throughout the state of Florida, and many Florida county courthouses, variables of intimate partner homicide were analyzed in unique quantitative models using IBM SPSS®, an advanced statistical software analysis program. Also, as part of the content analysis process, Petitions for Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence were organized, coded, and analyzed to provide insight into the role coercive control takes prior to an intimate partner homicide. This study sheds light on the fact that the emphasis on physical violence in intimate partner abuse, rather than the non-violent tactics of coercive control, for lethality risk assessments for intimate partner violence victims is misplaced and warrants reconsideration.

Keywords: intimate partner homicide; coercive control; intimate partner violence; injunction

This dissertation 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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the dedication and support of many extraordinary people along the way. First, *Dr. Lin Huff-Corzine*, my major professor and dissertation chair, has been my “go to” person for so long, it is going to be strange to not be able to go to her for assistance on a research project anymore. I am truly going to miss interacting with her on a regular basis. This dissertation would not have been possible without her belief in my ideas for this study, her support in the execution of it, and her undying willingness to allow me to pursue my goals. She has been a wonderful advocate for me.

I would also like to recognize my dissertation committee, *Dr. Jay Corzine*, *Dr. Amy Reckdenwald*, and *Barbara Bernier, J.D.*, for their trust in and support for this study. I am more than thankful for their willingness to allow me to pursue such a project of this nature.

It has been a while since we sat together in a class, but I would like to thank *Erin O’Neal* for all her support along the way. You have been my dearest and closest friend as I have worked through this PhD program. I am very fortunate to have a friend in you.

My family, including my *mom*, *dad*, *stepmother*, and *daughters*, have been an incredible support system as I have worked throughout my PhD program and on this dissertation. I could not have done any of it without their steadfast love and encouragement. I especially appreciate *Courtney’s* loving support. Finally, my husband, *Dayton King*, has been my biggest moral supporter throughout it all. From my first day of class in the PhD program to finalizing this dissertation, he has been by my side cheering me on, even when I was not sure about myself. I look forward to making my entire family proud.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Research	10
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Not All Domestic Violence is Created Equal	14
Coercive Control's Impact on Women	15
Explaining the Inexplicable: The Difficulty in Defining "Domestic Violence"	19
Risking Leaving: She Knows He's a Threat, But Does Anyone Else?	23
Gender and Domestic Violence: Legislating against Patriarchal Violence	25
Assessing the Risk: Understanding A Domestic Violence Victim's Risk of Death	31
The Disillusionment of the Protections of an Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence: Why and When are They Important to I.P.V. Victims?	33
The Role of Intimate Partner Homicide-Suicide in Intimate Partner Homicide	35
The Gender Asymmetry of Coercive Control	37
Litigation and Coercive Control: Not Every P.I.F.P. is the Same	39
Gender Bias in the Courts	41

Gaining an Understanding into I.P.H. Victims: A Comparison of Studies	42
CHAPTER THREE: THEORY	48
Black's Theory of the Behavior of Law	49
Bellew's Explanation of the I.P.V. Socioeconomic Divide.....	52
Theoretical Implications from the Avakame et. al. (1999) Study.....	53
CHAPTER FOUR: CURRENT STUDY DESCRIPTION	55
Data and Methodology.....	55
Methodology for Data Collection: Sourcing Public Records	56
The F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. Data	56
Florida Local Law Enforcement Agencies	59
The Florida County Courthouse.....	61
CHAPTER FIVE: QUALITATIVE METHODS	64
Voices of I.P.H. Victims	66
Intimidation.....	69
Animal abuse	71
Harassment.....	72
Surveillance.....	73
Threats.....	74
Threatens Friends and Family.....	75

Weapons.....	76
Isolation.....	77
Economic Control	78
False Imprisonment.....	79
Financial Control	80
Humiliation	81
Degradation.....	82
Name Calling	82
Power and Control	83
Child Abuse	83
Violent Acts towards Family and Friends	85
Taking Children from Victim	85
Deprivation of Necessities	86
Psychologically Controlling.....	87
Verbal Abuse	88
Household, Clothes and Personal Belongings Destroyed.....	88
Fearful of the Future	89
Fear for Child(ren)’s Safety	90
Pregnant	91

Resistance to Abuse	91
Helping Abuser	93
Separated or Estranged	94
Abuser Mental Illness	95
Drinking Alcohol	96
Drug Use	96
Paranoia.....	97
Physical Violence.....	98
Non-fatal Strangulation.....	99
Rape and Sexual Abuse	99
The Frequencies of Coercive Control	101
CHAPTER SIX: QUALITATIVE DISCUSSION	108
Native Americans.....	108
Asian American and Pacific Islander.....	109
Cases with Multiple P.I.F.P.s.....	111
Abuser Mental Illness	113
Resistance to Abuse	114
The Effectiveness of Injunctions for Protection Against Domestic Violence	115
The Interactions of Coercive Control Tactics	117

CHAPTER SEVEN: QUANTITATIVE METHODS	119
Data Set A: Variable Definitions and Measures	119
Data Set A: Research Question and Quantitative Hypotheses.....	122
Data Set A: Univariate and Bivariate Analyses	124
Data Set A: Logistic Regression Model Variable Frequencies	124
Data Set A: Correlation Results	126
Data Set A: Pearson Correlation	127
Data Set A: Phi Correlation	129
Data Set A: Logistic Regression Results	130
Data Set B: Variable Definitions and Measures	131
Data Set B: Research Questions and Quantitative Hypotheses	136
Data Set B: Univariate and Bivariate Analyses	139
Data Set B: Logistic Regression Model Variable Frequencies.....	139
Data Set B: Correlation Results	141
Data Set B: Pearson Correlation	141
Data Set B: Phi Correlation.....	143
Data Set B: Logistic Regression Results	143
CHAPTER EIGHT: QUANTITATIVE DISCUSSION.....	147
Discussion: Data Set A - Frequencies.....	147

Discussion: Data Set A – Correlations.....	149
Discussion: Data Set A - Logistic Regression	150
Discussion: Data Set B - Frequencies	152
Discussion: Data Set B - Correlations	156
Discussion: Data Set B - Logistic Regression	157
CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION	161
Limitations to the Study	163
Future Directions for Research	166
One Final Word.....	170
APPENDIX A: NVIVO 12 PRO CODEBOOK - COERCIVE CONTROL	
THEMES AND SUBTHEMES	171
APPENDIX B: COMPLETE LIST AND DESCRIPTION OF STUDY	
VARIABLES	176
APPENDIX C: V.I.F. TABLES OF STUDY VARIABLES	183
APPENDIX D: FREQUENCY TABLES OF VARIABLES NOT USED IN	
STUDY LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS	187
Age Characteristics	188
Gender Characteristics	190
Race Characteristics.....	191

Weapon Used Characteristics	191
I.P.H.S. Characteristics	192
Miscellaneous Variables Characteristics	192
APPENDIX E: CORRELATION MATRICES.....	194
Pearson Correlation Matrices.....	195
Phi Correlations	201
APPENDIX F: COPYRIGHT PERMISSION.....	205
LIST OF REFERENCES	207

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. The Power and Control Wheel	22
Figure 2. The Maze of Coercive Control: The (New!) Recreated Power & Control Wheel	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Coercive Control Themes and Subthemes.....	68
Table 2. Coding Coverage Percentages	70
Table 3. Definitions and Coding of Coercive Control Variables.....	102
Table 4. The Characteristics and Frequencies of Coercive Control	103
Table 5. Definitions and Coding of T.I.P. and F.J.I.P. Variables	104
Table 6. T.I.P. and F.J.I.P. Variable Frequencies	104
Table 7. Coding and Definitions of I.P.H. & P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Race	105
Table 8. I.P.H. & P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Race Variable Frequencies	106
Table 9. P.I.F.P. Filing Frequencies.....	111
Table 10. Explanation of Quantitative Variables for Data Set A	121
Table 11. Dependent Variable Frequencies (Data Set A).....	124
Table 12. I.P.H.S. Variable Frequencies (Data Set A)	125
Table 13. Record of P.I.F.P. Variable Frequencies (Data Set A)	125
Table 14. Weapon Used Variable Frequencies (Data Set A).....	126
Table 15. Data Set A: Logistic Regression Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement for I.P.H. between Heterosexual Spouses in Florida, N=493	130
Table 16. Explanation of Quantitative Variables for Data Set B.....	135
Table 17. Dependent Variable Frequencies (Data Set B)	139
Table 18. Non-Violent Coercive Control Variable Frequencies (Data Set B)	140

Table 19. Data Set B: Logistic Regression Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement for I.P.H. between Heterosexual Spouses in Florida, including Non-Violent Coercive Control (Victim Reaction Tactics), N=62	144
Table 20. Data Set B: Logistic Regression Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence to the Court for I.P.H. between Heterosexual Spouses in Florida, including Non-Violent Coercive Control (Victim Reaction Tactics), N=62.....	145
Table 21. Data Set B: Logistic Regression Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence to the Court for I.P.H. between Heterosexual Spouses in Florida, including Non-Violent Coercive Control (Abuser Tactics), N=62	146
Table 22. V.I.F.s of Original Data Set with All Variables.....	184
Table 23. V.I.F.s of Data Set A with All Variables	184
Table 24. V.I.F.s of Data Set A: Variables used in BLR Model	184
Table 25. V.I.F.s of Data Set B using Dependent Variable - Prior Report of PV to Law Enforcement: All Variables	185
Table 26. V.I.F.s of Data Set B using Dependent Variable - Prior Report of PV to Law Enforcement: Variables used in BLR Model.....	185
Table 27. V.I.F.s of Data Set B using Dependent Variable - Prior Report of PV to the Court: All Variables	185
Table 28. V.I.F.s of Data Set B using Dependent Variable - Prior Report of PV to the Court: Variables used in BLR Model.....	186
Table 29. Victim Age Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set and Data Set A	188
Table 30. Offender Age Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set and Data Set A.....	188
Table 31. Age of P.I.F.P. Victim Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set	189

Table 32. Age of P.I.F.P. Offender Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set.....	189
Table 33. Victim Age Variable Frequencies: Data Set B	189
Table 34. Offender Age Variable Frequencies: Data Set B.....	190
Table 35. Victim/Offender Gender Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set and Data Set A ..	190
Table 36. Gender of P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set	190
Table 37. Victim/Offender Gender Variable Frequencies: Data Set B	190
Table 38. Victim/Offender Race Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set and Data Set A	191
Table 39. Race of P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set	191
Table 40. Victim/Offender Race Variable Frequencies: Data Set B	191
Table 41. Weapon Used Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set.....	191
Table 42. Weapon Used Variable Frequencies: Data Set B	192
Table 43. I.P.H.S. Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set.....	192
Table 44. I.P.H.S. Variable Frequencies: Data Set B	192
Table 45. Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set.....	192
Table 46. Record of P.I.F.P. Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set	192
Table 47. T.I.P. and F.J.I.P. Variable Frequencies: Data Set B.....	193
Table 48. P.I.F.P. Victim was I.P.H. Victim Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set	193
Table 49. Data Set A - Pearson Correlation: All Variables	195
Table 50. Data Set B - Pearson Correlation: All Variables	196
Table 51. Data Set A - Phi Correlation: Logistic Regression Model Variables	201
Table 52. Data Set B - Phi Correlation: Logistic Regression Model Variables	202

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Domestic Violence: D.V.

Florida Attorney General’ Statewide Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team:

F.A.G.S.D.V.F.R.T.

Florida Department of Law Enforcement: F.D.L.E.

Florida Department of Law Enforcement Uniform Crime Report Supplemental Homicide Report:

F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R.

Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence: F.J.I.P.

Intimate Partner Homicide: I.P.H.

Intimate Partner Homicide-Suicide: I.P.H.S.

Intimate Partner Violence: I.P.V.

National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative: N.D.V.F.R.I.

Petition for Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence: P.I.F.P.

Temporary Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence: T.I.P.

Uniform Crime Report Supplemental Homicide Report: U.C.R.-S.H.R.

United Nations: U.N.

United States: U.S.

Variance Inflation Factor: V.I.F.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In Citrus County, Florida on March 29, 2004, a thirty-nine-year-old woman filed a Petition for Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence (P.I.F.P.) against her forty-year-old husband (Petition, 001235). In her P.I.F.P., she explained that, on March 28, 2004, her husband came home drunk and was angry because she did not have dinner ready for the family; they had three children. He believed it was her responsibility. As she continued in her P.I.F.P., she described the family sitting around the dinner table as he commanded. He informed the children that they were getting a divorce and that he was moving to New Jersey without them. Continuing, she recounted his demands that the family share how they felt about the situation. As this took place, he became louder and more insistent. She detailed how he put a bullet to each one of their heads. He explained which one of them would be killed first; his plan was youngest to oldest. However, he planned to spare the oldest because she had a job. Then he would kill their mother because it was her fault. He told them he would try to shoot himself twice in the process of killing himself. She explained that it was clear the children were being tormented, but he continued, even though they were all crying. He repeatedly told them to remember the date on the calendar because it would be their last day on earth. 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. But he went to use the bathroom; so, they were able to run out of the house and drive away to safety.

On March 29, 2004, the day the P.I.F.P. was filed, the woman was granted an *ex parte*¹ Temporary Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence [with Minor Children] (T.I.P.)

¹ “On or from one party only, usu. without notice to or argument from the adverse party” (Garner, 2011, p. 291).

(Secured Courts, 2018). On April 8, 2004 after notice to the husband, a hearing was held, and the court entered a Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence [with Minor Children] (F.J.I.P.) that did not expire without further order of the court. Nevertheless, on April 21, 2004, the woman filed a Motion for Modification of the Injunction for Protection Against Domestic stating that she wished to have the F.J.I.P. changed because her husband received help for his alcohol and anger issues (Motion, 001235; Secured Courts, 2018). The Motion resulted in dismissal of the T.I.P. (Secured Courts, 2018). Because the F.J.I.P. was no longer in place, on July 1, 2004, the husband received an order from the court releasing his firearms (Secured Courts, 2018). The couple lived together as husband and wife for the following eight years *without reports of physical violence to law enforcement or the court*. But, on July 1, 2012, they separated because the woman was considering divorcing the husband (Ventimiglia, 2012). One month later, the husband kidnapped the woman, shot and killed her; and, then, turned the gun on himself.

It is difficult to know exactly what type of relationship the husband and wife above experienced for the eight years between the last court order in 2004 and their deaths in 2012. There were no reports of domestic violence to law enforcement or the court during that time frame. It is possible they lived free of physical violence and threats of physical violence during that time. It is also possible that, if there were such episodes, they went unreported to law enforcement and the court. However, other such forms of intimate partner violence (I.P.V.) the wife described in her P.I.F.P., that occur daily for many women, may not be regulated by most

U.S. state statutes to provide protection to I.P.V. victims who do not experience physical violence at the hands of their abuser (Stark, 2007).²

There is a lack of consensus about the cause of I.P.V., which stems from differing worldwide cultural accounts and explanations. Programs for I.P.V. have become stagnate, and little progress is being made toward the elimination of this devastating social epidemic (Dalton & Schneider, 2001). Defining and responding to I.P.V. are daunting tasks, especially because it, in its worst form, becomes deadly. Adding to these issues, there is little agreement among scholars, legislators, law enforcement, prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, and I.P.V. program employees about how to universally define the collective of behaviors attributed to I.P.V. and respond to this social problem of epic proportions that is at the top of the list of the most misunderstood crimes (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Mears, 2003; Riger, Ahrens, & Blickenstaff, 2000; Wright, 2013). Indeed, understanding and classifying the types of abusive acts constituting physical and sexual abuse is easier achieved than accepting the concept of the continuum of behavior that is mental abuse—also known as psychological and/or emotional abuse, i.e., non-violent forms of I.P.V. The forms of coercive and controlling behaviors, which are continuously utilized by the offender against the victim, are very different when invoked through non-violent tactics of abuse rather than through physical violence or other criminal acts (Johnson, 2009; Mears, 2003; Stark, 2007).

National, state, and local governments throughout the world employ different definitions in their recognition and prosecution of I.P.V. Many definitions only include physical acts of violence, with situational violence being the best understood context in which I.P.V. occurs as it

² In this dissertation, “domestic violence,” “domestic abuse,” and “intimate partner violence” are used interchangeably, unless otherwise indicated.

does not continue beyond a single, isolated incident (Wright, 2013). Wright (2013) explains that some governmental bodies—such as the Office of Violence on Women at the United States Department of Justice and the United Nations (U.N.) —agree that I.P.V. manifests itself in physical, sexual, and psychological abuse, occurring concomitantly rather than in isolation. The behaviors embodying these forms of abuse are not mutually exclusive; yet, they are often legislated and enforced as though they occur discretely. Indeed, a uniform, all-encompassing definition, inclusive of the multitude of behaviors encompassing the physical, sexual, and psychological forms of abuse, remains elusive.

Most state statutes regulating “domestic violence,” “domestic abuse,” or “intimate partner violence” generally proscribe isolated incidents of violence. They do not address a continuum of abuse over time where physical acts of violence constitute a very small portion of the overall abusive behavior. Laws often utilize the terms domestic violence, domestic abuse, 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. For example, the criminal justice system treats each occurrence of physical abuse as a separate and distinct act of violence for which the offender is charged with a separate crime. This prevents the criminal justice system from assessing multiple incidents of physical abuse by one offender against the same victim as an overall continuum of escalating abusive behavior, preventing the comprehensive adjudication of an overarching pattern of controlling and abusive behavior, which includes, but is not exclusive of, physical violence. Nevertheless, I.P.V. is often understood by academics and professionals alike as consistently repetitive abusive behavior manifesting in multiple forms of overt and covert acts, which the civil justice system may be able to recognize when evaluating a P.I.F.P.

The non-violent forms of abuse are minimized, overshadowed, and misunderstood when they are combined with physical acts of violence, causing the non-physical behavior to be normalized by the victim, society, and the judicial system (Johnson, 2009). Abusers understand that civil and criminal courts, which are regularly gender-biased and apathetic to violence against women, may view women negatively for reporting any form of I.P.V. they experience (Douglas, 2012; King, 2012a; Weitzman, 2000). Indeed, these gender-biased courts reward abusers with failed P.I.F.P.s; and, often, because the victim must report the I.P.V. when applying for the P.I.F.P., it angers and empowers the abuser because he is emboldened when the court denies the petition (Iyengar, 2009). Coupled with a lack of official response or assistance to the I.P.V. victim, filing the P.I.F.P. becomes deadly for the victim. Most state laws focus on addressing each discrete act of physical violence, rather than attempting to regulate the ongoing, continuous pattern of mental abuse that typically manifests in the more covert, torturous non-violent acts of I.P.V. that may turn just as deadly.

To provide broader protection that encompasses all victims of I.P.V., 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 (Stark, 2007). Accordingly, it is reasonable to think that, with such an understanding, legislators would seek to protect the citizenry from non-violent forms of abuse as they have from the physically violent forms. 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.

Women from all socioeconomic levels throughout the U.S., 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 (Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, Medina-Ariza, 2007; Raphael, 2000; Stark, 2007; Weitzman, 2000). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (C.D.C.) reports that “[n]early 1 in 4 adult women . . . report having experienced severe physical violence from an intimate partner in their lifetime”³ (CDC, 2017). Also, considering its many forms, there are approximately 5 million occurrences of I.P.V. taking place each year throughout the U.S. (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2009; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Kelly & Johnson, 2008; Sheehan, Murphy, Moynihan, Dudley-Fennessey, & Stapleton, 2015). Men’s abuse against women often presents in an ongoing, coercive, and controlling manner and has a much more devastating impact on the victim than physical violence alone, including the risk of lethality (Dragiewicz, 2011; Sheehan et al., 2015; Stark 2007).

A debate exists among experts regarding the experiences of I.P.V. between the genders and its relative applicability to society’s patriarchal gender norms (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2009; Dragiewicz, 2011; Dutton & Goodman, 2005; Johnson, 2010; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). The concept known as gender-symmetry, or conversely gender-asymmetry, is the cornerstone of this debate. It is often applied to I.P.V. in relation to situational violence or it is discussed relative to the ongoing, coercive, and controlling manner of abuse that is employed more often by men against women than vice versa. Indeed, researchers, practitioners, and academics understand I.P.V. as a highly gendered combination of tactics of abuse, intended to

³ The C.D.C. reports that “[n]early 1 in 7 adult men report having experienced severe physical violence from and intimate partner in their lifetime” (C.D.C., 2017). This dissertation acknowledges the fact that both men and women, whether in heterosexual or homosexual relationships, experience I.P.V. as victims and offenders; however, this dissertation focuses on I.P.V. heterosexual spousal relationships in which, generally, the man is the offender and the woman is the victim.

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* (Dobash et al., 2007; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Myhill, 2015; Stark, 2007; Walby & Towers, 2018).

Scholars from various academic disciplines and experts in related fields, including sociology, psychology, and law have studied domestic violence (D.V.) for decades, mostly focusing on its nonlethal forms; yet, the murder of women by their intimate partners has attracted comparatively little attention (Aldridge & Browne, 2003; Bowman, Rosenbury, Tuerkheimer, & Yuracko, 2011; Dobash & Dobash, 2015; Dobash, Dobash, & Cavanagh, 2009; Myhill, 2015; Moracco, Runyan, & Butts, 1998; Mossman, 1991; Stark, 2007). During the last quarter of the 20th century, intimate partner homicide (I.P.H.) research focused more on women as the perpetrators rather than as the victims (Dobash & Dobash, 2015; Moracco, et al., 1998). At the same time, the battered woman's defense began to recognize women as victims and scholarly attention began to focus on I.P.V. and the potential of women as I.P.H. victims.⁴ Yet, the availability of reliable and generalizable data for studies did not exist and are still difficult to obtain. Thus, I.P.V. and the murder of women by abusive intimate partners needs to be studied together because women are more likely to become the victim of an I.P.H. than any other category of homicide (Iyengar, 2009; Moracco et al., 1998).

The theoretical framework stemming from the predominant body of literature focusing on the risk factors for the lethality of women in relationships where I.P.V. is present is based on the notion of recidivism, meaning those who are repeatedly arrested for I.P.V. or violent crimes are

⁴ Battered women's defense is a complex legal strategy that involves the application of the dominant victimization narrative and a linkage of the woman's trauma experiences due to extreme abuse, the special case of post-traumatic stress disorder that battered women's syndrome has been defined as, and the criminal or civil cases the woman is facing (Stark, 2007).

the most at risk for committing I.P.H. (DOJNIJ, 1992; Dobash, Dobash, & Cavanagh, 2009; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). The research interest in arrest rates stemmed from the implementation of mandatory arrest and proarrest policies due to the passage of nationwide legislation against D.V. (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Iyengar, 2009). However, these arrest-based studies only look to the implications of the physical violence allegations on the criminal justice response as opposed to their outcome-based implication on I.P.V. victims. 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 I.P.H. (Dobash & Dobash, 2015; Sheehan et al., 2015; Walker, 1979). Additionally, 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 I.P.V. (Campbell et al., 2003; Sheehan et al., 2015).

The criminal justice system attempts to punish the abuser, which indirectly helps protect the I.P.V. victim because the abuser becomes incapacitated from effectuating his abuse. The criminal court's rationale for punishment is based solely on the idea that I.P.V. occurs in discrete and insular acts of physical violence rather than on the notion that it is comprised of a continuum of actions; actions that may *never* involve physical violence (Birenbaum, & Grant, 2013; Dragiewicz, 2011; Hanna, 2009; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). Indeed, a judge can view the aftermath of a physically violent act; but it is not possible to see the aftermath of the ways in which an abuser isolates and intimidates their victim. Unquestionably, protecting I.P.V. victims from non-violent tactics of coercive control is a challenging and unresolved proposition because it is difficult to measure coercive control. 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 the

victim(s) (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Stark, 2007). Rarely do the U.S. criminal and civil justice court systems consider episodes of I.P.V. that do not include physical violence as offenses worthy of punishment or deserving of protection for the victim. 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 of the goals of this study was to contextualize and operationalize coercive control using secondary data collected from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Uniform Crime Report Supplemental Homicide Report (F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R.), law enforcement records, and court documents for the years 2006 to June 2016. Additionally, content analysis of the P.I.F.P.s between the I.P.H. victims and offenders was conducted utilizing NVivo 12 Pro, a qualitative social sciences software package. NVivo 12 Pro provided an analysis of the text of the P.I.F.P.s for development of an understanding of the nature of the relationships between the married/divorced/separated, heterosexual couples involved in I.P.H.s. 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 court. Additional variables were also considered in the quantitative phase of the study using IBM SPSS®, an advanced statistical software analysis program. In furthering the notion that an I.P.H. 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 theory of *the behavior of law* is instructive.

Significance of the Research

To date, no large-scale, empirical study exists that documents coercive control rather than, or concurrent with, physical violence prior to an I.P.H. (Bellew, 2005; Block & Christakos, 1995; Dobash & Dobash, 2015; Dutton, Goodman, & Schmidt, 2006). Additionally, Block and Christakos (1995) explain that the particulars of an I.P.H. rarely provide information about the intimate details of the relationship, as well as the events and circumstances that took place prior to the I.P.H. However, this study sought to do just that, meaning it traced each case to elucidate the I.P.V. victim's interactions with the criminal and civil justice system prior to the I.P.H. Because the murder of women has received little academic attention, since much research and academic attention was focused on women who were physically abused, one of the goals of this study was to bring light to the fact that placing so much emphasis on the physical violence involved in an intimate partner relationship to identify high risk I.P.V. victims may be misplaced (Aldridge & Browne, 2003; Dobash & Dobash, 2015). In fact, most of the research involving lethality risks for I.P.V. victims stems from the abusers arrest data rather than from any type of I.P.H. data (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). This study distinguishes itself because it utilizes P.I.F.P.s, meaning victims' data, as its source for data collection to understand the relationship between the I.P.H. victim and offender.

It is important that these data were collected and analyzed to assess the efforts, or lack thereof, made by I.P.V. victims and/or law enforcement authorities, as well as the judicial system, to protect victims prior to an I.P.H. Empirical literature analyzing the effects of legislation on I.P.V. beyond the point of arrest is not readily, if at all, available. Additionally, there is a dearth of information related to the non-violent tactics of coercive control and risk factors of I.P.H. This lack of empirical literature also includes an analysis of enacted laws

protecting against coercive control, including its non-violent tactics. 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 (Anderson, 2009; Arnold, 2009; Hanna, 2009; Stark, 1994; Stark 2007; Stark, 2009). The results from this study will add to the gaps in the existing empirical literature regarding I.P.V. and I.P.H. Thus, this study will provide helpful data for future research into I.P.H., as well as coercive control for social science, legal, and criminal justice perspectives.

Websdale (2010) describes the establishment of the National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative (N.D.V.F.R.I.), a federally funded fatality review board established in October 1999. He explains that many fatality review boards begin by examining intimate partner homicide-suicides (I.P.H.S.s). However, Dobash and Dobash (2015) discuss the problems presented with conducting I.P.H. case studies, in particular, the inability to generalize the results. 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.

The Florida Attorney General' Statewide Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team (F.A.G.S.D.V.F.R.T.) meets semi-annually to comprehensively review selected D.V. homicide cases from the state's complete set of D.V. homicide cases as provided by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Uniform Crime Report (AG Review, 2018). The 2018 Florida D.V. Fatality Review report analyzed 32 homicides that occurred between 2008 and 2017. The resultant report is quite detailed; however, it lacks in the volume of cases for generalizability to the population for an empirical study. For instance, the report covered an I.P.H.S., which seems to have been hand selected for the purposes of presentation in the report. Due to the nature of

F.A.G.S.D.V.F.R.T., this is not inappropriate; however, it is possible that more or less I.P.H.S.s might need to be included in the sample of cases if the review team wanted it to reflect more accurate statistics. Thus, this study's significance is to add to the body of work that the state of Florida currently has regarding I.P.H.s and I.P.H.S.s. Indeed, fatality review teams serve a very important purpose of detailing D.V. homicides throughout the state each year. However, this study could provide valuable information for key stakeholders because it is generalizable. Additionally, this study analyzes I.P.H.S.s derived from the study of I.P.H.s as opposed to the study of murder-suicides like the majority of I.P.H.S. studies. Caman, Kristiansson, Granath, & Sturup (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 I.P.H., as profound percentage of the I.P.H. offenders commit suicide in connection to the homicidal act (p. 19).

Thus, this study provides much needed information to help alleviate the deficiency.

This study gives meaning to the lives of the I.P.V. victims behind the incident report numbers on the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R., and provides a deeper, richer understanding of the law enforcement and judicial process that occurs prior to an I.P.H. By doing so, it is possible to make a determination of whether physical violence is the only, or even the most, important indicator of lethality risk for I.P.V. victims, as is the current policy. Indeed, the results of this study may have far reaching implications for the policies behind the determination of a lethality risk assessment for an I.P.V. victim who is requesting a T.I.P./F.J.I.P. or any other form of legal assistance or protective services. Briefly stated, lives depend on finding answers to the questions posed in this dissertation.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The general notion is that an abused woman, who is scared for her life from her intimate partner, would contact law enforcement or the judicial system to secure protection for herself (including her child[ren]), from her abuser; but this may not always be the case (Avakame, Fyfe, McCoy, 1999; Bellew, 2005; Mears, 2003; Moracco et. al., 1998). 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 I.P.V. Indeed, there exists an abundance of research that explains that many I.P.V. victims, including those who ultimately become victims of I.P.H., do not report every act of I.P.V. (Campbell, Glass, Sharps, Laughon, & Bloom, 2007; Mears, 2003; Moracco et. al., 1998). Yet, there also exists a plethora of research and academic literature linking the social issue of I.P.V. to arrest rates and whether the policing of I.P.V. is positively affecting the lives of I.P.V. victims, especially the prevention of their death from I.P.H., suggesting that the victim did seek law enforcement's intervention (DOJNIJ, 1992; Campbell et al., 2007; Garcia, Soria, & Hurwitz, 2007; Glass et. al., 2008; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; McFarlane et. al., 1999; Mears, 2003). Contrarily, there is a dearth of research and academic literature analyzing the experiences between an offender and the victim of an I.P.H. 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 (Bellew, 2005; Moracco et. al., 1998; Sheehan et al., 2015; Stark, 2007). I plan to begin filling the empirical gap where the research on I.P.V. arrests ends and the research on the lives of I.P.H. victims begins.

Not All Domestic Violence is Created Equal

To provide improved protection for all I.P.V. victims, my groundbreaking empirical research study seeks to provide an understanding of how devastating and deadly coercive control can be to an I.P.V. victim by providing first-hand knowledge and insight into the experiences of the I.P.H. victim, including those who experience non-violent tactics without any physical violence.

Traditionally, police and prosecutors do not consider a crime “serious until there is a felony, a dead body, or blood and guts.” Domestic violence, however, often defies such stereotyping. Sophisticated abusers can inflict incredible violence without leaving any physical marks and yet the vast majority of domestic violence cases end up being categorized as misdemeanors. It is a tragic mistake to assume these cases are therefore insignificant. (Gwinn & O’Dell, 1992, p. 8).

Although Gwinn & O’Dell (1992) were referring to misdemeanor domestic violence crimes that do not leave physical marks and that law enforcement did not consider as significant, their statement is a foreshadowing for I.P.H. victims who were victims of coercive control where no physical violence was present. Indeed, law enforcement resources are generally spent on major crimes such as homicides. Domestic disputes are considered run-of-the-mill type calls for law enforcement officers, which do not fall under major crimes for responding officers. But, as Gwinn & O’Dell explain, D.V. defies the stereotyping of typical crimes and should be considered as major crimes; thus, it is important to remember that a seemingly run-of-the-mill D.V. type call can turn tragic at any moment. In fact, it is quite possible for a domestic dispute call to turn deadly for the I.P.V. victim as she is dialing 911, while law enforcement is en route to the location of the 911 call, or while the offender of an I.P.H. engages law enforcement.

Coercive Control's Impact on Women

Coercive control is the most destructive and widespread form of I.P.V. in the U.S., as well as throughout the world (e.g., King, 2012a; Stark, 2007). Yet, many of its victims do not realize they are victims because coercive control does not require physical violence for its effectiveness.⁵ Its non-violent tactics are primarily comprised of intimidation, isolation, and control. Its victims live in a virtual prison that is often not apparent to the them or other close family and friends. Coercive control relies on society's gender imbalances and subordination of women for its ongoing success (King, 2012a; Myhill, 2015, Stark, 2007; Walby & Towers, 2018). Without structured gender inequalities throughout society, coercive control would not be as effective in today's patriarchal world.

Isolation and intimidation are forms of coercive control that compare to the torture experienced by prisoners of war (King, 2012a; Stark, 2007). Isolation is a tactic whereby the abuser prevents a victim from having access to support systems such as family and friends because such access may help her prevent the abuse or assist her in leaving the abusive relationship (Arnold, 2009; Dragiewicz, 2011; King, 2012a). For some, isolation means moving across country away from her friends and family. For others, they may have their family and friends stay to visit, only to be isolated from them through his conversational techniques and unwillingness to interact with her family and friends. This repetitive behavior during each visit becomes so humiliating, she stops inviting her family and friends to her home. Because she is so embarrassed and humiliated by his behavior, she stops associating with her friends and discontinues visits with her family. An even more radical isolation techniques is the mail-order

⁵ This lack of awareness of being a victim of I.P.V. generally stems from the belief that one must be subject to physical violence in order to qualify as an I.P.V. victim.

bride. Some men marry women who cannot speak English, so the woman's entire atmosphere is foreign. Thus, she relies solely on the man for guidance. Other examples of isolation tactics include destroying personal effects, such as personal photographs and family heirlooms (Arnold, 2009; King, 2012a). In each case, isolation can lead to the victim becoming more dependent on her abuser for survival, which includes basic necessities, such as food, bathing, and toileting, as well as her emotional needs (King, 2012a; Stark, 2007; Weitzman, 2000). Isolation destroys a victim's sense of "selfhood, social authority, and personal identity" (King, 2012a, p. 158; see also Stark, 2007).

Isolation, in the form of economic abuse, is also a very effective non-violent form of coercive control (King, 2012a; Stark 2007). Many male abusers prevent or forbid women from working or going to school for fear that their victims will achieve financial independence and leave the abusive relationship (Raphael, 2000). To invoke control over a victim, abusers often regulate all forms of access to financial resources, including the victim's own wages. Many abusers insist that the victim release their paycheck to them so that she has no access to her own funds, which is a form of independence. If the victim did have access to her own money, it might give rise to other forms of independence and autonomy that the abuser wants to suppress. Indeed, a victim's ability to leave an abusive relationship is often dependent upon her economic independence (Bellew, 2005; King, 2012a). As DeKeseredy and Schwartz (2009) explain, these types of coercive control victims feel trapped in a volatile relationship, regardless of whether any physical violence is present.

Another form of isolation can occur through the criminal justice system and family law courts when they blame the I.P.V. victim by challenging her innocence, as well as her role within the violent relationship, attributing her behavior as contributing to, or being responsible for, the

violence (Berns, 2004). In fact, victims are viewed as masochistic and, therefore, just as responsible for their victimization as the abuser, or for at least encouraging the abuse. Abusers recognize that the judicial system is an effective vehicle for the further implementation of coercive control, especially economic abuse. The judicial system allows abusers to legally create and prolong divorce litigation, which may generate exorbitant legal fees for the victim, further causing hardship to the victim and furthering the abuser's ongoing control over the victim (King, 2012a; Weitzman, 2000). Likewise, abusers may use child support payments, or the lack thereof, to maintain control over a woman's financial independence and personal autonomy (Crowley, 2003; Kalmanson, 2017). If the woman is employed, her job is an optimal target for the abuser, who may attempt to sabotage her job. As a result, experts recognize that legislation addressing these issues is necessary to combat coercive control tactics inside and outside the courtroom (Hanna, 2009; Stark, 2007; Tuerkheimer, 2004).

Intimidation often presents in the form of threats to do physical harm to the victim, her loved ones, or her pets (King, 2012a; Stark 2007). The abuser does not have to act upon these threats for them to successfully invoke constant fear in the victim for the purpose of torturing her and maintaining her compliance with the abuser's agenda. Other examples of intimidation include, but are not limited to, surveillance, harassment, brandishing weapons, as well as threatening family and friends. Indeed, coercive control's intimidation and isolation may be just as, or even more, detrimental to a victim of I.P.V. than they are to a prisoner of war. Tactics, such as these, deployed by someone with whom victims are intimately involved, like a spouse, boyfriend, or father, will most likely have a greater psychological impact than for prisoners of war, who are generally tortured by an unknown person representing an unknown belligerent power.

Humiliation is a non-violent tactic of coercive control that is more powerful than anyone who has never been abused by someone using it could realize. It strips an I.P.V. victim of her self-worth and identity (Stark, 2007). Over time, the I.P.V. victim who is humiliated due to coercive control begins to “buy into” the degradation and name calling that the abuser constantly barrages her with to the point that she begins to internalize the humiliation. Indeed, constantly telling an I.P.V. victim that she is “stupid” will ultimately cause her to believe that she *actually* is stupid, especially when she is isolated from any other friends or family who might tell her otherwise. Likewise, consistently being told that she is an “ugly whore” will eventually cause an I.P.V. victim to feel little to no self-worth, as would the words “fat pig.” One familiar degradation tactic is to make I.P.V. victims act like animals by eating off the floor (Stark, 2007). Taken to its extreme, an abuser may humiliate an I.P.V. victim by degrading her and calling her names in public.

Power and control tactics include, but are not limited to, withholding food, clothing, and medicine from the victim to obtain her compliance (Stark, 2007). Such deprivation of necessities causes the I.P.V. victim to become so dependent upon the abuser that she must comply to his demands. Other non-violent tactics of power and control include, but are not limited to, child abuse, destruction of the I.P.V. victim’s clothes and personal belongings, and violent acts towards the I.P.V. victim’s family and friends. Although child abuse may become violent towards the child, it does not take on the form of physical violence towards the I.P.V. victim; thus, it is considered a non-violent tactic of coercive control. However, child abuse is unique in that the child is affected when exposed to the abuser’s acts against the I.P.V. victim; thus, physical violence does play a role in child abuse when the child is exposed to the physical violence between the abuser and the I.P.V. victim. This same consideration applies to violent

acts towards the I.P.V. victim's family and friends. Because the violent act is not directed towards the I.P.V. victim, this coercive control tactic is considered non-violent; however, it has a tremendous effect on the victim in the form of power and control over her. Other forms of power and control include, but are not limited to, psychological control of the abuser over the I.P.V. victim, the abuser taking children from the I.P.V. victim, and verbal abuse.

Physical acts of violence usually accompany other coercive control tactics; however, they are not needed to instill paralyzing fear in its victims (Dutton & Goodman, 2005; King, 2012a; Stark, 2007). The complex patterns of various forms of abuse begin slowly and, generally, do not take the form of physical harm. It is because of this slow indoctrination that many victims do not recognize that they have become victims of coercive control. Indeed, for many generations, society has understood I.P.V. as physical violence alone; and it is because of this societal expectation that coercive control victims do not see themselves as such since their harm stems solely from the non-physically violent forms of abuse (Douglas, 2012; Stark, 2007).

Explaining the Inexplicable: The Difficulty in Defining "Domestic Violence"

Defining "domestic violence" is a daunting task, and there is little agreement among scholars and legislators in doing so, making consistency and comparisons across policies and evaluations extremely difficult (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Mears, 2003; Riger et. al., 2000). It is a process that begins with a subjective viewpoint but ends with an objective description of an act by one person against another who, in the case of I.P.V., were intimate with each other, presumably without violence or any other form of abuse. Generally, D.V. is used to describe behavior between family members other than intimate partners whereas I.P.V. is used, specifically, to describe behavior between intimate partners (Mears, 2003). One reason for the

inconsistency in defining I.P.V. is due to the perceived reason for the definition, whether social or legal (Mears, 2003). Depending on the purpose for which the I.P.V. definition is used and for which governing body, organization or entity throughout the world the definition is provided, legally, it is meant to recognize and prosecute I.P.V., as well as to protect its victims (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Mears, 2003; Riger et. al., 2000).

During the 1970s and 80s, as D.V. research and battered women's shelters helped to change society's perspective regarding the fact that D.V. offenders should be held criminally liable for their actions rather than believing that D.V. was a private family matter where men were entitled to physically dominate their household, it became more understood that D.V. is the result of a manifestation of societal power differentials between men and women (Mears, 2003; Stark, 2007). This new perspective required new ways of describing the behaviors, not just physical violence, that manifest the gender imbalance between men and women, requiring more terminology for D.V. other than simply "domestic violence." The type of D.V. that refers to society's gender imbalance and patriarchal values where it is generally acceptable for men to physically dominate women and subjugate them in other ways, is referred to as I.P.V. (Mears, 2003). Thus, D.V. has taken on a more nuanced perspective for legal purposes where it often refers to violence among the entire family as opposed to just intimate partners. I.P.V. is understood to refer to only those people who engage in intimate relationships; thus, the term "intimate partner violence."⁶

⁶ This explanation is for definitional purposes only. To reiterate, in this dissertation, "domestic violence," "domestic abuse," and "intimate partner violence" are used interchangeably unless otherwise indicated.


Most commonly utilized I.P.V. definitions include physical acts of violence without the inclusion of other non-violent tactics of abuse (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Mears, 2003; Riger et. al., 2000; Stark, 2007). One of the reasons for this overuse of the physical violence definition is the fact that the most understood form of I.P.V. is situational violence, which typically manifests in the form of physical violence and does not continue beyond a single, isolated incident (Wright, 2013). Yet, I.P.V. is understood as a pattern of coercive control that often does not include physical harm (Dutton & Goodman, 2005; Stark, 2007; Tuerkheimer, 2004).

There are many tools utilized by experts and advocates to assist victims in addressing and identifying the forms of I.P.V. they experience. The Domestic Abuse Intervention Program's Power and Control Wheel includes coercion and threats, intimidation, emotional abuse, isolation, and economic abuse in its list of forms of abuse (DAIP, 1984; Dragiewicz, 2011; Riger et. al., 2000) [Figure 1]. Academics, such as Lininger (2009) and Sev'er (1997), utilize the term "violence" as an incorporation of intentional physical acts of violence against the body as well as controlling and degrading behavior against a woman's personhood, including her psychological well-being. In its 1993 *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women*, the U.N. provides a comprehensive definition of "violence against women," which includes "coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty" and "results in, or is likely to result in . . . suffering to women" (DEVAW, 1993). Nevertheless, D.V. experts detail the fact that the laws within the jurisdiction of the U.S. define D.V. very narrowly, excluding coercive control and its non-violent tactics (Kalmanson, 2017; Lininger, 2009).

POWER AND CONTROL WHEEL

Physical and sexual assaults, or threats to commit them, are the most apparent forms of domestic violence and are usually the actions that allow others to become aware of the problem. However, regular use of other abusive behaviors by the batterer, when reinforced by one or more acts of physical violence, make up a larger system of abuse. Although physical assaults may occur only once or occasionally, they instill threat of future violent attacks and allow the abuser to take control of the woman's life and circumstances.

The Power & Control diagram is a particularly helpful tool in understanding the overall pattern of abusive and violent behaviors, which are used by a batterer to establish and maintain control over his partner. Very often, one or more violent incidents are accompanied by an array of these other types of abuse. They are less easily identified, yet firmly establish a pattern of intimidation and control in the relationship.



Developed by:
Domestic Abuse Intervention Project
202 East Superior Street
Duluth, MN 55802
218.722.4134

Produced and distributed by:



NATIONAL CENTER
on Domestic and Sexual Violence
training • consulting • advocacy
4612 Shoal Creek Blvd. • Austin, Texas 78756
512.407.9020 (phone and fax) • www.ncdsv.org

Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs. (1984). *Power and Control Wheel*.
Retrieved from
<http://www.ncdsv.org/images/powercontrolwheelnoshading.pdf>

Figure 1. The Power and Control Wheel

Risking Leaving: She Knows He's a Threat, But Does Anyone Else?

“Why didn’t she just leave?” is a common question often asked by those who do not understand coercive control’s power and control tactics. (King, 2012a, p. 170; see also DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2009; Dragiewicz, 2011; Stark, 2007). It is very difficult for a victim to leave an intimate partner relationship where coercive control exists, especially if she has children because access to her own mental, physical and tangible resources are, most likely, depleted (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2009). Davies, Ford-Gilboe, and Hammerton (2009) assert that society erroneously believes the solution for a victim of I.P.V. is to simply leave the abusive relationship. The societal failure to understand that 1) women do not willingly or knowingly enter into abusive relationships; 2) when women recognize they are in an abusive relationship, it is very difficult to determine what to do about it; and 3) women face extraordinarily difficult challenges when attempting to permanently leave their abuser because one who invokes coercive control does not simply let go of such levels of power and control enjoyed in the abusive relationship, which vanishes when the victim is outside of his physical space (Davies, Ford-Gilboe, Hammerton, 2009; Dobash et al., 2007; Sev’er, 1997). Indeed, he will view her audacity to invoke such autonomy as unacceptable, causing him to become angry and willing to rise to levels of physical violence that may not have been previously experienced in the relationship (Dobash et al., 2007; Sev’er, 1997).

Society views the victim’s unwillingness to leave her abuser as a sign of weakness rather than considering that she understands her peril and is attempting to prevent an escalation of violence, either to save her life or the life of her child(ren), by deciding to stay with her abuser (Dutton & Goodman, 2005). In fact, leaving her abuser is a calculated risk between maintaining physical proximity with him and knowing that the violence will most likely escalate once she

leaves (Stark, 2007). Indeed, the coercive control, i.e. her living conditions, must become so unbearable while in the physical presence of her abuser that it becomes obvious that leaving, and risking possible death, is the better option than staying. Because of this misconception, society's inclination is to blame the victim (Davies et al., 2009). Sev'er (1997) explains that this societal misconception stems from the fact that many people believe that marriage provides men with a license to employ violence to keep women under their control; however, many I.P.V. victims are not married to their abusers and are free from physical abuse until the time they separate from their abuser. Some victims, who *had not experienced physical violence prior to leaving their abuser*, are physically assaulted for the first time once separation takes place (Dobash et al., 2007; Sev'er, 1997). Although the term "separation assault" was introduced to raise awareness of the problem, most people do not realize that physical violence usually begins, increases, or becomes deadly once a victim leaves their abuser (Davies, et al., 2009; DeKeseredy, & Schwartz, 2009; Dobash et al., 2007; Raphael, 2000).

Aldridge & Browne (2003) explain that the point in time a woman leaves the relationship is the deadliest because abusers often feel the most emotional and vulnerable. Thus, victims of I.P.V. find making the decision to leave extraordinarily difficult (Raphael, 2000; Weitzman, 2000). To explain the causes of continued I.P.V. and the severity of the risk of lethality when the woman leaves her abuser, it is important to emphasize the fact that many men become obsessed with their former intimate partner because they no longer have access to them (Aldridge & Browne, 2003; Dobash et al., 2007; Ellis, 1989). The mere circumstance of a woman having left the abusive relationship often makes her situation more dangerous than remaining with her abuser due to his lack of power and control over her (Dobash et al., 2007; Sev'er, 1997).

Another consideration for the increased violence at the time of separation is the victim's reduced ability to engage in self-guardianship. Although some I.P.V. victims live in a constant state of *hyperarousal* due to their stress level and possible post-traumatic stress, others may feel more comfortable and at ease in their new surroundings, without their abusers' presence. Thus, some victims are more vulnerable because they let their guards down. Others, although still in a state of *hyperarousal*, are no longer able to read their abusers' every move because they are no longer in their physical presence and cannot anticipate what they will do next. Therefore, they are inherently more vulnerable to attacks as well. Certainly, many I.P.V. victims, who understand this dynamic when considering their option prior to leaving an abusive relationship, will leave their abusive relationship only after they accept the possibility of death over continuing to live in their unbearable, abusive intimate partner relationship (Raphael, 2000).

Gender and Domestic Violence: Legislating against Patriarchal Violence


The Women's Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s ushered in the Domestic Violence Revolution (Berns, 2004; Stark, 2007). Within the argument for women's civil rights, there exists an assertion for greater regulation and enforcement against I.P.V. because of its "political, social, cultural, and structural context" (Berns, 2004, p. 133). It was within this context that Lenore E. Walker, among others, developed the ground-breaking concept of "The Cycle Theory of Violence" (Walker, 1979). Accordingly, I.P.V. moves through stages from what Walker calls the tension-building stage, when minor battering incidents occur, to the acute battering incident, whereby the tension-building incidents become more frequent and out of control to the point that the batterer and the victim are no longer able to prolong the inevitability of a major battering incident. The final stage identified by Walker (1979) is the kindness and

contrite loving behavior stage when she explains the battered woman's victimization becomes complete through the batterer's cries for forgiveness and promises of changed behavior.

Then, in 1984, the staff at the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project developed the Power and Control Wheel to describe women's experiences in abusive relationships (DAIP, 2017, January 6) [Figure 1]. Battering, they argued, was just one form of I.P.V. The pattern of actions is one that involves intentional control of the intimate partner. "That is why the words 'power and control' are in the center of the wheel. A batterer systematically uses threats, intimidation, and coercion to instill fear in his partner. These behaviors are the spokes of the wheel. Physical and sexual violence holds it all together—this violence is the rim of the wheel" (DAIP, 2017). Later, the Maze of Coercive Control was created by Kathy Jones to depict the complexities of coercive control that are not adequately conveyed through the original power and control wheel (Jones, 2019a; Jones, 2019b) [Figure 2]. Indeed, as a visual tool, the Maze of Coercive Control is one of the best aids to succinctly show the chaos an I.P.V. victim deals with when coercive control enters their life on an everyday basis.

To successfully legislate against D.V., society and the law must adequately recognize and identify all forms of I.P.V. (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2009; Stark, 2007). Indeed, the continuum of abuse that includes all forms of coercive control should be properly regulated and enforced. To do so, state laws should encompass the broad spectrum of coercive control tactics in their regulation. To accomplish this, legislators must understand the lack of regulation of all forms of I.P.V., including abuse without physical violence, which causes victims to be at risk of great harm by their abuser, including, but not limited to, death (Berns, 2004; Stark, 2007). However, this is all despite the difficulty that lawmakers face in understanding the dynamics of an intimate relationship that only involves non-violent tactics of I.P.V., especially when no prior

The (NEW!) Recreated Power & Control Wheel



27

record or reported history of physical violence between an abuser and a victim exists before the I.P.H. occurs.

Very few laws focus on the broad range of continuous abusive behaviors that allow I.P.V. to manifest into a woman's loss of self-worth, identity, and physical integrity (Hanna, 2009, p. 1459). Indeed, the tactics of coercive control are rarely simplistic in their implementation, making them even more difficult to regulate (Arnold, 2009; Hanna, 2009). Coercive control does not comport with the narrow characterization of the physical violence of I.P.V. and those harms involved (Tuerkheimer, 2004). Experts understand that the motivation behind I.P.V. is multifaceted, making it difficult to unequivocally ascertain the abuser's intention for committing the abuse (Lininger, 2009).

Many scholars argue that coercive control is a political crime, or a crime that affects society as well as the individual (Hanna 2009; King, 2012a; Stark, 2007). Similar to political terrorism, coercive control deprives its victims of liberty and autonomy, making it necessary to create laws that consider an I.P.V. victim's loss of such aspects of their life. In doing so, it requires law makers to look beyond the physical harms of I.P.V. to determine how to decontextualize and de-gender them (Dragiewicz, 2010a, p. 197).

Evan Stark, one of the best-known experts on D.V. and coercive control, advocates for the implementation of laws regulating coercive control and vehemently argues that coercive control should be considered a crime and afforded appropriate regulation and accompanying punishment (Stark, 1994; Stark 2007; Stark, 2009). Because of this, his works on coercive control are some of the most analyzed, criticized, and relied upon (Anderson, 2009; Arnold, 2009; Hanna, 2009; Libal & Parekh, 2009). He promotes policy change that would recognize and criminalize the non-violent forms of coercive control regardless of whether any form of physical

abuse exists between the offender and his victim. In particular, Stark believes coercive control should be regulated as a crime against a person's liberty because its victims remain in virtual prisons while under their abusers' control.

Tuerkheimer (2004) supports Stark's assertions by stating that criminal statutes throughout the U.S. "are inapt and require an overhaul to capture the practice of domestic violence" (p. 961). She asserts that victims' accounts of the battering they survive are not included in existing legal and extralegal structures. Tuerkheimer (2004) explains that women's accounts of abuse are the most accurate form of evidence in determining the forms of D.V. that should be regulated. In fact, both Stark and Tuerkheimer developed their views because of the patterns of abusive behavior they began to understand from their abused female clients who repeatedly described similar accounts of the violence they endured and escaped. These are the ongoing patterns of abusive behavior that criminal law does not consider in its regulation and punishment for the perpetration of D.V.

Hanna (2009) is one of Stark's toughest critics. She argues that it is difficult to convert the results of social science research, such as that of coercive control, into legal doctrine. She explains that social theory does not always transform directly into legal practice. Hanna explains that, theoretically, expanding D.V. laws to include coercive control and its non-violent tactics might provide better safeguards for women who are disqualified from legal protection from their abusers because their abuse does not fit the category of physical violence. However, she explains that separating situational violence from coercive control may be very difficult for law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Hanna (2009) comprehensively critiques Stark's (2007) advocacy for new coercive control laws, which are presented in his book, "Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life." Also, Hanna (2009) does not agree with

Stark's (2007) belief that victims will readily testify against their abusers, which is necessary to provide the detailed evidence of the unique techniques utilized in coercive control's non-violent tactics. Without such testimony, it is nearly impossible to obtain convictions of abusers who exclusively employ coercive control's non-violent tactics.

Hanna (2009) raises valid points about the potential difficulties in prosecuting coercive control, including the expense of providing expert witnesses to help explain its dynamics. However, she does not offer solutions for working with victims to encourage them to testify or to curtail expert witness expenses. Nevertheless, she definitively agrees that coercive control poses societal and political challenges as a crime against women's freedom and autonomy. Hanna (2009) also acknowledges that coercive control denies women full equality and citizenship but suggests that laws regulating it may cause more problems for its victims than the number of issues they resolve. She believes Stark's (2007) advocacy for new laws governing coercive control is both optimistic and naïve by not accounting for the realistic difficulty in prosecuting such crimes.

But, does difficulty proving a crime make it any less of a crime (Kalmanson, 2017)? Absolutely not. Should society turn its back on victims who may be at risk of death simply because prosecuting the crimes perpetrated against them is *inconvenient*? Instead of ignoring coercive control victims, more stringent laws that include coercive control regulation, especially for the non-violent tactics of coercive control, need to be developed. Law enforcement needs to respond with arrests for I.P.V. violations that include actions without physical violence, and prosecutors need to prosecute cases that have the evidence to support convictions against I.P.V. abusers. There is a multitude of academic literature supporting the notion that prior physical violence, or a tendency thereto, between intimate partners is one of the best indicators that I.P.H.

may take place; however, the unresolved proposition of protecting victims of I.P.V. from the non-violent tactics of coercive control has left as a chasm to fill in the empirical literature (Birenbaum & Grant, 2013; DOJNIJ, 1992).

Assessing the Risk: Understanding A Domestic Violence Victim's Risk of Death

There is a widely accepted belief that, to accurately assess a victim's risk of becoming a casualty of an I.P.H., previous evidence of physical violence or direct threats of physical violence must exist between the abuser and victim (DOJNIJ, 1992; Dobash et al., 2007; Sheehan et al., 2015). As a result, rather than regulating I.P.V. with the concept that it incorporates a continuum of actions that may *never* involve physical violence, the criminal justice system and civil family law courts try to protect I.P.V. victims by punishing their abusers based only on the notion that I.P.V. presents in discrete and insular acts of physical violence (Birenbaum, & Grant, 2013; Dragiewicz, 2011; Hanna, 2009; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Mears, 2003).

Sheehan, Murphy, Moynihan, Dudley-Fennessey, and Stapleton (2015) assert that previous abuse is considered “one of the most important risk factors of IPH” (p. 271). In their discussion, Sheehan et al. (2015) explained the danger of separation for the I.P.V. victim due to the abuser's loss of control over her and the fact that women were three (3) times more likely to become a victim of I.P.H. if separated from their abuser rather than living with him. Additionally, stalking, the presence of weapons, especially handguns, as well as the abuser's consumption of drugs and alcohol contribute to the heightened risk of lethality for the I.P.V. victim.

Campbell et al. (2003) states that “[t]he majority (67%-80%) of intimate partner homicides involve physical abuse of the female by the male before the murder, no matter which

partner is killed” (p. 1089). They draw the conclusion that intervening in intimate partner relationships where physical abuse exists will reduce the number of I.P.H.s. but seek to find additional risk factors beyond physical abuse to enhance their knowledge of risk factors. Thus, they raise unemployment as an important risk factor leading to I.P.H.; and, similar to Sheehan et al., (2015), Campbell et al., (2003) state that the availability of guns increases the risk of I.P.H. Another less commonly recognized but significant risk factor for I.P.H. is non-fatal strangulation (Reckdenwald, King, & Pritchard, 2019). In fact, prior non-fatal strangulation carries an estimated seven and a half times higher risk of I.P.H. than for I.P.V. victims who have not experienced non-fatal strangulation.

Aldridge and Browne (2003) acknowledge that I.P.V. research has been a vigorous endeavor without an I.P.H. empirical research counterpart. However, they explain that “[t]here is a large body of evidence that links spousal homicide to domestic violence” (p.267). In their literature review, they explain that the data on I.P.H. risk factors are limited because the victim, the key witness to the homicide to which one is trying to collect the data, is unavailable. However, other sources of data, with potential self-serving agendas, provide a picture of risk factors to assess. Aldridge and Browne agree with and echo many of the risk factors determined by Sheehan et al., (2015) and Campbell et al., (2003); and they determine others as well. These risk factors include age disparity between the I.P.V. victim and the abuser, possessiveness and sexual jealousy by the abuser, and personality disorder.

As discussed above, separation is an important risk factor for the I.P.V. victim. The most dangerous time during an I.P.V. victim’s relationship with her abuser is when she leaves him. However, if the abuser has *never been* physically violent with the I.P.V. victim before the separation, based on the widely-accepted belief that a lethality risk assessment should be

completed based on evidence of prior physical violence between the I.P.V. victim and her abuser, then how can we predict that there *is* a lethality risk? What if the first time the violence occurs is at the time of the killing? Have we provided an injustice to that I.P.H. victim by placing too much emphasis on prior physical violence in the relationship?

The Disillusionment of the Protections of an Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence: Why and When are They Important to I.P.V. Victims?

It is often said that an Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence is “just a piece of paper” and does nothing to protect the person holding one when it comes to *actual* protection from abuse (Sheehan et al., 2015). But, some I.P.V. victims are, generally, willing to jump through all the legal hoops it takes to obtain such a civil protective order because one is usually enforced through the criminal judicial system, meaning jail time if the abuser violates the order (Logan, Shannon, Walker, & Faragher, 2006).

The process to obtain an F.J.I.P. is overwhelming and cumbersome, especially for anyone who is not familiar with the legal process, i.e., your typical I.P.V. victim. Most U.S. states have similar statutes and processes, and many of them have non-profit and community-based organizations to help I.P.V. victims with their legal filings for little to no cost (Logan & Walker, 2010). Some local and county organizations offer victim advocate support services to assist I.P.V. victims with their cases, especially if they must go to a hearing by themselves. These advocates do not provide legal services, but they are familiar with the legal processes and paper filings. This allows them to support the I.P.V. victim throughout the entire legal process. Of course, the ideal situation is to have the I.P.V. victim hire a licensed attorney to represent her from the beginning of the process of filing the initial P.I.F.P. against the abuser; but, many I.P.V. victims do not have the financial resources to hire an attorney to assist them with this process.

To obtain an F.J.I.P. against an abusive intimate partner, a P.I.F.P. must be sworn to and filed by the I.P.V. victim, which is then reviewed *ex parte* by the court (Logan et al., 2006). At that point, the P.I.F.P. is either denied, temporarily granted with a hearing set for the F.J.I.P. or denied with a hearing set for the F.J.I.P. The subsequent hearing is usually set within a 10 day to 2-week time frame.⁷ Because the initial P.I.F.P. is heard *ex parte*, it is incumbent upon the court to hold the hearing, with notice to the Respondent, i.e., the alleged abuser, as soon as possible so that the responding party may have their due process.⁸

There is a debate among researchers about the effectiveness of T.I.P.s and F.J.I.P.s in stopping abuse and preventing the lethality of I.P.V. victims (Logan & Walker, 2010). Indeed, these protections are state specific; and many I.P.V. victims, who do not realize they have been or are being abused, due to the lack of physical injury they receive from their abuser, often fail to appreciate the fact that they may be eligible for assistance from law enforcement or protection from the court depending upon their state's protections (Kalmanson, 2017; King, Kalmanson & Huff-Corzine, 2019, May; Schwaeber, 2010; Stark, 2007). Each of the individual states throughout the U.S. have statutes providing for T.I.P.s and F.J.I.P.s for I.P.V. victims who experience "battery, assault, bodily injury, threat of bodily injury, or placing a person in fear of physical injury" (Johnson, 2009, p. 1131; see also Logan & Walker, 2010).⁹

⁷ This timing is generally driven by the court's docket, but the 2-week time frame is the standard by which most courts try to adhere.

⁸ It is important to keep in mind that, if the T.I.P. is granted at the *ex parte* stage, the alleged abuser loses his rights without notice or a hearing, i.e., without due process. It is because of this that it is so important to ensure the level of abuse alleged meets the criteria to issue the T.I.P. and to make sure that the scheduled hearing on the F.J.I.P. is held as soon as possible after service of the T.I.P. to the alleged abuser.

⁹ The terminology utilized for the issuance of the order for protection against domestic violence is, sometimes, locally determinative.

The absence of non-violent tactics in these laws makes it difficult for I.P.V. victims who are abused exclusively through non-violent tactics to obtain T.I.P.s and F.J.I.P.s because they are rarely able to produce evidence of any physical bodily harm through the filing of a P.I.F.P. or a hearing. Without evidence of the mostly physical forms of I.P.V. enumerated in the statutes governing when the court may issue T.I.P.s and F.J.I.P.s, the I.P.V. victim who experiences ongoing non-violent abuse must employ self-guardianship to preserve her safety and well-being because she cannot rely on law enforcement or the Court. Alternatively, many victims of I.P.V., who feel they have no other option, look to the family court system for their personal safety and well-being, especially within the context of a divorce proceeding because they are too afraid to seek help by filing a P.I.F.P. or have been denied a P.I.F.P. in the past (Bellew, 2005).

The Role of Intimate Partner Homicide-Suicide in Intimate Partner Homicide

The concept of the termination of an intimate relationship resulting in a homicide of one of the persons involved in that intimate relationship may be difficult for some who have never been involved in an abusive relationship to understand. To take it a step further, when that intimate relationship terminates in an I.P.H.S., most people find this difficult to comprehend. However, the complete end to a family when the intimate relationship ends, indeed with the killing of the spouse, children, and other family members by the “family annihilator,” it is unbearable for the community at large (Salari & Sillito, 2015, p. 27; see also Morton, Runyan, Moracco, & Butts, 1998).

It is estimated that between 1,300 and 1,400 I.P.H.S. deaths occur each year in the U.S. (Salari & Sillito, 2015). However, it is difficult to determine the risk factors for an abuser who may commit an I.P.H.S. because there is no “one size fits all” profile for this type of killer. Salari

and Sillito (2015) suggest that lethality risk factors are not as predictive for I.P.H.S., making it more difficult for community and criminal justice responses because these killings tend to take place more as a reaction to relationship situational circumstances. Undeniably, I.P.H.S. is distinct from homicide or suicide alone. And, to be clear, with I.P.V., homicide is the best way for an abuser to maintain ultimate control over his victim.

Richards, Gillespie, and Givens (2014) explain that, of all forms of homicide-suicide, I.P.H.S. is the most common. They emphasize the interwoven risk factors of domestic violence and homicide while pointing out the fact that suicide reporting guidelines inadequately instruct on domestic violence considerations. This is considerably dangerous for the I.P.V. victim, especially when depression and mental illness are considered as two risk factors found for I.P.V. and suicide. Because of this connection between I.P.V. and suicide risks, Richards et al., (2014) emphasize the fact that the media should report on the history of any collective problems rather than simplifying the event or suggesting it came “out of the blue” (p.455). Indeed, according to Morton et al., (1998), these types of homicides, i.e., I.P.H.S., “are rarely sudden, isolated occurrences. They are typically the culmination of long-standing turmoil and conflict including threats, physical abuse, and victim attempts to leave the relationship” (p. 92).

Although there are very few studies that include statistics for the percentage of I.P.H.s that result in I.P.H.S.s, Velopulos, Carmichael, Zakrison, and Crandall (2018, September) found that 46.5% of the male offenders in an I.P.H. when the victim is a female attempted suicide and were successful with their attempts 35% of the time (Caman, Kristiansson, Granath, & Sturup, 2017). Velopulos et al. (2018) asserts that the 35% successful I.P.H.S. percentage is astonishing and worthy of further investigation as it pertains to I.P.V. and suicidality.

The Gender Asymmetry of Coercive Control

The types of abuse women experience from men who assert their patriarchal privileges with which coercive control is identified is particularly gender-asymmetrical, meaning it is not experienced in a similar manner by both genders (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2009; Dragiewicz, 2011; Johnson, 2010; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). The concept of gender symmetry and violence in intimate partner relationships is one that has been debated for several decades (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). However, recently, theorists and researchers have attempted to find common collective ground.

Dragiewicz (2011) explains that abusers utilize patriarchal gender norms to justify their I.P.V. She also asserts that such norms are important for society's general acceptance of violence against women. Masculinity is usually associated with violence because men use it in their day-to-day lives more than women; thus, their violence against women is sewn into the fabric of American life, making it explicitly condoned or generally ignored (Dragiewicz, 2011, p. 47). Other authors, such as Berns (2004), suggest that the media is largely responsible for society's ambivalence and indignation towards I.P.V. In fact, Garland Waller (2010) points out that the mainstream media turns a blind eye on the every-day abuses women face, allowing such disgraces as I.P.V. to go unchecked not only by law enforcement and the courts but by society at large. Waller (2010) explains that some stories are simply too dark and too extreme for the media to cover because the public will not be interested in these types of I.P.V. stories.

Dutton and Goodman (2005) explain how some studies argue that I.P.V. is a gender symmetrical offense, meaning that men are victims of violence perpetrated by women offenders just as often as women experience violence inflicted by men. However, there is a recognition that I.P.V. should be broken down into different typologies; and when discussing gender symmetry,

violence is the measurement between the man and the woman in the intimate relationship (Dutton & Goodman, 2005; Johnson, 2010; Kelly & Johnson, 2008; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). Generally, it is recognized that the type of I.P.V most closely associated with coercive control is gender asymmetrical and is perpetrated by the male in the relationship. Additionally, because gender symmetry is measured by violence, the typology most generally known as situational violence is recognized more as one that is gender symmetrical because men and women do engage in violence perpetration (Johnson, 2010).¹⁰

Coercive control does not focus on *actual* violence for its effectiveness; thus, whether physical violence between the couple is reported is not relevant to the existence of I.P.V. between the couple (Dutton & Goodman, 2005). However, because coercive control is usually perpetrated by men in heterosexual relationships, it is important to consider the violence a woman may use in resistance to her abuser's violence (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). Kelly and Johnson (2008) term this type of violence by women "Violent Resistance" and make it clear that they do not classify similarly to the legal term of art definition of "self-defense," even though the two terms may have similarities. Violent resistance is any type of violence a woman uses "as an immediate reaction to an assault and that is intended primarily to protect oneself or others from injury," which does correspond to the layperson's understanding of self-defense (Kelly & Johnson, 2008, p. 484). I.P.V. victims who employ this type of resistance to abuse may feel empowered and decide to separate from their abuser once they begin resist coercive control, or

¹⁰ The terminology of "violence perpetration" is very important to the overall conclusion that situational violence is gender symmetrical due to the fact that both men and women have been measured "on a ridiculously narrow definition of symmetry in terms of incidence/prevalence." In studies that determine gender symmetry, men and women have acknowledged having engaged in at least one act of violence based on the survey used, no matter the outcome of that violence. However, studies using agency samples, i.e., those stemming from law enforcement, courts, hospitals, and shelters, result in gender asymmetry.

they may determine that it worsens their situation. Thus, resistance to abuse, whether violent or not, is a personal choice the coercive control victim must navigate while ensuring her and her child(ren)'s safety.

Litigation and Coercive Control: Not Every P.I.F.P. is the Same

Often, the I.P.V. victim finds herself involved in litigation with her abuser (Bellew, 2005; King, 2012a; Özçakar, Yeşiltepe, Karaman, & Ergönen, 2016). Whether before a criminal or civil court, the process can be very difficult for the I.P.V. victim as she can feel revictimized by the legal system, as well as by her abuser. Nevertheless, it is necessary to file certain cases with the court to secure legal rights, including a T.I.P. or F.J.I.P. (Person, Moracco, Agnew-Brune, & Bowling, 2018). In many cases, the I.P.V. victim and the abuser may file multiple P.I.F.P.s, especially when coercive control is present in the intimate relationship. One of the reasons for this is because the domestic violence protection system is “one incident” focused rather than able to handle a couple's cumulative file, forcing the court to treat each violent incident as a separate court action.

Agnew-Brune, Moracco, Person, and Bowling (2017) explain that 37% of all violent crimes against women are classified as I.P.V. Due to such repeated exposure to violence from their intimate partner, victims of I.P.V. apply for T.I.P.s and F.J.I.P.s throughout the country on a regular basis to prevent their partner from intimidating, threatening, harassing, assaulting, or contacting the person filing for the court order for protection from domestic violence. It is up to the judge to determine the severity of the case and to base it on the statute's language as to whether the T.I.P. or F.J.I.P. may be granted. Judges have great discretion in denying or granting T.I.P.s and/or F.J.I.P.s and are mandated to make objective decisions without inserting their

personal beliefs into the decision-making process. However, Agnew-Brune et al. (2017) explain that judges' perceptions of what severity of violence that is required to cross the line for the issuance of a T.I.P. and/or F.J.I.P. may be very different. They explain that, in the absence of physical evidence of injuries, such as visible bruising and lacerations, judges rely on their own personal definitions of what should be "enough" to issue the T.I.P. and/or F.J.I.P.

One judge in the Agnew-Brune et al. (2017) study explained that they use intuition to determine whether a T.I.P. or F.J.I.P. should be granted. Specifically, they explained that they observe the I.P.V. victim's demeanor, rather the alleged abuser's behavior in court. Judges look to the reactions of the victims in court to see if they are afraid or in fear of what has or is taking place to determine whether they believe the fear of physical violence is high enough to cross the threshold for the granting of a T.I.P. or F.J.I.P. An appearance by the victim of normalcy, i.e., such as not seeming tearful enough, caused some judges to feel as though the victim was not in enough fear to warrant the issuance of an order for protection. Indeed, judges went as far as to accuse victims who appeared in court and happened to smile as having faked their abuse or playing games with the court system.

The study did not indicate that any of the judges stated they paid attention to the abusers' demeanor in court to determine how they interacted with court personnel or the victim. Often, body language can indicate a person's social interactions and skills, especially regarding how they are perceived by others and whether they are manipulating and controlling. Instead, regarding the abusers, the judges in the study focused on their anticipated regret for 1) erroneously issuing the protecting order due to the havoc it would reap in the lives of the innocently accused and 2) worrying about not issuing the protective order for fear that they would allow the domestic violence to escalate if one was not issued. Yet, different from the

influences of the victims' presentations in court, the judges did not let these fears of regret impact their decisions on the bench.

Gender Bias in the Courts

Many studies and task forces examining gender bias in the courts have been completed over the past several decades, finding that “gender bias is pervasive and has serious consequences” (Dragiewicz, 2010b, p. 5-7; McConnell & Sikora, 2000; Schafran & Wikler, 2001; Schafran & Wikler, 1986). To understand this form of bias, it is first important to understand the definition of gender bias as defined by the National Judicial Education Program to Promote Equality for Women and Men in the Courts because it can often be misunderstood. “Gender bias refers to attitudes and behaviors based on sex stereotypes,¹¹ the perceived relative worth of women and men and myths and misconceptions about their economic and social positions” (Schafran & Wikler, 1986, p.2). The role of gender and its implicit hierarchal structure between men and women within the judicial system not only affects the personnel working among it every day but the members of society who are exposed to the rule of law and its judicial orders. (Dragiewicz, 2010b; King, 2012b; King & King, 2017). Indeed, the law itself is based on a patriarchal precedent of social and cultural norms that bind women and men to a legal jurisprudence developed almost exclusively by white men with privilege. Today, this inherently male legal system seeks to disempower women and reinforce male dominance.

One of the forms of disempowerment of women in the judicial system is the constant questioning of her credibility (Dragiewicz, 2010b; King & King, 2017). While challenged with

¹¹ The terms “gender” and “sex” are often used interchangeably; however, sex refers to the female or male category as biologically assigned at birth. Gender refers to the social construct of femininity and masculinity as applied to the sexes (Dragiewicz, 2010b).

judicial proceedings against their abuser, many victims of I.P.V. are still under enormous stress of the trauma from the abuse they face(d) from the same person they now must confront in court. Often, this trauma related stress can cause the I.P.V. victim to appear agitated or dissociated with her surroundings, making them seem less credible than the non-traumatized litigant.¹² When these outward manifestations of trauma occur, the non-trauma informed court, most-likely, will not take the I.P.V. victim's abuse and trauma symptomology into account. Thus, when a P.I.F.P. is heard without any visible evidence of recent physical violence and the victim presents agitated or dissociated, the court may be inclined to view their claims of abuse as non-credible, effectively empowering the abuser to continue his abuse unabated.

Gaining an Understanding into I.P.H. Victims: A Comparison of Studies

To most accurately develop lethality risk factors for I.P.V. victims, it is necessary to access the best data available. Recently, researchers have begun to look to covictims as “the source of firsthand and intimate knowledge regarding the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator” (Sheehan et al., 2015, p. 270).¹³ However, for a multitude of reasons discussed below in Chapter Four: Current Study Description , obtaining data from the I.P.H. victim prior to the killing provides credible facts about the relationship that cannot otherwise be obtained. For this reason, prior studies on I.P.H. must be compared to this study because the persons the researcher looks to for the data collection and how the research is conducted, i.e., the

¹² Dissociation is a coping mechanism that manifests in a trauma victim when confronted with a trauma inducing situation that causes the need for the victim to escape from their immediate surroundings (Eubanks Fleming & Resick, 2016).

¹³ Sheehan et al., (2015) defines a *covictim* as family members and close friends who have lost loved ones to a homicide. Researchers also utilize the term “proxy” to describe someone they consider knowledgeable about the victim's relationship with the perpetrator but who does not have direct information about the I.P.H.

methodology of the study, ultimately plays a central role in the outcome of the results. In other words, it is possible that the study may erroneously focus on prior physical violence alone; thus, the results are skewed towards an overall outcome of physical violence predating the killing due to the methodology of the study.

In 1992, Dr. Jacquelyn C. Campbell stated that about two thirds of I.P.H. victims were physically abused before they were killed (DOJNIJ, 1992, p. 27). This statement was provided in support of the initial lethality risk assessment tool that was being presented to the National Institute of Justice at the time and has been heavily relied upon ever since (Block & Christakos, 1995).¹⁴ In addition to Dr. Campbell's risk assessment, the entire report provided during the "Proceeding of the First Annual Workshop of the Homicide Research working Group" on "Questions and Answers in Lethal and Non-Lethal Violence," included Block and Block's detailed report on how they collected data for their "Chicago Homicide Dataset [that, at the time,] contain[ed] over 200 variables . . . and almost 20,000 cases" (DOJNIJ, 1992, p. 98). These data were derived from the Chicago police department and included all homicide cases known to them occurring between 1965 and 1990. Police investigation files were the data source for the study, which lead to a focused study on I.P.H. published in 1995.

Block and Christakos (1995) utilized "the largest, most detailed data set on violence available in the United States" at the time of their I.P.H. study, which spanned over 22,000 homicides. Of the 22,000 cases, 2,556 homicides were utilized for their study on I.P.H. Block and Christakos (1995) make it very clear when explaining their data and methodology that "[t]he Chicago Homicide Dataset contains information from the *police* point of view" (p. 497). Indeed,

¹⁴ In 1992, the risk assessment tool was termed "Danger Assessment Instrument" (DOJ, 1992, p. 31).

they want to ensure that the reader understands the offender's designation in the case was not taken to prosecution, i.e., the police determined culpability; however, what is also important to understand is that the data set was developed from a third-party's viewpoint of the case, meaning the I.P.H. victim did not have a voice in the development of the data set. The results of the study are very detailed and useful; yet, Block and Christakos (1995) explain that I.P.H. prevention is unresolved because it requires longitudinal analysis of I.P.V. cases to their eventual outcome, lethal or nonlethal.

Moracco, Runyan, and Butts (1998) study of femicide in North Carolina between 1991 and 1993 utilizes two unique, but complimentary, data sources to create a data set that is generalizable and detailed. First, they accessed the data from the statewide medical examiner system which is mandated in North Carolina to investigate all unnatural causes of death. Second, they conducted telephone interviews of the law enforcement officers who completed the I.P.H. investigations. In the course of the 15-20-minute interview, a targeted question centered on a prior history of domestic violence. The term "domestic violence" is defined as "a set of physically violent and / or threatening behaviors perpetrated against an intimate partner" (Moracco et al., 1998, p. 427). An example scenario offered by Moracco et al. (1998) is as follows:

We asked the law enforcement officers whether specific behaviors (e.g., the perpetrator physically assaulted the victim, the perpetrator threatened the victim's family) had occurred prior to, but not during the femicide. If any of these behaviors occurred, or if a history of domestic violence was noted anywhere in the medical examiner file (including the narrative section of the Report of the Medical Examiner Investigation and / or enclosed newspaper clippings), we classified the case as having a history of domestic violence. (p. 427).

Thus, details of any other form of domestic abuse or coercive control, including questions thereof, were not covered or, possibly, discouraged.

Campbell et al. (2003) published their case-control study that utilizes proxies as data sources for the I.P.H. victims' relationship with the abuser information. This study analyzes 307 cases with at least 2 proxy informants who are familiar with the details of the intimate relationship between the killer and the I.P.H. victim prior to the killing. However, 19.2% of the 307 cases were eliminated because the proxy reported no prior abuse by the femicide perpetrator, essentially requiring that all proxy cases had prior abuse to qualify for the study. Additionally, the 343 control cases were randomly identified intimate partners who had to meet the criteria of "abused," which meant "physically assaulted or threatened with a weapon by a current or former intimate partner during the past 2 years" (Campbell et al., 2003, p. 1089). Thus, this study limits the data's ability to express any notion of domestic abuse other than physical violence or the threat thereof.

Dobash, Dobash, and Cavanagh (2009) named their study "The Murder in Britain Study," and it produced three different data sets.

The study included three distinct sources of data: (a) two extant Homicide Indexes containing, annual reports of all known homicides within Britain (approximately 700-800 in England/Wales and about 100 in Scotland); (b) an original data set including quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the case files of a sample of 866 men and women convicted of murder; and (c) another original data set of qualitative data based on 200 in-depth interviews with men and women currently serving life in prison for murder (Dobash, Dobash, & Cavanagh, 2009, p. 195).

For their article "'Out of the Blue': Men Who Murder an Intimate Partner" which is the focus of this comparison, Dobash et al. (2009) analyzed 104 cases of men who were convicted of I.P.H.

Their data are incredibly detailed and span the lifetime of the killer, with life circumstances and details of the murder adding to the holistic framework. Indeed, “the police, forensic experts, solicitors, trial judges, psychiatrists/psychologists, medical staff, social workers, probation officers, school teachers, family members, witnesses, and the offender” all contributed to the rich data collected for this study, which are available because of the offender being in prison in the United Kingdom (U.K.) for the I.P.H. (Dobash et al., 2009, p. 205; see also Dobash & Dobash, 2015).

The processes the U.K. developed for the I.P.H. offender evaluation for prison release is extraordinarily extensive, and the study’s access to these data is invaluable (Dobash et al., 2009; Dobash & Dobash, 2015). However, much of the data are specific to the offender and does not provide any information regarding the I.P.V. victim’s point of view about the intimate relationship. In addition, and most importantly to this study’s focus, Dobash et al., (2009) specifically acknowledge that I.P.H. research in the U.S. is “*primarily limited to cases with a history of previous violence to the victim* [emphasis added]” (p. 202). This type of limitation, especially for an entire class of cases such as those studied in the U.S., alters the results of any number of studies published for decades to state that physical violence prior to the I.P.H. is most certainly a lethality risk.

In their exploratory I.P.H. study, Sheehan et al. (2015) explain that accessing covictims as a source of data for information regarding the I.P.H. victim is a neglected area of study. They explain that, although I.P.V. advocates, medical examiner reports, and police records provide some information regarding the intimate partner relationship, obtaining access to family members and close friends increases the level of understanding of the intimate relationship to improve development of I.P.H. risk factors. As a result, the Sheehan et al. (2015) study, which

consists of 14 covictims representing 9 incidents, 16 deaths, and 9 I.P.H. victims, is instructive.¹⁵ Their study is not generalizable and the covictims were interviewed approximately 6 years after each I.P.H.¹⁶

Sheehan et al. (2015) explained their methodology in detail to determine that, although a specific topic of conversation was “the covictims’ perspective on level of dangerousness[,]” the study was not specifically focused on prior physical violence. Indeed, the method of free-flowing, conversation-like interviews conducted for this qualitative study allowed for the covictims to provide the information they had about the intimate partnership without interruption. Thus, this exploratory study’s results, although not generalizable, were quite interesting in terms of prior physical violence because, according to the covictims, all nine I.P.H. cases had a history of domestic violence. In fact, the covictims provided details as to the types of prior reporting the I.P.H. victims had done in attempts to seek protection from their abusers leading up to the killings, i.e., law enforcement, I.P.V. advocate, and health care professional.

Although the studies discussed above are exceptional, methodologically, each tends to lend itself to the inevitable conclusion that physical violence between intimates is a precursor to I.P.H. The Sheehan et al. (2015) study seems the most promising for data collection from those as close to the I.P.H. victim in determining prior reporting of physical violence without bias; however, additional data for generalization is needed. Indeed, this type of data may be difficult to collect due to covictims’ reluctance to participate, as is the citizenry’s reluctance to mobilize the law when they witness I.P.V.

¹⁵ The study originally identified 59 covictims from 39 I.P.H. cases.

¹⁶ Mean length of time since the homicide.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORY

There are many theoretical approaches to homicide and violence within the family, macro- and micro-social orientation respectively (Parker & Toth, 1990). To provide a predominant theoretical framework for I.P.H., where the determinates consider the non-violent aspects, as well as the physically violent exchanges between the victim and offender, it is often necessary to consider a theoretically synthesized approach (Parker & Toth, 1990; Mears, 2003). However, for this study, Black's Theory of the Behavior of Law provides the best theoretical perspective because it considers the I.P.V. victim's decision to mobilize the law, either criminal or civil, for self-protection prior to the killing.

Due to the finality between parties to an abusive intimate relationship when an I.P.H. occurs, including less restrictive legal concerns for privacy, I.P.H. cases may be the most enlightening as to: 1) the totality of the content needed in lethality assessments for living victims; 2) common signs provided by the I.P.V. victim and/or the abuser which may provide useful information for the need to expedite legal intervention than is generally applicable by today's standards; and 3) the need for more collaboration and coordination between the criminal and civil court systems as well as various authorities among all jurisdictions involved in any I.P.V. case (DOJNIJ, 1992; Moracco et al., 1998; Walker, 1994). The results of this study may help to better identify an abusive intimate relationship as high-risk for lethality and provide a more in-depth understanding of the risk factors that affect the interactions between an abuser, the I.P.V. victim, and the legal system, i.e., the behavior of law.

Black's Theory of the Behavior of Law

Black's (2010) work provides various propositions and explanations about why and how people utilize the law and when they determine to mobilize it for their own benefit. This "mobilization of law" takes shape in many forms, from an emergency when the initial call to 911 is made to the filing of a civil lawsuit, whether an actual crime was ever committed. Black (2010) considers many societal characteristics to explain his theory about how certain groups of people may or may not behave in relation to the law. According to Black, for an offense against a victim of a private crime, such as I.P.V., to result in the arrest and subsequent prosecution of the I.P.V. offender, it is necessary for someone, meaning the I.P.V. victim, to mobilize the law. Thus, Black asserts that people of different social classes, races, educational levels, and income levels determine when or how to mobilize the law based on several different societal propositions. These propositions form the basis of his theory, "the behavior of law."

Black (2010) provides the foundation for his theory of the behavior of law through six propositions of social interaction that help to explain why prior physical violence may not be as critical a factor in the risk assessment for an I.P.H. Black's six propositions are as follows: 1) stratification, 2) morphology, 3) culture, 4) organization, 5) social control, and 6) anarchy.¹⁷ These propositions work together to serve as an overarching theory for when, why, and how

¹⁷ A simplified explanation of Black's (2010) six propositions is as follows:

- 1) Stratification explains inequality of wealth, and the litigant's ability to access the courts, i.e., access to justice;
- 2) Morphology explains "the patterns of social life", and the litigant's "quantity and style of law" (p. 37-38);
- 3) Culture explains "the symbolic aspect of social life, including expressions of what is true, good, and beautiful", as well as historical jurisprudence (p. 61-62);
- 4) Organization explains "the capacity for collective action . . . patterns of revolt . . . [and] the success of social movements"; thus, law varies based on "the organization of law itself" (pg. 85-86);
- 5) Social control explains normative behavior and that behavior which is considered deviant; thus, law is social control;
- 6) Anarchy explains a society without law; thus, the relationship between law and anarchy is inverse.

people within certain social settings will mobilize the law (Avakame et al., 1999; Black, 2010). Yet, Black (2010) states that “law is inactive among intimates” (p. 41). His theory on the mobilization of law between intimate partners espouses the notion that those in close proximity to each other, such as intimate partners, will not mobilize the law, regardless of whether violence is present. He explains that U.S. law takes legal actions between intimates less seriously. Hence, a person who is at the greatest risk of becoming a victim of an I.P.H., i.e., an abused intimate partner, may not become involved in the system or be subjected to a lethality risk assessment because they will not mobilize the law on their own behalf, knowing the system will not take them seriously. Additionally, I.P.V. victims who do enter the system may not necessarily disclose the intimate details of their spousal relationships. These details are often necessary for advocates and authorities to determine that mobilization of the law is necessary to protect the victims’ personal safety. Therefore, Black (2010) concludes that “intimacy provides immunity from law” (pg. 42).

According to Payne and Triplett (2009), special attention has been given in the arena of I.P.V. research to: 1) its cycle of violence, 2) the intergenerational transmission of violence, and 3) the reaction of various government agencies that could help to break the cycle of violence between an I.P.V. victim and their offender if they choose. Payne and Triplett (2009) explain that much research attention has been paid to “front line workers dealing with domestic violence,” including the police and the courts (p. 243). Their study is victim centered, and they explain that not all I.P.V. victims come to the attention of law enforcement or the courts as the simplistic police and judicial response inadequately meets the special needs of most I.P.V. victims. Most of the programs assessed by Payne and Triplett (2009) place the responsibility on the victim and

those people whose main goal or job it is to help or advocate for the victim, as does Black's Theory of Law (Black, 2010).

Although Payne and Triplett (2009) recognize that many I.P.V. cases do not enter the system because the police are never called (lack of mobility of the law), their study does not actually assess I.P.V. victims' reasons for lack of the mobilization of the law. Certainly, such a myriad of reasons an I.P.V. victim may choose to remain unknown to law enforcement as well as the criminal and civil judicial system is complex and confounding. However, it is possible to explain this phenomenon through Black's (1970) account of the citizenry's option to invoke the power of law enforcement. Black (1970) asserts that the legal "system responds only to those who call upon it while it ignores illegality that citizens choose to ignore" (p. 739). An I.P.V. victim who is constantly physically abused may not mobilize the law in her own defense, i.e., for fear of retaliation from her abuser, whereas another may attempt to mobilize the law to protect herself but does not have the law on her side because she has not been physically abused. Neither result is effective in protecting the I.P.V. victim, but it does help to explain why some victims are left to their own self-guardianship.

Avakame, Fyfe, and McCoy (1999) produced a study based on Black's 1973 theory of the behavior of law and which focused on I.P.V. and calls to the police as well as law enforcement authorities' reactions to the calls. It is a socioeconomic focused study. Avakame et al. (1999) explain that certain components of Black's 1973 theory of the behavior of law asserts that intimates, especially married and employed people, are more likely to mobilize the law and utilize it aggressively, especially using the court system. Therefore, married, upper-middle class socioeconomic groups are more likely to call the police and effectuate an arrest (Avakame et al.,

1999). However, this assertion is in direct contradiction with Bellew (2005), where she explains that married, affluent women who are victims of I.P.V. are less likely to call the police for help.

Bellew's Explanation of the I.P.V. Socioeconomic Divide

Bellew (2005) explains that married, affluent women are more likely to utilize divorce attorneys for escape from an abusive intimate relationship rather than contacting any law enforcement authorities or contacting I.P.V. shelters for help, even when they fear for their own physical safety. She suggests that the women she studied remained as far away from the criminal justice system as possible, resulting in a complete lack of mobilization of the criminal law system. Thus, Bellew's assertions support a mobilization of the civil law system as opposed to the criminal law system regarding the various demographic groups of I.P.V. victims she studied.

The contradiction between Bellew's (2005) assertions and Black's 1973 theory is expected because I.P.V. is a very complex and misunderstood crime. The multifaceted dynamic of I.P.V. is compounded by the fact that there is a lack of available data regarding many stages of I.P.V. prior to the mobilization of the law and an I.P.H. (Avakame et al., 1999; Moracco et al., 1998). This lack of data is especially due to a lack of I.P.V. victim reporting. Although well-known and respected surveys are conducted that do not involve police reporting, such as the National Crime Victimization Survey, they still rely on the victims' truthfulness, perception of the seriousness of the crime, and ability to speak freely without fear of repercussions from their abusers (Avakame et al., 1999; Moracco et al., 1998; Walker, 1994). Walker (1994) asserts that I.P.V. victims and offenders may be reluctant to provide information regarding their experiences and that the phrasing of questions during a survey are critical to the survey's success and accuracy.

Bellew (2005) explains that I.P.V. victim surveys do not include those victims who were killed by their intimate partner and those who chose to deal with their situation in a different form of law mobilization than penal law, such as through the process of a divorce which occurs in the civil law system. Yet, by utilizing the N.C.V.S., the Avakame et. al. (1999) study produced some interesting results in relation to Black's (2010) theory of the behavior of law. The Avakame et. al. (1999) results suggest that the race of the I.P.V. offender/victim, the age of the I.P.V. offender/victim, and the gender of the I.P.V. offender/victim each affect the probability of the mobilization of the law when I.P.V. is involved, including when people call the police as well as when the police decide to make an arrest. It is well recognized that gender plays a large role in the outcome of a conflict, especially between intimate partners, with females being more likely to be killed by their spouse or an estranged partner (Block & Christakos, 1995). Thus, it is important that the law is mobilized by someone who is aware of the I.P.V. occurrence, even when the I.P.V. victim is not able to do so themselves.

Theoretical Implications from the Avakame et. al. (1999) Study

The first step the system takes in determining to mobilize the law is at the point of responding to a 911 call. If the police, while using their discretion, do not make an arrest, then the remaining *criminal law* processes are devoid of their ability to determine whether to mobilize the law. Some of the Avakame et. al. (1999) results supported Black's theory, but other results do not. Thus, the results of the Avakame et. al. (1999) study were mixed in relation to the support of Black's theory. Avakame et. al. (1999) found that many factors, outside of the structural variables of Black's theory, account for the different ways in which I.P.V. victims, offenders, and authorities mobilize the law. In reconciling why this might be the case, Avakame

et. al. (1999) explained that, today, I.P.V. is handled differently than when Black first published his theoretical book in 1976, including new mandatory arrest policies which affect the reported data. Nevertheless, they concluded that Black's theory is supported by several factors including the race of the I.P.V. offender/victim, the age of the I.P.V. offender/victim, and the relationship between the I.P.V. victim and offender: 1) the older the I.P.V. victim, the more likely the law will be mobilized; 2) if the I.P.V. offender is a minority, the more likely the law will be mobilized against them; and 3) the further apart the relationship between the I.P.V. victim and the offender, the more likely the law will be mobilized. In addition, Block and Christakos (1995) studied many of the same factors when they reviewed Chicago's homicide data between the 1960s and 1990s. They found that age, gender, race, and the type of weapon used were all relevant to the outcome of an I.P.H.

CHAPTER FOUR: CURRENT STUDY DESCRIPTION

Data and Methodology

The focus of this mixed-methods study was to determine whether coercive control, exclusive of a prior reporting of physical violence to law enforcement or the court before an I.P.H., presents a significant risk of death. Through inductive and deductive reasoning, this study tests Black's (2010) behavior of law theory against the empirical research regarding whether the victim of an I.P.H. sought the assistance of law enforcement or the court at various times during the heterosexual spousal relationship prior to the I.P.H. Additionally, the term "coercive control" was contextualized and operationalized from the secondary data collected relevant to P.I.F.P.s between heterosexual spouses who are the subjects of the I.P.H.s for this study.

This study looks at certain variables, such as I.P.H.S., Record of P.I.F.P., and weapons used, as well as correlations among the variables.¹⁸ These data provide insight into the frequencies of the cases studied that had prior reporting of physical violence and those that did not have prior reporting of physical violence before the I.P.H. It assumes that the I.P.H. involved physical violence between the I.P.V. victim and the offender, so the violence at the time of the killing was not considered I.P.V. for prior physical violence to the I.P.H. for the purposes of this study. The data were organized, coded and analyzed following the qualitative and quantitative methods described below. Additionally, a detailed description of the data collection process and resulting conceptualization and operationalization of coercive control, as described below, is vital to this study.

¹⁸ This variables list is not all inclusive. Please refer to Chapter Four: Quantitative Methods sections below for full details.

Methodology for Data Collection: Sourcing Public Records

Deliverables for this study, including the conceptualization and operationalization of coercive control, were sourced from data for January 1, 2006 through June 31, 2016 that were collected from the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R., various law enforcement agencies throughout the state of Florida, and multiple Florida county clerks of court.¹⁹ Heterosexual married couples were chosen for this study because I.P.H.s are known for being expressive, i.e., the main reason the killing occurs is because the offender's motive was to intentionally hurt the victim (Block & Christakos, 1995).

The F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. Data

To initiate the collection of data, this study utilized email for all Florida Department of Law Enforcement (F.D.L.E.) public records requests to the official F.D.L.E. Office of General Counsel email at publicrecords@fdle.state.fl.us (FDLE, 2017). Specifically, requests were made for all F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. "that are coded for all homicides involving spouses, no matter the circumstance code, where one spouse is the victim and the other is the offender . . . for all Florida counties" (D. King, personal communication, January 31, 2017). For the period of January 1, 2006 to June 30, 2016, the overall total of reported I.P.H. cases provided by the F.D.L.E. was 665. However, the F.D.L.E. does not filter its Uniform Crime Report Supplemental Homicide Report (U.C.R.-S.H.R.) public records requests to provide only the cases requested; thus, all public records from all law enforcement agencies involved in the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. were

¹⁹ Researchers utilize the process of conceptualization to define a concept for the purposes of their study because some researchers may conceptualize a concept differently than others. Once conceptualization takes place, the concept is able to be specified as to how it will be measured; thus, operationalization has taken place (Chapter 5, n.d.).

contacted to ensure external and internal validity of this study. In other words, the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R., on its face, cannot be taken as an exact measure for Florida heterosexual spousal I.P.H.s. (Campbell et al., 2007).

One of the reasons for the fact that the U.C.R.-S.H.R. cannot be taken at face value, as Campbell et al. (2007) explains, is because the U.C.R.-S.H.R. misclassifies intimate partners, mostly because they do not have a category to account for ex-boyfriend/girlfriend. Thus, for this study, the data provided by the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. were cross-referenced against the incident report for each I.P.H. for the reporting law enforcement agency to ensure accuracy. More importantly, this cross-referencing was completed to ensure that each homicide on the U.C.R.-S.H.R. was, in fact, a heterosexual spousal I.P.H., especially because it is possible that some cases that were reported may be other types of I.P.H. cases (Campbell et al., 2007). Additionally, the data collected from law enforcement in the second phase of this study, as well as the data collected from the county courthouses, further helped to cross-reference against the U.C.R.-S.H.R. for any I.P.H. cases that may not have fit this study's criteria.

Of the 665 cases originally provided by the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R., 47 cases were excluded from this study for the reasons listed immediately below, bringing the total number of cases to 618. As discussed above, when cross-referencing the U.C.R.-S.H.R. with the data collected from law enforcement as well as the county courthouses, it became evident that cases on the U.C.R.-S.H.R. did not fit this study's criteria for the following reasons:

- The I.P.H. victim and offender were not married = 17 cases
- The heterosexual spouses were involved in either a drunk driving/vehicular homicide rather than an I.P.H. = 9 cases
- The homicide victim(s) was/(were) killed by an unknown assailant = 10 cases

- The case is not an I.P.H. between heterosexual spouses = 3 cases
- Both spouses committed suicide = 1 case
- Both spouses were victims of a crime (not necessarily a homicide) = 2 cases
- The wrong case number and year of incident was provided; the case is outside the criteria of the study = 1 case
- Missing person report; not an I.P.H. = 1 case
- Homicide victim was family member of suspect, not spouse of suspect = 1 case
- The case was not a homicide between the heterosexual spouses; it was a simple battery = 1 case
- The case was not an I.P.H.; it was an accidental drug overdose = 1 case

Lack of availability of records from various law enforcement agencies based on either their unresponsiveness to requests for public records or their public records rules, such as the unavailability of public records while criminal trials and appeals are still in progress, prevented 125 cases from being included in this study. This brought the total number of cases from 618 to 493, allowing for generalizability at this level of the study. The breakdown of reasons as to why cases were excluded from this study due to law enforcement agency rules, etc. is as follows:

- Law enforcement agencies' unresponsiveness to requests for public records for this study = 67 cases
- Law enforcement agencies' policy of not releasing records while litigation is still taking place regarding the suspect in the case = 27 cases
- The name of either the I.P.H. victim and/or offender provided by the law enforcement agency was legally redacted under F.S. Chapter 119 for various

reasons, such as the I.P.H. victim or offender was a police officer (some reasons were undisclosed) = 5 cases

- The name of either the I.P.H. victim and/or offender provided by the law enforcement agency was unknown for various reasons, such as the I.P.H. report was handwritten and illegible; and additional requests to obtain the names were unsuccessful = 17 cases
- The name of either the I.P.H. victim and/or offender provided by the law enforcement agency was missing from the first request of I.P.H. reports, and additional requests to obtain the names were unsuccessful = 6 cases
- The law enforcement agency destroyed the I.P.H. reports, as a matter of standard agency procedure, requested through the public records request = 2 cases
- The name of the victim and offender provided by the law enforcement agency was labeled as “unknown;” and the case was not an I.P.H. = 1 case

Florida Local Law Enforcement Agencies

The F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. provides information to link each I.P.H. to their respective reporting law enforcement agency to obtain the names of the I.P.H. victim and offender by tracking the Agency Report Number. This information is necessary for further qualitative data collection. For this study, each agency was provided a public records request of the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. excerpt pertaining to its Agency Report Number(s) and case(s) so that the incident report(s) for the homicide(s) was/(were) provided. Once the first round of incident report(s) from each law enforcement agency was logged, coded, and analyzed, a second public records request

was sent to each local law enforcement agency within the county where the I.P.H. occurred. The difference with the second public records request was that it contained the name of the I.P.H. victim and offender, as opposed to the anonymous Agency Report Number that was provided on the U.C.R.-S.H.R. The purpose of the second public records request was to collect all incident reports within the Florida county where the I.P.H. occurred to account for all possible prior physical violence reports that may have been made to local law enforcement agencies before the killing. Thus, it was possible to log the prior reporting of physical violence between the I.P.H. victim and offender that might have taken place at any time during their relationship prior to the killing by obtaining these data.

There were 163 law enforcement agencies that were contacted during the data collection process for the 665 cases for the first reports as described above. Of the 163 law enforcement agencies, 139 responded to the first request for records. Twenty-four (24) law enforcement agencies did not respond to the first request for records, which generally stemmed from a lack of response after multiple attempts to contact the public records department and/or contact persons for the identified law enforcement agency. Of the 139 law enforcement agencies that responded to the first request for records, 119 responded to the second request for records. Thus, 20 agencies were non-responsive at the second request phase of the law enforcement agency data collection portion of the study, affecting 60 cases in the study.²⁰ In other words, 60 I.P.H. cases do not have the prior physical violence data from law enforcement for analysis. Reasons for lack of response at the second request phase were similar to those at the first request phase, even though relationships with public records departments were built during the first phase of data

²⁰ There were times that third requests for public records were necessary to obtain all the documents from a particular agency; however, this was agency specific as each agency had their own set of protocols.

collection. Other reasons for lack of inclusion of second phase data include excessive costs to obtain them, as well as the extensive time needed by some agencies to complete the public requests which fell outside the time frame of this study.

The Florida County Courthouse

The final source of public access for data collection was the county courthouse. Today, most, if not all, county courthouses in Florida have online access to their public records dockets. As a result, for this study, it was possible to research each of the 493 cases for which the name of the I.P.H. victim and offender were obtained, as described above, making it possible to research the court records between them. Specifically, P.I.F.P.s filed between the I.P.H. victim and offender, whether filed by the I.P.H. victim or against the victim, were searched for using the relevant county's online court access vehicle to determine whether the couple had any prior P.I.F.P.s between them. The county courthouse search was limited to the county in which the I.P.H. occurred. Each name, i.e., the I.P.H. victim and the offender was searched separately in the clerk of court's on-line system to ensure that all possible cases were found through the on-line system. Only P.I.F.P. cases that matched for both parties were included in this study. 8 cases' P.I.F.P. documents, identified through the on-line search process as described above, were destroyed as a matter of the clerk of courts' administrative procedures. For purposes of the county courthouse data source, 100 P.I.F.P.s, spanning 62 cases were collected. However, because it is possible to do additional on-line docket research into the complete history of the

P.I.F.P. case, 108 P.I.F.P.s were able to be used for analysis in the qualitative phase of this study but not for content analysis.²¹

These P.I.F.P. data are critical for the qualitative methods phase of this study as well as the quantitative methods phase. Once the identification of each P.I.F.P. was made, the public records request to the relevant clerk of court was made to obtain the P.I.F.P. as they are not readily available through on-line services. Generally, the clerk of courts local rules allowed them to respond via their on-line systems; however, some responded via mail, e-mail, or only in person. At times, clerks of court were particularly resistant to providing the requested documents, citing privacy issues relevant to the parties in the cases. When this arose, additional correspondence was required to explain the nature of the study and to remind the clerk of Florida's Sunshine Law, including Florida Statute, Chapter 119, which allows for access to the public records that were being requested (AG Moody, 2018).²² This correspondence was effective and produced the desired effect of receiving the requested documents from the resistant clerk of court.

P.I.F.P.s contain attested-to narratives, written by the person in the I.P.V. relationship who is asking the court for protection, that provide insight into the history of the forms of I.P.V. that would have been experienced by the person seeking protection prior to the I.P.H. Any such records are inherently rich in details because it is incumbent upon the person seeking protection from the court to provide detailed information for the court to determine whether to provide a T.I.P. as described above in "Chapter Two: The Disillusionment of the Protections of an Injunction for Protection: Why and When are They Important to I.P.V. Victims?". Indeed, the

²¹ By utilizing the 108 P.I.F.P.s, 3 additional cases were included in the analysis for a total of 66 cases.

²² Florida's Government-in-the-Sunshine Law, enacted in 1967, supports the public's right to access most governmental and governmental agency records (AG Ashley Moody, 2018).

P.I.F.P.s are first-hand accounts, provided by the I.P.H victims and/or their offenders, prior to the killing, making this study the first of its kind to obtain these data for analysis.

As discussed above, Aldridge and Browne (2003) explain that the key witness to the I.P.H. is unavailable when collecting data; and researchers have attempted to do their best to piece together the personal aspects of the intimate partner relationship prior to the killing. However, police records, medical examiner reports, coroner reports, covictims' interviews, newspaper collections, social media, witnesses' interviews, etc. do not have the same intimate details as the I.P.H. victim, who is seeking the court's protection from her abuser. Aldridge and Browne (2003) explain that all the various sources of data, other than the I.P.H. victim, may have varying agendas when collecting data or providing information. However, the I.P.V. victim, attesting to her P.I.F.P. narrative to the court, is viewed as having one agenda, i.e., seeking protection from the court due to a perceived threat of violence from her abuser.

CHAPTER FIVE: QUALITATIVE METHODS

The qualitative methods phase of this study utilizes secondary data collected from 100 P.I.F.P.s from various Florida clerks of court to conduct a content analysis. The content analysis looks at the nature of I.P.V. relationships between heterosexual spouses living in Florida that resulted in 62 I.P.H.s occurring between January 1, 2006 and June 31, 2016 with the dates of the P.I.F.P.s spanning from August 1993 to December 2015. The data were analyzed for the identification of coercive control tactics, including physical violence, utilized by the I.P.V. offender spouse as attested to by the I.P.V. victim spouse in the P.I.F.P. prior to the killing. It is important to note that, in many cases, the P.I.F.P. may have been filed by the I.P.H. offender rather than the victim. In fact, many cases include P.I.F.P.s in which the I.P.H. victim and offender filed multiple P.I.F.P.s each.

NVivo 12 Pro assisted in organizing, coding, and analyzing the 100 P.I.F.P.s so that the conceptualization and operationalization of the emotions and tactics of coercive control were able to be defined.²³ The processes of conceptualization and operationalization are necessary so that strictly defined variables for coercive control may be empirically and quantitatively measured; these measures are utilized in the quantitative phase of this study. One of the most important questions asked by this study and for which the P.I.F.P. data were collected is: “What role the non-violent tactics of coercive control plays in I.P.V. compared to physical violence prior to the I.P.H.?”

Content analysis involves a systematic method for identifying, organizing and indexing units of meaning to explore overarching themes, patterns, and main ideas that emerge from the

²³ NVivo 12 Pro is a qualitative and mixed-methods data analysis social sciences software package.

data (Richards et al., 2014; Salari & Sillito, 2016). Each of the 100 P.I.F.P. documents were uploaded into a NVivo 12 Pro database as a PDF document. The narrative portion of the P.I.F.P. was typed into a Microsoft® Word document because NVivo 12 Pro was not able to read the text of the PDF. Thus, each Microsoft® Word document representing the 100 P.I.F.P. narratives were uploaded into the same NVivo 12 Pro database as well. The Microsoft® Word documents, representing the 100 P.I.F.P. narratives, were coded; the 100 P.I.F.P. documents in PDF format were used for reference if needed.

The Power and Control Wheel [Figure 1] and The Maze of Coercive Control [Figure 2] provided guidance as to the types of coercive control behaviors that the content analysis coding should substantiate as did the literature reviewed in this study. To be very clear about the question(s) asked in this phase of this study and the data coded to answer these questions, the center of the Power and Control Wheel [Figure 1] focuses on the terms “Power” and “Control.” Based on most current U.S. state statutes, for behavior to be considered I.P.V., the offender must become physically violent with the victim or threaten such acts, i.e., an act that ignores the major part of the wheel as it passes from its controlling persistence to the outer physical violence ring of the wheel. All the pie shaped sections that contain concepts and examples of the non-violence acts of coercive control are treated as though they do not exist if focusing on physical violence alone. This study focuses on evidence of all these types of abuses that are commonly ignored and unregulated. Also, valuable information regarding the use of various non-violent coercive control tactics used for abuse may be gleaned from the Jones et al. (2010) study.

The first level of coding was guided by the literature reviewed for this study and the most commonly understood tactics of coercive control, i.e., intimidation, isolation, control, and physical violence. However, within the data, many subsets of these forms of coercive control

began to emerge from the data, as did other themes. As additional themes emerged and the need for more codes arose, second and third level coding took place to ensure that all cases were properly coded. This process continued until all cases were completely coded and all necessary codes were inputted. To this point, some themes and sub-themes were outside the scope of the four main tactics of coercive control. In fact, some codes provide for the coercive control victim, although being victimized, attempting to find her agency as a citizen, often becoming resistant to her abuse and her abuser (Stark, 2007).

Voices of I.P.H. Victims

This chapter reflects the voices of those lost to I.P.H. The 100 P.F.I.P.s collected for this study provide first-hand accounts of the intimate partner relationships analyzed for this study, particularly from the point of view of the I.P.H. victim. As the P.F.I.P. data were analyzed and themes began to emerge, phrases were coded within NVivo 12 Pro, allowing for free-flowing generation of new themes, subthemes and codes. As discussed above in “Chapter Four: Current Study Description,” the total overall number of cases for this study is 493; and there were 62 cases with P.I.F.P. documents for analysis. It is important to note that, as discussed above, some cases had more than one P.I.F.P.; thus, the number of P.I.F.P.s, i.e., 100 and the number of cases with P.I.F.P.s, i.e., 62 are different.²⁴

The term “coercive control” was defined within the context of the data collected. This study conceptualizes and defines “coercive control” as an ongoing pattern of behavior by an abuser that includes, but is not limited to, intimidation, isolation, humiliation, physical violence, and power and control, which is utilized against a victim to invoke constant fear, even when the

²⁴ The range in the number of P.I.F.P.s per case is 1 to 6 for the 62 cases that have P.I.F.P.s.

victim is able to resist abusive tactics that may culminate into future physical injury or death.

Within this definition, the themes of the qualitative phase of the study begin to appear.

Collectively, twenty-seven subthemes, generating eight main themes, were derived from the P.I.F.P. data²⁵ [Table 1.] However, these themes are not mutually exclusive, meaning they share similar qualities. For purposes of this study, their order of presentation is purposeful for overall organization as well as substantive presentation of data. Intimidation, isolation, humiliation, power and control, and fearful of the future are themes that refer to the characteristics that the P.I.F.P. victim is experiencing as a result of the abuser's actions.²⁶ Resistance to abuse is a theme that describes an action taken by the victim in response to the abuse or the abuser. Abuser mental illness, although a theme that describes an attribute of the abuser, includes subthemes that are actions taken by the abuser and include some behavior directed towards the P.I.F.P. victims. Physical violence is another characteristic that the P.I.F.P. victim experiences as a result of the abuser's action; however, it is separated in its presentation in this study because it is utilized as a dependent variable in quantitative analysis.

Before discussing the results of this study, it is important to recognize the language barriers inherent in the P.I.F.P.s submitted to the court for requests for protection. Not only are these language barriers evident from those who experience English as a second language, but many narratives are written by people who might have achieved less than a high school education. These people struggle with either handwriting or typing the narrative that is required of them to be responsive to the court in filing the P.I.F.P. documentation.

²⁵ The NVivo 12 Pro Codebook developed as a part of this study for the Coercive Control Themes and Subthemes is available for review in Appendix A: NVivo 12 Pro Codebook – Coercive Control Themes and Subthemes.

²⁶ The P.I.F.P. victim and I.P.H. victim may not be one in the same as the person who requests protection from the court may not be the person who was killed by their spouse. Also, in some cases, both spouses filed a P.I.F.P.

Table 1. Coercive Control Themes and Subthemes

<u>Theme</u>	<u>Subtheme</u>
<u>Result of Abuse</u>	
Intimidation	Animal Abuse Harassment Surveillance Threats Threatens Family and Friends Weapons
Isolation	Economic Control False Imprisonment Financial Control
Humiliation	Degradation Name Calling
Power and Control	Child Abuse Violent Acts Towards Family and Friends Taking Children from Victim Deprivation of Necessities Psychologically Controlling Verbal Abuse Household, Clothes, and Personal Belongings Destroyed
Fearful of the Future	Fear for Child(ren)'s Safety Pregnant
<u>Response to Abuse</u>	
Resistance to Abuse	Helping Abuser Separated or Estranged
<u>Attribute of the Abuser</u>	
Abuser Mental Illness	Drinking Alcohol Drug Use Paranoia
<u>Result of Abuse</u>	
Physical Violence	Non-fatal Strangulation Rape and Sexual Abuse

Note: Physical violence will be used as a dependent variable in quantitative analysis.

Also, even for those who are well educated, it is important to understand that many I.P.V. victims,²⁷ when experiencing the stressors and extreme anxieties of abuse, i.e., trauma, are not always the most articulate communicators of their abusive experiences. Additionally, a person who is living “in survival mode” will often write in such a way that is incoherent and difficult to read. As a result, some of the first-hand accounts from the P.I.F.P.s may seem out of sorts, including spelling and punctuation errors; however, their form is normal in the I.P.V. community for all the reasons previously stated.

Intimidation

For this study, “intimidation” is a theme that describes acts by the abuser that are meant to create fear in the I.P.V. victim in general, such as threatening suicide or making the I.P.V. victim afraid by using certain behaviors and gestures. 1.6% of the 493 cases and 12.6% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 10.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in an intimidation coding [Table 2.] In a case where 3 P.I.F.P.s were filed prior to the killing, all by the I.P.H. victim, the offender threatened to kill himself in 2 of them.²⁸ In April 2007 and September 2008, the offender told the I.P.H. victim that he was going to kill her, their daughter, and himself.

²⁷ In this chapter, there are references to the I.P.V. victim and the I.P.H. victim, who may or may not be the same person. This is because these terms refer to the person writing the P.I.F.P. (I.P.V. victim), who could be the offender or victim of the I.P.H. because, in some cases, the offender of the I.P.H. filed P.I.F.P.s as well.

²⁸ One P.I.F.P. in this case was not able to be collected due to the clerk of court’s administrative destruction of the case file.

Table 2. Coding Coverage Percentages

<u>Code Name</u>		<u>Cases,</u> <u>N=493</u>	<u>Cases*</u> <u>w/P.I.F.P.,</u> <u>N=62</u>	<u>P.I.F.P.,</u> <u>N=100</u>
<u>Theme</u>	<u>Subtheme</u>			
Intimidation		1.6%	12.6%	10.0%
	Animal abuse	0.4%	3.1%	2.0%
	Harassment	3.4%	26.9%	21.0%
	Surveillance	2.8%	22.2%	15.0%
	Threats	8.9%	69.8%	75.0%
	Threatens family and friends	2.8%	22.2%	14.0%
	Weapons	2.4%	19.0%	12.0%
Isolation		3.4%	26.9%	22.0%
	Economic control	2.0%	15.8%	10.0%
	False imprisonment	2.0%	15.8%	11.0%
	Financial control	2.2%	17.4%	13.0%
Humiliation		1.4%	11.1%	10.0%
	Degradation	1.8%	14.2%	11.0%
	Name Calling	4.6%	36.5%	23.0%
Power and control		7.3%	57.1%	48.0%
	Child abuse	3.4%	26.9%	23.0%
	Violent acts towards family and friends	0.4%	3.1%	2.0%
	Taking children from victim	1.2%	9.5%	7.0%
	Deprivation of necessities	1.0%	7.9%	5.0%
	Psychologically controlling	2.8%	22.2%	17.0%
	Verbal abuse	2.8%	22.2%	18.0%
	Household, clothes, and personal belongings destroyed	3.4%	26.9%	22.0%
	Fearful of the future	7.0%	55.5%	42.0%
	Fear for child(ren)'s safety	2.8%	22.2%	16.0%
Resistance to abuse	Pregnant	0.4%	3.1%	2.0%
		10.3%	80.9%	51.0%
	Helping abuser	1.4%	11.1%	10.0%
Abuser mental illness	Separated or estranged	5.8%	46.0%	37%
		1.8%	14.2%	11.0%
	Drinking alcohol	3.0%	23.8%	19.0%
	Drug use	0.8%	6.3%	5.0%
Physical violence	Paranoia	3.4%	26.9%	17.0%
		10.7%	84.1%	75.0%
	Non-fatal strangulation	2.6%	20.6%	14.0%
	Rape and sexual abuse	1.6%	12.6%	9.0%

Note: Physical violence will be used as a dependent variable in quantitative analysis; *Cases may have more than one P.I.F.P.

In her April 2007 P.I.F.P., the I.P.H. victim specifically explained that, “when I went back home I saw a few pieces of string hanging from the ceiling fan in the living room. My daughter told me when I came [home] that he showed it to her and told her that he was going to hang himself.” Although the reference to the few pieces of string and being able to hang oneself from string does not necessarily make sense, it does not minimize the references to the offender wanting to kill the family and himself.²⁹ These threats resurfaced again in September 2008 when the offender stated he was going to kill the I.P.H. victim, their daughter, and himself. Three months later, in December 2008, an I.P.H.S. occurred.

Animal abuse

“Animal abuse” is a subtheme of intimidation and, for the purposes of this study, describes acts the abuser has committed or threatens to commit that are, or would be harmful, neglectful, or of a physically or sexually abusive nature toward animals that are loved by the I.P.V. victim. One reason for such efficacy in this area for abusers is because pets have become so important within socio-demographic and socio-economic landscape (Owens, 2015). Indeed, pets, i.e., family members play a central role within the fabric of American lives. As a result, abusers understand that targeting the I.P.V. victim’s pet is a very effective means to target the emotions of their victim. In this study, one I.P.H. victim attested to the fact that the offender threatened to take her dogs away from her. In another case, the offender threatened to kill the I.P.H. victim’s dog. In both cases, the threat of removing or killing the victim’s dog is an effective form of intimidation to obtain compliance from the victim. 0.4% of the 493 cases and

²⁹ It is possible that a language barrier caused the misunderstanding.

3.1% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 2.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in an animal abuse coding [Table 2.]

Harassment

“Harassment,” in this study, is a subtheme of intimidation that describes the abuser continuously contacting the I.P.V. victim or doing something the victim has asked the abuser to stop doing. 3.4% of the 493 cases and 26.9% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 21.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a harassment coding [Table 2.] Most of the phrases and themes focused on either the I.P.H. victim or the offender stating in their P.I.F.P. that they were being harassed. Many cases involve language about excessive texting and phone calls, such as the person having left “32 messages,” or that they had “called my cell phone continuously.” However, these themes escalate once viewed in context with other harassment phrases. Many cases discuss the other (ex)spouse following them or being in their house when they should not be there. In two cases, the offender utilized the police department to harass the I.P.H. victim by filing multiple police reports against her. Still, one I.P.H. victim described her harassment as, “Sometimes he follows me in his car doing bumper to bumper to scare me.” In another passage, she explained, “Some nights when I am sleeping, he kicks me constantly just to start a fight; this happens at all times during the night.” These examples show how harassment can escalate to such heights that the I.P.V. victim’s bodily integrity is in danger. As a result, although intimidation may seem as though it is, truly, a non-violent tactic of coercive control, in practice, even harassment (a behavior that seems so commonplace in today’s America) can threaten one’s safety.

Surveillance

“Surveillance” is a subtheme of intimidation that describes acts by the abuser intended to maintain constant information about what the I.P.V. victim is doing and with whom they are doing it. 2.8% of the 493 cases and 22.2% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 15.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a surveillance coding [Table 2.] As with harassment, most of the phrases and themes with surveillance focus on either the I.P.H. victim or the offender. Within this node, the word “followed” is the most commonly used, tending to show that offenders utilize this form of surveillance most often. Other surveillance tactics utilized by offenders that emerged from the data are in the form of the offender going through the I.P.V. victims’ phone, purse, house, and truck. However, some offenders, who were the killers in the I.P.H. offense, escalated their surveillance tactics.

In one case, the I.P.H. victim reported surveillance to the court when she wrote, “He put up [a] video camera up in the house without my knowledge.” In a similar case, the I.P.H. victim explained:

Lastly, I do not have any privacy because he installed a system on all phones so he can tape/record and listen into every call. He uses that against me saying he will always know where we are. He has followed us on many occasions.

The same victim in another P.I.F.P. stated that, “He let me know that he knew exactly where I am because he installed a GPS device to follow me everywhere.” She continued:

He is recording all of our fights and saying he will be using that in court to protect himself; he is using a video camera to record in the house; I once found out he was recording us while we were together when I saw the video in his computer; I felt devastated.

Both victims quoted above were killed in I.P.H.S.s 2½ years after their requests for protection from the court.

Surveillance is a difficult non-violent tactic of coercive control to live with because the I.P.V. victim is stripped of her sense of privacy. As stated by the I.P.H. victim above, she felt devastated to learn that her husband had recorded their fights while they were together. In another case, in one P.I.F.P. alone, the I.P.H. victim explains that she has learned from her (ex)husband that “people are listening to [her] phone calls,” “that [she is] being followed,” that “[h]e has gotten into [her] email,” and that “[h]e could break into [her] home and the police could not do anything about it.” This I.P.H. victim was killed 24 days after having written and filed her P.I.F.P. in an I.P.H.S. Indeed, surveillance is a very effective intimidation tactic as it strips I.P.V. victims of their sense of privacy and security. It also lets them know that the abuser is an omnipresent force in their life, causing the I.P.V. victim to lose their sense of autonomy.

Threats

“Threats,” a subtheme of intimidation, describes acts or words by the abuser towards the I.P.V. victim that are meant to evoke immense fear of imminent danger or worry of something to occur in the future. 8.9% of the 493 cases and 69.8% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 75.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a threats coding [Table 2.] The most common word within this code is “kill,” with the most common phrase or usage being “he threatened to kill me” or some variation thereof. Often, the threat to kill is preceded by the explanation, “he said if I leave,” meaning the offender intends to kill the I.P.V. victim if she intends to leave him. One I.P.H. victim wrote in a P.I.F.P, filed in 2005, that the offender:

began threatening me as well (as he has done many times in the past), that when my second son [] leaves for college, he is going to kill me. . . . He said he can't do it now as long as my (our) son is still in the house, but he will make sure it happens when he leaves and then afterwards he said he will kill himself.

Later, she wrote in another P.I.F.P. filed in 2007 that he threatened to kill her many times. In 2009, she was killed in an I.P.H.S. after her son was old enough to have been in college.

In some of the P.I.F.P.s, the I.P.V. victims are very detailed in the threats to kill their offenders make, especially in the manner of death. One I.P.H. victim explained that her offender threatened to kill her by “snapping” her neck and “that he was sick enough to do it.” 16 days after writing and filing her P.I.F.P., she was killed in an I.P.H.S. but by a firearm. Although he did not ultimately kill her by the method she stated as threatened in her P.I.F.P., her fear of his threat being serious was warranted. Another I.P.H. victim described her offender stating that he was going to kill her, himself, and their daughter. She explained that “he was going to tie me up and burn me in the car.” 3 months later, she died by an I.P.H.S. via firearm. Although there was a third victim to the shooting, the daughter was not involved.

Threatens Friends and Family

“Threatens friends and family,” in this study, is a subtheme of intimidation that describes acts or words by the abuser towards the I.P.V. victim’s friend(s) and/or family that are meant to evoke immense fear in the I.P.V. victim that there is imminent danger of something terrible happening to their friend(s) or family. 2.8% of the 493 cases and 22.2% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 14.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a threatens friends and family coding [Table 2.] Unlike the threats to the I.P.V. victim in general,

there is no pattern to the threatens friends and family code; however, “kill” is still the most common word among this code. One I.P.H. victim wrote how her offender “went on saying how he would start killing my family members to make me suffer.” One month later she was killed.

In another case, the I.P.V. victim wrote:

He threatened me and my friend verbally . . . He left the house in my truck looking for the friend he thought I was with before coming home stating he would beat him to a pulp if he found him. He has called this person multiple times and threatened his life.

Less than a month later, she was killed in an I.P.H.S. Many of these incidents bear a resemblance to the other non-violent tactics of intimidation, only utilizing friends and family. Often, the offender brings the I.P.V. victim’s closest people into the fray to challenge her will. Indeed, she may have given up on caring about her safety and well-being; but threatening others in her life escalates the level of the threats.

Weapons

“Weapons,” a subtheme of intimidation, describes the abuser’s possession of weapons, threat to use a weapon against the I.P.V. victims, or intent to purchase a weapon. 2.4% of the 493 cases and 19% of the 62 case, as well as 12.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a weapons coding [Table 2.] The most commonly coded weapon is a “gun,” with “knife” as the second most commonly coded weapon. Most of the cases included in weapons involve the offender insinuating a use of the weapon against the I.P.V. victim rather than overtly doing so. For example, one I.P.H. victim wrote, “He pretended that he was reaching for the gun.” Other cases were more direct with the offender making overt actions to ensure the weapon was shown to the I.P.V. victim. For example, one I.P.H. victim stated that “he was

pointing a silver gun at me.” Another I.P.H. victim wrote about her husband chasing her with a knife. These brandishing of weapons are very persuasive non-violent tactics of intimidation because they achieve the desired effect from the I.P.V. victim, including compliance of the abuser’s wishes.

Isolation

For this study, “isolation” is a theme that describes acts by the abuser that causes the I.P.V. victim to feel alone or secluded. 3.4% of the 493 cases and 26.9% of the 62 cases, as well as 22.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in an isolation coding [Table 2.] Common phrases in isolation describe the abuser preventing the I.P.V. victim from having access to the phone, as a result, “phone” is the most commonly coded word within this theme. Another common phrase in isolation is the abuser preventing the I.P.V. victim from having access to family and friends. One I.P.H. victim wrote in her P.I.F.P. in January 2008, “He doesn’t let me use ‘1’ minute to talk with nobody . . . Nobody can visit me.” Later, in September 2008, she wrote:

[H]e does not let me talk to anybody on the phone; nobody can come to our house and even my own family that came all the way from Venezuela to visit us could not stay with us. . . . I feel trapped in this situation; I do not have any family in this country . . . and nowhere to go.

In December 2010, she explained, “I have been wanting to leave the house for months and he always prevents it. . . . I have nowhere to go, - - nowhere.” She was killed in an I.P.H.S. 3 months later. Indeed, abusers understand that isolating their I.P.V. victims causes them to become more vulnerable, disenfranchised, and incapable of having resources to leave them.

Isolation is a very powerful, misunderstood non-violent tactic of coercive control that prevents I.P.V. victims from seeking help, even when they understand that they are in danger.

Economic Control

“Economic control,” a subtheme of isolation, describes the abuser preventing the victim from going to work or school, as well as interfering with the I.P.V. victim’s work or school activities. 2.0% of the 493 cases and 15.8% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 10.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in an economic control coding [Table 2.] The most common words in this subtheme are “job” and “work.” Coded phrases explain how the abuser prevented the I.P.V. victim from going to work. For example, two different I.P.V. victims detail, “I don’t even have a vehicle to go to work” and “One time when I was going to work, he laid in front of my car, so I could not leave.” Additionally, even if the I.P.V. victim got to work, many coded phrases explain how the abuser inserted himself into the I.P.V. victims’ daily work environment. For example, several different I.P.V. victims explain, “Calling me on the job with threats;” “He’s come to my job;” and “he has been calling my employer and threatening to kill me.”

In one I.P.H. case, the P.I.F.P. stated:

Since the separation he has come to the school that I work at twice.
The first time to pick me up because he was holding the vehicle.
The second [sic] he came to the back by passing the office banging
on my portable door.

Here, the I.P.V. victim filing the P.I.F.P. was the offender in the I.P.H. She killed her (ex)husband almost three years after filing this P.I.F.P. In another case, the I.P.V. victim stated that her managers at work were already concerned about her because they knew so much about

her situation with her (ex)husband. She explained that she was bringing their affairs to work, and her manager had asked her if she was “ok.” Four months after writing and filing this P.I.F.P., she was killed in an I.P.H.S.

Economic control effects many facets of the I.P.V. victim’s life, including being able to perform at work or school to her fullest capacity. When one is constantly bombarded with threats at work, it is difficult to concentrate on the task at hand. When one is prevented from going to work, it is difficult to become independent and maintain a sense of autonomy from their abuser. Indeed, this is the goal of isolation through economic control. It is a very effective tactic of non-violent coercive control.

False Imprisonment

“False imprisonment,” in this study, is a subtheme of isolation that describes the abuser confining or restraining the I.P.V. victim against their will. 2.0% of the 493 cases and 15.8% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 11.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a false imprisonment coding [Table 2.] The two most commonly coded words for false imprisonment are “let” and “leave,” respectively. The phrase for this subtheme that most commonly arise are exemplified by the following: “would not let me leave;” “he got in front of the door and wouldn’t let me go;” “He wouldn’t let me leave the room;” and “Held us there in my house.” In one case, the I.P.V. victim explained how her abuser “refused to let [her] leave the house . . . sat on [her] for two hours . . . saying he would see [her] dead before he let [her] leave.” She was killed in an I.P.H.S. less than a month later. In a different case, the I.P.V. victim detailed how “He then wouldn’t let me get away. . . . He then followed me into the

bathroom as I tried to walk away and kept me cornered there for five or so minutes.” She was killed in an I.P.H.S. 1½ years later.

Although false imprisonment may seem as though it is about the length of time the abuser holds the I.P.V. victim, this is not necessarily the case. It is about how the I.P.V. victim feels and whether she did not want to be held in that situation.³⁰ For example, one I.P.H. victim wrote two weeks before she was killed in an I.P.H.S., “he wouldn’t let me out of the bathroom. . . . He didn’t let me out of the bathroom for an hour and a half.” Another I.P.H. victim wrote six months before she was killed in an I.P.H.S.:

Wouldn’t let me leave . . . As I tried to go out the door several times, he just blocked the way pushing me back. . . . He pushed me on my couch, sat on my lap while he read the txt’s [sic].

Here, it is clear that she attempted to go out the door several times. Whether false imprisonment occurs once or several times, it can seem very isolating to the I.P.V. victim, which can have the effect of compliance for the abuser.

Financial Control

“Financial control,” a subtheme of isolation, describes the abuser’s ability to control certain aspects of the I.P.V. victim’s financial resources, such as money, shelter, car etc. 2.2% of the 493 cases and 17.4% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 13.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a financial control coding [Table 2.] “Money” is the most common word coded in the subtheme of financial control coding. In this subtheme,

³⁰ This is not to say that the legal standard for false imprisonment may be different. Here, this analysis concerns the non-violent tactic of coercive control, which is not meant to have to meet the higher legal standard.

phrases range from payments about houses to cars and electric bills to asserting that the abuser is not providing money for food and medical expenses. As stated above, tactics of coercive control are not mutually exclusive; and this subtheme is an example of one that easily bleeds over into another theme, such as deprivation of necessities. For example, one I.P.V. victim stated that “[he] makes me beg for money to go to my doctors and get my meds.” Nine months later, she became the I.P.H. offender. Another I.P.V. victim wrote, “He has not paid any bill toward the house for water, food, FPL, etc.” She was killed in an I.P.H.S. 4 months later. And, in another case, the I.P.H. offender wrote six months before the killing, “She has taken assets, took my personal items, clothes and guns, etc., out of house and safes, and bank account.”

Humiliation

For this study, “humiliation” is a theme that describes acts the abuser did to the I.P.V. victim to evoke feelings of mortification. 1.4% of the 493 cases and 11.1% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 10.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a humiliation coding [Table 2.] Often, the abuser humiliates the I.P.V. victim in front of others as is indicated in some examples from the P.I.F.P.s in the study. One I.P.V. victim wrote, “He calls me ‘bitch’, ‘fornicator’ and a ‘liar’ in front of our son;” and in another section of her narrative, she explained that her abuser used other acts to humiliate her, “He grabbed open my bathrobe stating, ‘that I had shaved for my boyfriend.’” Again, themes and subthemes are not mutually exclusive. These statements are similar to others for the theme of humiliation as I.P.V. victims explain their abusers’ behavior, which includes the more specific subthemes of degradation and name calling as exemplified below.

Degradation

“Degradation,” a subtheme of humiliation, describes a range of non-violent tactics used by the abuser to disrespect or show contempt for the I.P.V. victim, whether in public or private. 1.8% of the 493 cases and 14.2% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 11.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a degradation coding [Table 2.] By its very definition, this non-violent tactic of coercive control explains that “saying humiliating and degrading things,” cursing repeatedly, and “constantly being disrespectful and rude,” over time, can be very harmful to an I.P.V. victim’s sense of well-being and self-worth. Indeed, if anyone had a friend with them when their abuser was “yelling” and “cussing” at them and telling them to leave, the words are not just derogatory, but the effect on the I.P.V. victim is also humiliating. Indeed, abusers understand that “screaming obscenities” in public places, making sure they become “more vulgar and obscene,” is the best way to ensure their victim is degraded.

Name Calling

For this study, “name calling,” a subtheme of humiliation, explains situations in which the abuser calls the I.P.V. victim humiliating and/or degrading names either in public or in private. 4.6% of the 493 cases and 36.5% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 23.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a name calling coding [Table 2.] “Bitch” is the most common word coded in the subtheme of name calling. Phrases such as “constantly calling me names,” “cursing me and calling me names,” and “continually calls me filthy names” are indicative of the expressive language I.P.V. victims used to explain the fact that the non-violent tactic of name calling is utilized on an ongoing basis. Phrases with specific names used in name calling, such as “whore,” “cunt,” “worthless piece of shit,” and “bitch,” help

to explain the vitriol and invective used in this non-violent tactic. As with degradation, name calling is very effective at breaking down the I.P.V. victim's self-worth, making it more difficult for her to believe that she is worthy of any other life than the one she is living with her abuser.

Power and Control

For this study, "power and control" is a theme that describes acts of authority and regulation the abuser restrains over the I.P.V. victim to maintain compliance from the victim. 7.3% of the 493 cases and 57.1% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 48.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a power and control coding [Table 2.] The two most commonly coded words for the theme power and control are "car" and "phone," respectively. This is because many of the coded phrases involve the abuser preventing the I.P.V. victim from driving the car or preventing her from being able to use the phone as a form of power and control over the victim. Another common theme with phones involves the abuser obtaining the I.P.V. victim's phone and deleting her texts. Other, seemingly harmful, non-violent power and control coercive control tactics detailed throughout the power and control coded phrases exemplify the abuser telling the I.P.V. victim what to do on a regular basis. However, when these demands for compliance by the abuser from the I.P.V. victim became more invective, the general response from the victim was to either comply or refuse to comply by attempting to call for help, which the abuser often thwarted by taking the phone away from the I.P.V. victim.

Child Abuse

"Child abuse," in this study, is a subtheme of power and control that indicates the abuser has committed acts of child maltreatment and/or neglect or has threatened to commit acts of

child maltreatment and/or neglect, including physical violence, sexual abuse, or psychological abuse against the child(ren) and/or stepchild(ren) of or those in common with the abuser and the I.P.V. victim. 3.4% of the 493 cases and 26.9% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 23.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a child abuse coding [Table 2.] Although some coded phrases in the subtheme of child abuse exemplify the traditional connotation of child abuse, the commonly coded phrases for this subtheme reference the abuser conducting himself abusively with the I.P.V. victim in front of the child(ren), which is considered child abuse as well. Indications of this type of abuse are detailed by comments such as, “my kids have to look at it every day,” “[m]y children are being affected,” and “[m]y children witnessed the act and yelled for him to stop.”

Child abuse phrases coded in the traditional sense detail the abuser from a much more disturbing viewpoint. One I.P.V. victim detailed “radically abusive, accusing and degrading comments to [her] son [that] made him so afraid that he [did] not want to be at [her] home.” Another I.P.V. victim stated that her husband “hit, slapped and kicked” her son. An I.P.H. victim, 3 months before she was killed, stated that her husband hit her “kids with a belt for any and everything they did wrong along with slapping them.” And, one month before she was killed, another I.P.H. victim wrote that her husband choked her son and slapped her little baby girl by describing that “He hit her little hands hard because she dropped some Cheerios on the floor.” These episodes of child abuse are indicative of the violence abusers are willing to inflict on I.P.V. victims’ children, even when they are his own.

Violent Acts towards Family and Friends

“Violent acts towards family and friends,” in this study, is a subtheme of power and control that describes violence by the abuser towards family and friends of the I.P.V. victim. 0.4% of the 493 cases and 3.1% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 2.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a violent acts towards family and friends coding [Table 2.] There were 2 P.I.F.P.s out of the 100 analyzed for this phase of this study that were given a violent acts towards family and friends coding, and both were single victim / single offender I.P.H.s. The first P.I.F.P. was filed by the I.P.H. victim who explained that her (ex)husband has “slashed the tires of [her] brother’s car.” She was killed in an I.P.H.S. 1½ years later. The second P.I.F.P. was filed by the offender of the I.P.H. who stated that her (ex)husband had yelled and cussed at her mom and “raised his hand up like he was going to hit her [mom].” She killed her (ex)husband 4½ years later.

Taking Children from Victim

For this study, “taking children from victim,” a subtheme of power and control, explains situations in which the abuser either did take the child(ren) from the I.P.V. victim or threatened to take the child(ren) from the victim. 1.2% of the 493 cases and 9.5% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 7.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a taking children from victim coding [Table 2.] Abusers are known to threaten to “take” I.P.V. victims’ children from them, especially when couple are in the process of separation. For example, one I.P.H. victim wrote:

He has taken my children twice as a means to keep them away from me He told me if I tried to get them he would stay on the run with them so I cannot locate them ever. He still has them and will not let me see them.

Another I.P.H. victim wrote that after a previous injunction was lifted, her ex(husband) threatened to take her kids to the State of Mississippi.

Still, another I.P.H. victim wrote that she had no idea where her (ex)husband had taken her children. “[She] had no idea that he was taking them.” She explained in her P.I.F.P. that he would not tell her where he went with the children, even though she asked to see them. He denied her requests by explaining that he did not know when she will see them. She continued to explain to the court in her P.I.F.P. that, from her point of view, he was supposed to take the children to daycare; but, instead, ran away with the kids based on a plan he had that incorporated his brother’s help. In her P.I.F.P., she respectfully requested the custody of her children.

Deprivation of Necessities

“Deprivation of necessities,” in this study, is a subtheme of power and control that explains non-violent tactics the abuser uses to deprive the I.P.V. victim of necessities such as food, medicine, showering, toileting, etc. 1.0% of the 493 cases and 7.9% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 5.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a deprivation of necessities coding [Table 2.] A less considered form of a non-violent coercive control tactic is deprivation of necessities. This form of coercive control, which evokes power and control over the I.P.V. victim, causes the victim to feel as though the abuser is omnipotent. Indeed, when the abuser does not allow the I.P.V. victim to shower or toilet without being watched, this deprives the victim of certain necessities of everyday life that others take for

granted; but power and control is the force in the I.P.V. victim's life where a private shower and toileting opportunity are anything but normal.

When an I.P.V. victim is dependent on her abuser for medical necessities, her daily life becomes a matter of life or death depending upon the seriousness of her medical problems. This theme arose throughout the coding of deprivation of necessities as the I.P.H. victims detailed their offenders having deprived them of the medical treatment they required. Also, some of these victims were dependent on their (ex)husbands for daily care; so, when they were abandoned as the narratives explained, they were without food or water for days at a time.

Psychologically Controlling

“Psychologically controlling,” in this study, is a subtheme of power and control that explains acts by the abuser whereby non-violent tactics are for maintaining a form of mental control over the I.P.V. victim. 2.8% of the 493 cases and 22.2% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 17.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a psychologically controlling coding [Table 2.] Most abusers are very good at psychologically controlling their I.P.V. victim, and this can be one of the most effective tactics of non-violent coercive control. One of the most common patterns of psychologically controlling behaviors is for the abuser to apologize and tell the I.P.V. victim he loves her after the physical violence has taken place. One I.P.V. victim stated that her husband beat and raped her, then “[t]he next morning [he] said he was sorry that it happened and that he loved [her].” This same victim, less than a year later, stated that she was harmed by her husband again, “Some days [he] cried and said he was so sorry.” This statement exemplifies the cycle in which the abuser beats his victim then apologizes; the victim forgives her abuser then is beaten again.

Verbal Abuse

For this study, “verbal abuse,” a subtheme of power and control, describes verbal acts of vitriol and invective spewed by the abuser towards the I.P.V. victim. 2.8% of the 493 cases and 22.2% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 18.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a verbal abuse coding [Table 2.] All verbal abuse cases in this study were coded as such because the I.P.V. victim stated that they were a victim of verbal abuse based on experiencing verbal abuse, as well as cussing, making it verbal abuse *per se*, i.e., there are no specific examples of verbal abuse stemming from the P.I.F.P.s.

Household, Clothes and Personal Belongings Destroyed

“Household, clothes and personal belongings destroyed,” in this study, is a subtheme of power and control that describes the abuser destroying property including the home, household furnishings and the I.P.V. victim’s personal belongings. 3.4% of the 493 cases and 26.9% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 22.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a household, clothes and personal belongings destroyed coding [Table 2.] I.P.V. victims explained that their abusers constantly destroyed their property, poured gasoline all over the furniture, broke dishes, damaged their car, punched holes in the wall, smashed laptops, etc. However, the P.I.F.P. below details the type of personal property destruction about which courts, advocates, shelters, attorneys, etc. should ask questions to elicit information to ensure has not occurred when dealing with I.P.V. victims:

I came home after a weekend away with friends and when I walked into my closet all my clothes had been removed, as well as, all of my clothing in all dressers. I looked everywhere in the home to see if they were packed and found nothing. I then walked to the back yard and found a scorched circle about 5ft x 5ft in diameter. I sifted through the ashes and found several pieces of my clothing, under wires from my bras, and chargers. The clothes amounted to appx. 4K dollars.

This I.P.H. victim was killed less than 4 months after writing this narrative, even though she had an F.J.I.P. in place against her (ex)husband.

Fearful of the Future

For this study, “fearful of the future” is a theme that indicates the I.P.V. victim has expressed a fear or dread of something happening in the future due to the abuser’s actions. 7.0% of the 493 cases and 55.5% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 42.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a fearful of the future coding [Table 2.] Many of the I.P.V. victims expressed their fear of what types of actions their abusers might take in the future, but the most prominent of all was fear for one’s safety or that the abuser would kill them in the future. This range is especially true because so many of the I.P.V. victims expressed that their abusers had been threatened with their lives by their abusers. Three months before she was killed in an I.P.H.S., one victim wrote:

I’m scared because over the years he had threatened me, but this time he described it in details all he is going to do to me, I’m afraid he will snap and hurt me. . . . I’m afraid that he will hurt me.

This woman was killed while she had an F.J.I.P. in place. In another case, an I.P.H. victim wrote:

I am very afraid for my well being I don't feel safe in my own apartment for fear that he will come back to hurt or even kill me. . .
. I believe if allowed to continue to physically verbally & sexually abuse me he will hurt me again. I am very afraid of what is next when it comes to him, and what he will do to me.

Having been denied any type of protection from the court, this woman was killed 1½ years later.

Another phrase that flowed throughout this theme was the notion of the I.P.V. victim being in fear for their child(ren)'s safety, as well as their own.

Fear for Child(ren)'s Safety

For this study, “fear for child(ren)'s safety” is a subtheme of fearful of the future that describes the I.P.V. victim's fear of the abuser's ability to harm the child(ren) and/or step-child(ren) of, or those in common with, the abuser and the I.P.V. victim. 2.8% of the 493 cases and 22.2% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 16.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a fear for child(ren)'s safety coding [Table 2.] As stated above, some I.P.V. victims who expressed fear for their own lives also stated that they were in fear for their child(ren)'s lives as well. One I.P.V. victim described sleeping in her car for days to ensure her and her children's safety because she feared they would be killed. Another I.P.V. victim wrote that she changed the locks to try to protect herself and her children. However, the majority of P.I.F.P.s for this subtheme incorporated the dread the I.P.V. victim had of the future in regard to their child(ren)'s safety as an over-arching tone to the broader theme(s) or subtheme(s) provided throughout the P.I.F.P.

Pregnant

For this study, “pregnant” is a subtheme of fearful of the future that explains that the I.P.V. victim was pregnant at the time of the incident indicated in the P.I.F.P., making the I.P.V. victim concerned about the health of her fetus. 0.4% of the 493 cases and 3.1% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 2.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a pregnant coding [Table 2.] Both cases in this study were coded as such because the I.P.V. victims stated they were pregnant in the P.I.F.P. as a subtheme to a larger over-arching theme in their narrative. There is no specific example of pregnancy stemming from the P.I.F.P.s where the I.P.V. victim provided additional details.

Resistance to Abuse

For this study, “resistance to abuse” is a theme that describes the I.P.V. victim’s details of acts taken by the I.P.V. victim, which may have been acknowledged by the victim to be against their own best interests, that were specified as overt actions against the abuser’s tactics of abuse, including fighting back during a physical altercation with the abuser, calling the police to report the abuse or the abuser, filing the instant P.I.F.P. against the abuser or detailing other P.I.F.P.s that had previously been filed, leaving or fleeing from the abuser during altercations, separating from the abuser, etc. 10.3% of the 493 cases and 80.9% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 51.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a resistance to abuse coding [Table 2.] In this theme, phrases varied from each other more than in other themes, except for I.P.V. victims reporting that they called the police after altercations with their abusers.

After being choked and being told she was going to die that night by her abuser, one I.P.V. victim replied to him, ““Oh, well, we all have to die sometime.”” Then she yelled to a

friend to call the police for her because she was still being held down along the highway by her abuser. Another I.P.V. victim wrote, “I called 911 and the dispatcher asked me if he was there. I said yes while on the phone, [he] yelled out ‘Thanks a lot. You ruined everything.’” One other I.P.V. victim wrote about her experience with her husband who was “under influence of alcohol” because he had started drinking in the afternoon and wanted to go to the store:

I refused because I said you can’t drive under influence of alcohol. He started verbal abuse. When I said Don’t do abuse I will call police if you hurts [sic] me physically. He grabed [sic] my neck. I escaped myself and try to pick up baby. He hits glass vase on us. I escaped from hit. I tried to snatch phone and close the door but I went outside and called to D. Violence and they advice [sic] call to 911. I called and they came on spot of incident.

This woman went missing five months after having written this P.I.F.P.; her body was found eight years later.

An I.P.V. victim who detailed her resistance to abuse and the repercussions it brought on her wrote:

I told him he better not harass my family anymore, and he began threatening me as well . . . he [stated he] is going to kill me. . . . When I began to tell him that I was going to file something in court to get him out of the house completely because he has been so abusive and volatile, he came over to the bed where I was lying and he took his leg and bent it and put it on my side (I was laying on my side) and pushed down as hard as he could. I heard a crack and for a minute I couldn’t breathe. I had been telling him (since he spent a night in jail from having a domestic violence incident) that if he ever laid a hand on me again, I would call the police and this time I would prosecute. Since he knew this, he blocked my way to get up and get to the phone. He held me down with his arm across my throat. He wouldn’t let me leave the room. After he did, he stayed right with me to make sure I didn’t call. I decided at that point to file this injunction instead.

This woman was killed in an I.P.H.S. 3½ years after having written this P.I.F.P.

This I.P.V. victim detailed an altercation with her husband who woke her up by attacking her:

[He] started repeatedly throwing his black bag of his belongings @ my head. I had to duck to keep from getting hit. [He] then broke up the bedroom lamps & other what knots in the bedroom. I had to dive on the floor to reach up for the phone to call 911. [He] snatched the phone out of the wall and threw it up against the wall. JSO called back & I got my son to get the phone. [He] came towards me w/ his fist balled up & cursing @ me as if he was going to hit me. I got the phone in my hand & started screaming & the JSO operator heard me. I told the JSO operator that I needed help. I then ran out of the home.

This woman was killed 3 weeks later in an I.P.H.S. with an F.J.I.P. in place.

Helping Abuser

For this study, “helping abuser” is a subtheme of resistance to abuse that is a description by the I.P.V. victim whereby the victim helped the abuser, even though the victim also described being abused in the same narrative. 1.4% of the 493 cases and 11.1% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 10.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a helping abuser coding [Table 2.] This subtheme elucidates the struggle I.P.V. victims have with leaving their abusers, especially because the words are from P.I.F.P.s from I.P.H. victims. The good deeds described in them do not seem out of the ordinary until put into the proper context of the ultimate outcome of these cases. And still, they are juxtaposed against the theme of resistance to abuse because the I.P.V. victim in the case may describe having called the police but allowing the abuser to stay at the house or come back home.

In one case, the I.P.V. victim provided detailed information as to why she was helping her husband:

I visited with him earlyier [sic] that day while kids was [sic] not home. Well my husband has been going through mental issues and only started bk [sic] conversating with because he need help. . . . I told my husband that I didnt [sic] mind being there for him when he needed me.

This I.P.V. victim killed her husband eleven months after writing this P.I.F.P.

Separated or Estranged

For this study, “separated or estranged” is a subtheme of resistance to abuse that explains that the I.P.V. victim and the abuser are no longer living together or are living together but in different quarters of the marital home. 5.8% of the 493 cases and 46.0% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 37.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a separated or estranged coding [Table 2.] Only cases with explicit information on separation or estrangement were identified for this subtheme. This subtheme is replete with phrases of “we are separated,” “filing for divorce,” “separated since,” he/she left, etc. One I.P.V victim wrote, “We each have a separate residence and take turns going to the marital home to care for the children.” Another I.P.V. victim wrote, “my husband has left voluntarily. . . . The week before Christmas my husband left . . . We don’t sleep in the same room. We have not slept together.”

Other P.I.F.P.s did not reflect an I.P.V. victim stating directly that the (ex)spouse was separated or estranged; however, the context of the writing made it clear that the couple was, indeed, separated or estranged. One I.P.V. victim wrote, “[He] came to my home at 2:30 am. . . . I told him he could not be here. . . . I’m afraid he will come back. . . . Police told him he could not come back.” Another I.P.V. victim wrote, “she knows that I have another girl. . . . She’s been

having a boyfriend. . . . I try to move on.” This last I.P.V. victim killed his wife and 5 children 4 years and 3 months after writing this P.I.F.P.

Abuser Mental Illness

For this study, “abuser mental illness” is a theme that indicates the abuser has a history of or tendency towards a wide range of conditions that affect mood, thinking, and behavior, i.e., mental disorder or is dealing with some type of mental disorder. 1.8% of the 493 cases and 14.2% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 11.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in an abuser mental illness coding [Table 2.] This theme involved many I.P.V. victim’s amateur diagnoses of their spouses’ mental health issues or a declaration of their spouses’ mental health diagnoses from professionals. However, two other P.I.F.P.s referenced the Baker Act, Florida’s law that allows for involuntary examination (The Florida Mental Health Act, 2016).³¹ One I.P.V. victim wrote:

[t]hen the officer tried to put him back in the car and he would he ran all down 231 Hwy saying he going to kill himself standing in the Hwy in front of big semi Truck and everything Tell police office shoot me because I’m just going to have to die tonite [sic].

This November 1998 P.I.F.P. was written about physical violence against the I.P.V. victim, including threats against her life. She was killed in an I.P.H.S. in November 2015.

³¹ Florida Statute 394.451-394.47891, The Florida Mental Health Act

Drinking Alcohol

For this study, “drinking alcohol” is a subtheme of abuser mental illness that indicates the abuser drinks alcohol in excess or to the point that the I.P.V. victim believed it necessary to raise this fact. 3.0% of the 493 cases and 23.8% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 19.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a drinking alcohol coding [Table 2.] All drinking alcohol cases in this study were coded as such because the I.P.V. victim stated that the abuser was drinking, was addicted to alcohol, was intoxicated, or some variant thereof. There are no specific examples of drinking alcohol stemming from the P.I.F.P.s where the I.P.V. victim provided additional details.

Drug Use

For this study, “drug use” is a subtheme of abuser mental illness that indicates the abuser uses illegal drugs or prescription drugs other than as prescribed. 0.8% of the 493 cases and 6.3% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 5.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a drug use coding [Table 2.] All drug use cases in this study were coded as such because the I.P.V. victim stated that the abuser was using cocaine, taking prescription drugs, smoking crack, doing drugs or some variant thereof. There are no specific examples of drug use stemming from the P.I.F.P.s where the I.P.V. victim provided additional details.

Paranoia

For this study, “paranoia” is a subtheme of abuser mental illness that describes “a mental disorder characterized by systematized delusions, as of grandeur or, esp., persecution, often, except in a schizophrenic state, with an otherwise relatively intact personality” that manifests in statements or acts by the abuser, such as threats to kill themselves or accusing the I.P.V. victim of seeing another person (Webster’s, 2005, pg. 1045). 3.4% of the 493 cases and 26.9% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 17.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a paranoia coding [Table 2.] As Dobash et al. (2009) explains, many abusers who commit I.P.H. may have mental health issues, including jealousy and possessiveness, i.e., manifestations of paranoia. Indeed, jealousy and possessiveness were phrases that flowed throughout the coding of this subtheme, although some of the other issues involved the abusers thinking people were after them in general. Comments from I.P.V. victims related to jealousy and possessiveness include accusations by the abuser that the victim was cheating on them by seeing someone else or having sex with someone else. One of the most chilling accounts given by an I.P.H. victim in this subtheme that incorporates other themes reads as follows:

This day, [he], waited outside my apt. door around 6:30 pm when I opened the door he came out & pushed me back into the apt. where he pulled down my pants and put his fingers inside me to see if I had sex with someone. else. He took my phone from my purse and went through my text messages. He called a friend and yelled, cursed at him and asked him to meet him. As I tried to go out the door several times he just block [sic] the way pushing me back. He pushed me on my couch, sat on my lap while he read the txt’s [sic]. I told him that I was going to call the police and he said I will be dead.

This narrative was written in October 2012; the woman who wrote it was killed 6 months later, in April 2013, by an I.P.H.S.

Physical Violence

For this study, “physical violence” is a theme that describes acts of physical violence by the abuser against the I.P.V. victim; these acts may be simple battery not resulting in the I.P.V. victim claiming cuts or bruising, such as having their shirt pulled. 10.7% of the 493 cases and 84.1% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 75.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a physical violence coding [Table 2.] “Hit” and “face” are the two most commonly coded words in the theme of physical violence, respectively. Common phrases in the physical violence theme include “grabbed my arm,” “pushed me,” and “hit me.” Often, the specifics of the acts of the physical violence were provided with other non-violent coercive control tactics, detailing again that coercive control tactics are not utilized in a mutually exclusive manner. For example, one I.P.H. victim wrote:

He pushed me into the door jam. Just as he did 3 days prior when he shoved me and into my mother to the floor. Braking my 72-year-old mother’s hip . . . stating “Fuck both of you bitches.” Punching holes in the wall, throwing beer bottles (and in the presence of both his sister and father.) . . . Making hateful and threatening remarks. I feared for my safety and well-being and the continuous destruction of my house. I’ve been hit, pushed down, slapped and hair pulled on more than one occasion.

Here, physical violence is used as well as: 1) violent acts towards family and friends (see below), 2) name calling, 3) degradation, 4) household, clothes, and personal belongings destroyed (see below), and 5) fearful of the future (see below).

The P.I.F.P. with the 87.67% coverage range reads very simply but is the most gruesome of the 75 P.I.F.P.s that have a physical violence coding:

[Him] – choking me punching & dragging across the floor. next evening slapped me off the truck.

Broke my rib, broked [sic] my false teeth. Choke [sic] me with a lamp cord then rap [sic]wires around my fingers & tried to plug it the socket. Beat me in the head with a monkey wrench.

The I.P.H. victim who wrote this was provided a T.I.P. from the court in August 1993 when she filed her P.I.F.P. She did not file any other requests for protection with the court prior to the time she was killed in September 2013; however, there is an indication that she was not estranged from her husband at any time between 1993 and 2013.

Non-fatal Strangulation

“Non-fatal strangulation,” in this study, is a subtheme of physical violence that explains the I.P.V. victim having their normal breathing or blood flow to the brain obstructed during violent acts committed by the abuser against the I.P.V. victim. 2.6% of the 493 cases and 20.6% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 14.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a non-fatal strangulation coding [Table 2.] The two most commonly coded words in the subtheme of non-fatal strangulation are “pillow” and “choke,” respectively. The two most common phrases throughout the subtheme of non-fatal strangulation “he tried to choke me” and “he put the pillow over my face.” Thus, choking with bare hands and suffocating with a pillow seem to be the two most common forms of non-fatal strangulation.

Rape and Sexual Abuse

“Rape and sexual abuse,” in this study, is a subtheme of physical violence that describes various forced sexual acts and other types of unwanted sexual violence forced on the I.P.V.

victim by the abuser. 1.6% of the 493 cases and 12.6% of the 62 cases in this study, as well as 9.0% of the 100 P.I.F.P.s analyzed in this phase of this study resulted in a rape and sexual abuse coding [Table 2.] The two most commonly coded words for the subtheme rape and sexual abuse are “sex” and “force,” respectively; however, the phrases did not have many similar themes. The singular theme that ran through the phrases for rape and sexual abuse referred to the I.P.V. victim resisting the abuse, which caused the abuser to force himself on her. One I.P.H. victim stated that he became “sexual even [when] I don’t want to do it. He always hit me to do it.” However, rape and sexual abuse seems to become more convoluted with physical violence when factors such as alcohol and the I.P.V. victim refusing to have sex with the abuser are at work:

[He] had been drinking alcohol, a lot of beers and wine. We began to argue and he pushed me in my chest, causing my head to hit the wall in the bedroom. He pushed me down and forced me to have oral sex. I tried to refuse but he continued to force me by screaming threats and grabbing me by my shoulders, causing the bruises []. He kept forcing himself into my mouth, calling me bad words, and [he] then raped me violently. During this sex he hit me hard in the lower back area and lower head and forced me to have anal sex with him.

Once again, multiple tactics of coercive control are detailed in this passage. The offender utilized: 1) threats, 2) physical violence, and 3) name calling, to abuse his I.P.V. victim. In combination, these tactics are very effective as the I.P.V. victim must overcome all these tactics to achieve and maintain self-worth and well-being.

Table 2 explains the coding coverage percentages of all the themes and subthemes as discussed above. The first results column, N = 493, states the coding coverage percentage for each theme and subtheme when the P.I.F.P.s are considered against all the cases in the study. The second column, N = 62, states the coding coverage percentage for each theme and subtheme

when the P.I.F.P.s are considered against all the cases in the qualitative portion of the study. The third column, N = 100, states the coding coverage percentage for each theme and subtheme when the P.I.F.P.s are considered as part of this content analysis for the qualitative portion of the study.

In the first column, physical violence had the highest overall coding coverage with 10.7%. Resistance to abuse was the second highest coding coverage with 10.3%. The third highest coding coverage for the first column was threats with 8.9%. The lowest coding coverage for this column included three different subthemes which were: 1) animal abuse, 2) violent acts towards family and friends, and 3) pregnant.

In the second column, as with the first, physical violence had the highest overall coding coverage with 84.1%. Resistance to abuse was also the second highest coding coverage with 80.9%. Similarly, threats came in third with 69.8% coding coverage. Also, as with the first column, animal abuse, violent acts towards family and friends, and pregnant had the same lowest coding coverage at 3.1%.

The third column is the most indicative of the content analysis coding coverage percentages for the themes and subthemes of this qualitative portion of the study. Here, at 75%, physical violence was matched with threats as the highest coding coverage. Resistance to abuse has the second highest percentage at 51.0%, with power and control in third at 48.0%. The lowest coding coverage percentages, i.e., animal abuse, violent acts towards family and friends, and pregnant, still tied at 2.0%.

The Frequencies of Coercive Control

The coercive control themes described above, i.e., intimidation, isolation, humiliation, power and control, fearful of the future, resistance to abuse, abuser mental illness, and physical

violence can all be analyzed in terms of their frequencies within the P.I.F.P.s, keeping in mind that all subthemes are incorporated within the themes. Table 3 explains the definitions and coding of the variables utilized for the frequencies presented in Table 4.³² IBM SPSS®, an advanced statistical software analysis program, was utilized for the frequencies analyses for this portion of the quantitative methods phase of the study.

Table 3. Definitions and Coding of Coercive Control Variables

<u>Result of Abuse</u>	Variable	Variable Coding
Intimidation	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
Isolation	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
Humiliation	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
Power and Control	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
Fearful of the Future	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
<u>Response to Abuse</u>		
Resistance to Abuse	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
<u>Attribute of the Abuser</u>		
Abuser Mental Illness	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
<u>Result of Abuse</u>		
Physical Violence	Yes (reference category)	0
	No	1
	Missing	9

Note: Physical violence will be used as a dependent variable in quantitative analysis.

³² Comprehensive tables of all variables analyzed in this study are available in the quantitative methods phase of this study, Chapter Seven: Quantitative Methods – Table 10 and Table 16.

Of all the coercive control themes, intimidation had the highest frequency with a 78.0% positive response for it being discussed in the P.I.F.P. by the victim. Power and control, as well as resistance to abuse, had the second highest positive response rate at 75% for the themes with “no” as their reference category. Fearful of the future had a frequency of 43% positive response, and isolation had a 38% positive response. Abuser mental illness had a frequency of 40% positive response for this theme that is unique to the attribute of the abuser. Humiliation had the lowest frequency with a 33.0% positive response for it being mentioned by the victim in the P.I.F.P. Physical violence, with its reference category as “yes,” had a high positive response rate of 76.0%; but it was not the highest overall.

Table 4. The Characteristics and Frequencies of Coercive Control

<u>Theme</u>	<u>Frequency, N=100</u>		<u>Valid Percent</u>	
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Result of Abuse</u>				
Intimidation	22	78	22.0%	78.0%
Isolation	62	38	62.0%	38.0%
Humiliation	67	33	67.0%	33.0%
Power & Control	25	75	25.0%	75.0%
Fearful of the Future	57	43	57.0%	43.0%
<u>Response to Abuse</u>				
Resistance to Abuse	25	75	25.0%	75.0%
<u>Attribute of the Abuser</u>				
Abuser Mental Illness	60	40	60.0%	40.0%
<u>Result of Abuse</u>				
Physical Violence*	24	76	24.0%	76.0%

Note: Physical violence will be used as a dependent variable in quantitative analysis.

Other frequencies of note for the qualitative portion of this study include the rate at which T.I.P.s and F.J.I.P.s were granted by the court as well as a determination as to whether any I.P.H. victims were killed during the time these court protections were in place.

N = 107 for these frequencies because, of the total 108 P.I.F.P.s collected, all but one was able to be used for these statistics. Table 5 provides the definitions and coding of these variables utilized for their frequencies presented in Table 6.

Table 5. Definitions and Coding of T.I.P. and F.J.I.P. Variables

	Variable	Variable Coding
T.I.P. Granted	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
T.I.P. in place at time of I.P.H.	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
F.J.I.P. Granted	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9
F.J.I.P. in place at time of I.P.H.	No (reference category)	0
	Yes	1
	Missing	9

Table 6. T.I.P. and F.J.I.P. Variable Frequencies

	<u>Frequency, N=107</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>
T.I.P. Granted	28	79	107	26.2%	73.8%
T.I.P. in place at time of I.P.H.	102	5	107	95.3%	4.7%
F.J.I.P. Granted	72	35	107	67.3%	32.7%
F.J.I.P. in place at time of I.P.H.	90	17	107	84.1%	15.9%

The frequency with the highest positive response rate shown in Table 6 is for T.I.P. Granted, which has a rate of 73.8% and describes T.I.P.s granted by the court to P.I.F.P. victims for protection against I.P.V. F.J.I.P.s granted had a frequency of 32.7% rate for a positive response relative to the court granting protection against I.P.V.

Table 7. Coding and Definitions of I.P.H. & P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Race

Variable		Variable Coding
I.P.H Race of Offender		
	White (reference category)	0
	Black	1
	Native Americans	2
	Asian	3
I.P.H. Race of Victim		
	White (reference category)	0
	Black	1
	Native Americans	2
	Asian	3
P.I.F.P. Victim Race		
	White (reference category)	0
	Black	1
	Native Americans	2
	Asian	3
P.I.F.P. Offender Race		
	White (reference category)	0
	Black	1
	Native Americans	2
	Asian	3

When looking at the frequency rate of the I.P.H. occurring during the time a protective order is in place, F.J.I.P.s had the higher rate of killing occurrence with a 15.9% positive rate than a T.I.P., which had a 4.7% positive rate.

The variables I.P.H. victim race, I.P.H. offender race, P.I.F.P. victim race and P.I.F.P. offender race have frequencies that are of importance to this qualitative portion of the study because certain minorities, i.e., Native Americans and Asians, who have dissimilarities with Black and White American cultures, often disappear in the statistics of quantitative analysis. Table 7 explains the definitions and coding of the variables utilized for victim/offender race in this study and their frequencies are presented in Table 8. N = 493 for I.P.H. Race of Victim/Offender and N = 108 for P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Race.

Table 8. I.P.H. & P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Race Variable Frequencies

Variable	Frequency				Total				
	White	Black	Native Americans	Asian		White	Black	Native Americans	Asian
I.P.H. Race of Victim	400	83	1	9	493	81.1%	16.8%	0.2%	1.8%
I.P.H. Race of Offender	395	92	1	5	493	80.1%	18.7%	0.2%	1.0%
Race of P.I.F.P. Victim	68	36	3	1	108	63.0%	33.3%	2.8%	0.9%
Race of P.I.F.P. Offender	65	40	3	0	108	60.2%	37.0%	2.8%	0.0%

Whites had the highest positive response rate for all the race categories, with I.P.H. race of victim as the highest at 81.1%; and race of P.I.F.P. offender as the highest at 60.2%. I.P.H. race of offender for whites had a positive response rate of 80.1%; and race of P.I.F.P. victim had a positive response rate of 63.0%. Blacks had the second highest overall positive response rate for all categories, with race of P.I.F.P. offender as the highest at 37.0%; and I.P.H. race of victim as the lowest rate for Blacks at 16.8%. Race of P.I.F.P. victim for Blacks had a positive response rate of 33.3%, and I.P.H. race of offender had a positive response rate of 18.7%. Asians had the next highest positive response rate for the I.P.H. category with a 1.8% rate for I.P.H. race of victim and a 1.0% rate for I.P.H. race of offender. Native Americans had the lowest positive response rate for I.P.H. race of victim/offender with just 0.2% for both categories; however, this race category changes against Asians when looking at the P.I.F.P. victim/offender categories. Native Americans had a higher positive response rate for P.I.F.P. victim/offender race at 2.8% as opposed to Asians at 0.9% for P.I.F.P. victim race and 0.0% for P.I.F.P. offender race.

The final frequency for the qualitative portion of this study focuses on an analysis between the P.I.F.P. victim and the I.P.H. victim. Because the I.P.H. victim may not necessarily be the same as the P.I.F.P. victim, a variable was created to analyze whether there is a difference between the two victim types, if any. The dummy variable “P.I.F.P. Victim was I.P.H. Victim,”

with a nominal level of measurement, is no = 1, yes = 0. With $n = 108$, it has a positive response rate of 67.6%, meaning of the P.I.F.P. victims were the same as the I.P.H. victims. Or, stated a different way, 32.4% of the P.I.F.P. victims were not I.P.H. victims.

CHAPTER SIX: QUALITATIVE DISCUSSION

Although this is a scientific study and the data analyzed in this qualitative phase of the study were viewed through a scientific lens, it is important to remember that the 100 P.I.F.P.s examined for the content analysis represent 62 I.P.H.s, i.e., 62 lives lost of people who were involved in a court process of asking for court protection prior to their deaths.³³ Even though 32.4% of the P.I.F.P.s filed were not filed by the I.P.H. victim, meaning the I.P.H. offender asked the court for protection from I.P.V. prior to killing their spouse, the remaining 67.6% of P.I.F.P.s were filed by the I.P.H. victim. Thus, the cases discussed below are about people who are no longer fighting for their lives. Indeed, they lost their battles against their abusers.

Native Americans

The first case of focus is on the only Native American I.P.H. case in this study. For many reasons it is of interest, the most noticeable is race. During pre-Colonial times, Native Americans did not tolerate violence against women (DOJ, OVAW, 2006). Their culture was one of gender equality whereby each saw the other as contributing equally to the overall good of society. If harm came to a woman through sexual or physical violence, it was dealt with by the community swiftly. Now, however, much has changed for Native American women, who are no longer safe on their native soil. American Indian and Alaskan Native women experience lives filled with risk of violent crime, including I.P.V., at higher rates than other races (DOJ, OVAW, 2006). Native American women should not feel safe in today's America; and when they seek a court's

³³ Note that 108 P.I.F.P.s were utilized for the frequencies and other statistical measurements as discussed in Chapter 5: Qualitative Methods.

protection from domestic violence, it is not necessarily the same process for them as it is for the rest of American women, making it even more difficult to stay safe.

The fact that Native Americans constitute only 0.2% of the race basis of this study is surprising given the racial diversity in the state of Florida [Table 8.] Native Americans make-up 0.38% of Florida's total population (Suburban Stats, 2018). Native Americans make up about 2% of the total population in the U.S., and Roberts (2015) explains that the national average for Native Americans for spousal homicide is 1.55%, highlighting the exceptionally low rate of 0.2% for Native American I.P.H.s in this study (U.S. Census, 2019).³⁴ Additionally, of the 100 P.I.F.P.s utilized for the content analysis for this study, there were 2 P.I.F.P.s generated from this same Native American couple.³⁵ These 2 P.I.F.P.s were coded with 10 codes and 12 codes respectively; thus, the details of the narrative were fairly rich. This is important in understanding that, although this single case may not have much of an impact for quantitative purposes, it did play a role in the qualitative voice of the victims. This Native American's voice is not lost.

Asian American and Pacific Islander

The Asian population in this study is the other minority group of focus. There is little research regarding Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and violence, but that does not mean that these minority groups are not at risk of experiencing I.P.V. at the same rate as their White counterparts (AAPA, 2014). Indeed, the Asian population is known to under-report I.P.V. because of the cultural stigma it brings based on the patriarchal norms of Asian culture. Because

³⁴ The national average for Native American on Native American spousal homicide is 1.55% (Roberts, 2015, p. 670). This average was used because in this study, the I.P.H. victim and offender were the Native American couple of interest for this analysis.

³⁵ Table 8 indicates a frequency of 3 P.I.F.P.s; however, one P.I.F.P. was not analyzed as it was destroyed by the clerk of court through administrative procedures and was not available for data collection. The same person filed both P.I.F.P.s in this case.

of these deep-rooted cultural ideals of women's place in society where men are the breadwinners and women stay home, it is important to analyze any data available where Asians reach out for assistance from the judicial system.

Out of the 493 I.P.H. cases, there were 9 Asian victims and 5 Asian offenders, which means there are couples of different racial combinations in this study. The Asian I.P.H. victims and offenders constituted only 1.8% and 1.0% of the race basis of this study, respectively [Table 8.] Asians make-up 2.0% of Florida's total population (Suburban Stats, 2018); so, for the I.P.H. cases, the average of 1.4% Asian I.P.H. death rate is slightly lower than its population in Florida. Roberts (2015) provides detailed explanations of male-on-female and female-on-male national averages for Asian spousal homicide rates based on the varying racial combinations he examined. However, these rates are not comparable to this study since this study's frequencies were determined based on victim/offender rates; and the different racial combinations of Asians in this study. Thus, averaging Roberts (2015) results across all Asian categories of racial combinations, i.e., Asian killing Asian, Asian killing White, Asian killing Black, and Asian killing Native Americans allows for a gross comparison of the national averages for Asian spousal homicides, which are 1.80% for male-on-female and 1.02% for female-on-male (p. 670). These averages from the Roberts (2015) study help to explain that Florida's average Asian I.P.H. rate determined by this study is in line with the national average when taking both national rates provided by Roberts (2015) into consideration.³⁶

³⁶ The national average for Asian spousal homicide for the Roberts (2015) study is 1.41% when taking the 1.80% male-on-female and 1.02% female-on-male rate into consideration (p. 670). Florida's average Asian I.P.H. rate determined by this study is 1.4% when taking the 1.8% rate for I.P.H. race of victim and 1.0% I.P.H. race of offender rates into consideration.

Only one of the 9 Asian I.P.H. victims sought court protection prior to their death, and none of the 5 Asian I.P.H. offenders chose to initiate any court proceedings regarding P.I.F.P.s prior to a killing. The one I.P.H. victim who did file a P.I.F.P. was involved in a mixed-race marriage with a White spouse. The P.I.F.P. alleged non-fatal strangulation as part of the physical violence, which is a marker for increased risk of I.P.H. Also, because the coding coverage percentage was the lowest for the subtheme of violent acts towards family and friends, the allegation of slashing the tires of the victim's brother due to an argument the offender had with the brother begs the question of race-based motives that might have been directed towards the brother [Table 2].

Cases with Multiple P.I.F.P.s

Of the 66 cases with filed P.I.F.P.s, some have multiple filings ranging from 2 to 6 P.I.F.P.s in one case; and 13.6% of the cases have P.I.F.P.s from both spouses [Table 9].³⁷

Table 9. P.I.F.P. Filing Frequencies

	<u>Frequency</u>							<u>Valid Percent</u>					
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
P.I.F.P. Case Filings	43	12	6	3	1	1	66	65.2%	18.2%	9.1%	4.5%	1.5%	1.5%

The multiple filings, as well as the filings from both spouses, provide interesting dynamics to the qualitative portion of this study in addition to the overall perspective of I.P.H.s. To begin with, these multiple filings, as well as many of the single P.I.F.P. filings, reveal the behavior of law and the I.P.V. victim's decision to mobilize the law. Black's (2010) theory of the behavior of law

³⁷ These 66 cases derive from the online search of the court records for all 493 cases. The difference between the 62 cases with P.I.F.P.s and the 66 cases is the 4 cases that had their P.I.F.P.s destroyed by administrative process by the appropriate clerk of court for the county within which the records were kept.

explains that intimates will not mobilize the law against each other even when I.P.V. is present; and when the law is mobilized, he states that it is ineffective because intimates, such as spouses, are less likely to follow through on participating in prosecutions or civil actions against each other.³⁸ However, when viewing the many cases with multiple P.I.F.P. filings in this study, i.e. 34.8% in all, Black's notion that intimates will not mobilize the law when I.P.V. is present does not seem to hold true. In fact, the relational distance of the spouses in this study does not appear to matter overall given that 46.0% of the cases with P.I.F.P.s had a coding coverage percentage for the separated or estranged subtheme [Table 2]. As a result, based on this qualitative portion of the study, not only do intimates mobilize the law against each other, Black's notion that intimates are inactive when it comes to the law is fallible.

At first, one might assume that the I.P.H. victim would be the only one to file all the P.I.F.P.s asking for protection from the court; but given that almost a third of the P.I.F.P.s in this study, i.e., 32.4% were filed by the killer, this assumption does not follow conventional wisdom. Perhaps this is because the P.I.F.P. victim is a battered spouse who just cannot take it anymore and becomes so frustrated with their situation because relief from the ongoing I.P.V. is not provided by the court, even though multiple requests have been made. Thus, the I.P.V. victim who has sought relief from the court, i.e. mobilized the law to no avail, takes the matter into their own hands and kills their abusive spouse. Additionally, when reviewing the content analysis for the qualitative portion of this study, it is important to remember that not all the words and phrases come from the I.P.H. victim, meaning that some of the words and phrases analyzed came from the person who was the killer in the case. This perspective, although it is not known at the

³⁸ Black (2010) suggests the relational distance is similar in measurement to stratification.

time the words are analyzed, is important because, once again, conventional wisdom is to assume that the P.I.F.P. victim was ultimately killed; but, for almost one third of the P.I.F.P.s, this is not the case.

Abuser Mental Illness

One very important disclosure the P.I.F.P.s provide is about the abuser's mental illness.³⁹ As discussed in Chapter Two: The Role of Intimate Partner Homicide-Suicide in Intimate Partner Homicide, I.P.H.S.s are killings that are generally not unexpected but are rather events that culminate after I.P.V. relationships experience turmoil and conflict. Among the turmoil and conflict that exists within these I.P.V. relationships that were disclosed in the P.I.F.P.s that ended in I.P.H.S.s were details of abuser mental illness. As stated in the results section of this study, many P.I.F.P. victims mentioned their spouses having mental health problems or diagnoses from professionals, as well as two others stating that their spouse was Baker Acted. The significance in the Baker Act reference is that this often is the result of a threat against one's own life, which is a known risk factor for I.P.H.S. when I.P.V. and depression are present.

A pronounced subtheme of abuser mental illness was paranoia. Many of the P.I.F.P.s had accounts of the abuser accusing the victim of cheating on them by simply texting, phoning, speaking, or talking to someone they did not approve of whether they had proof or not. Indeed, many of the narratives expressed the abuser's willingness to go to extremes to expose the victim's infidelity, meaning they would place themselves, the victim, their children or others in harm's way. One account described the abuser and victim almost getting into a car accident with their children in the car because they were fighting over possession of the victim's phone since

³⁹ Note that the theme abuser mental illness includes the subthemes drinking alcohol, drug use, and paranoia.

the abuser wanted to read her texts. The P.I.F.P. narrative provided in Chapter Five: Paranoia provides the lengths at which some abusers will go to accuse victims and hold them accountable. The victim who wrote this account was sexually assaulted because her abuser accused her of infidelity. Then she was held against her will, i.e. false imprisonment, while her texts were read by her abuser. Finally, her abuser threatened her life. He killed her 6 months later in an I.P.H.S., which helps to prove that these events are not sudden, unexpected events that come out of the blue but are predictable, preventable murders that must be stopped.

Resistance to Abuse

As discussed in Chapter Two: The Gender Asymmetry of Coercive Control, a term coined by Kelly and Johnson (2008), violent resistance, describes the violence an I.P.V. victim may use in reaction to physical violence against oneself for the primary purpose of self-protection. However, in this study, the resistance to abuse theme coded in the content analysis specifically excluded all references to physical violence because this study's focus is on the coercive control tactics exclusive of physical violence. Additionally, each P.I.F.P. was coded as its own individual data source, regardless of who filed it; so, this study did not determine whether violent resistance, as defined by Kelly and Johnson, had taken place between the spouses. Thus, physical violence was coded separately from any references to resistance to abuse, meaning the resistance to abuse definition for this study did not include the violent resistance as defined by Kelly and Johnson.

The resistance to abuse theme had an 80.9% coding coverage percentage for the 62 cases, which was the second highest percentage next to physical violence [Table 2].⁴⁰ This high

⁴⁰ This excludes the subthemes of helping the abuser and separated or estranged.

percentage juxtaposed against physical violence's coding coverage percentage of 84.1%, however, does seem to support Kelly and Johnson's proposition that I.P.V. victims "fight" back against their abusers, although support for this is derived from this study's data which are based on non-violent tactics rather than from the violent resistance Kelly and Johnson espouse. Indeed, as Stark (2007) explains and this study's data tends to prove, the coercive control victim will work through her victimization and find her agency through her resistance to the abuse. Additionally, the I.P.V. victims' narratives highlighted in this study, Chapter Five: Resistance to Abuse, reflect women who explicitly mobilized the law for their own protection, once again seemingly refuting Black's (2010) contention that intimates will not utilize the law for assistance when I.P.V. is present in the relationship.

The Effectiveness of Injunctions for Protection Against Domestic Violence

Chapter Two: The Disillusionment of the Protections of an Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence: Why and When are They Important to I.P.V. Victims? discusses the willingness of I.P.V. victims to jump through legal hoops to obtain a T.I.P. and/or F.J.I.P. to prevent their abuser from having legal access to them, which may include jail time for the abuser if the order is violated. Indeed, often, I.P.V. victims will file multiple P.I.F.P.s and obtain multiple T.I.P.s and/or F.J.I.P.s in the process of trying to protect themselves from multiple occurrences of abuse. The multiple P.I.F.P.s discussed above illuminates this willingness of I.P.V. victims and the fact that some will tirelessly fight for their safety.⁴¹ But even after these extraordinary efforts by I.P.V. victims to ask for court protection, 95.3% of the I.P.H. victims did

⁴¹ Note that 86.6% of the cases in this study did not have P.I.F.P. filings; 66 of the 493 cases in this study had P.I.F.P.s, leaving 427 cases without a filed P.I.F.P.

not have a T.I.P. order in place when they were killed and 84.1% of the I.P.H. victims did not have an F.J.I.P. in place at the time of their death [Table 6]. Although these percentages mean that only 4.7% of the I.P.H. victims were killed when a T.I.P. was in place and 15.9% were killed when an F.J.I.P. was active, these I.P.H. victims had mobilized the law and asked the court to protect them as much as possible before they were killed. Unfortunately, the other I.P.H. victims who had filed P.I.F.P.s and who were killed without any type of protective order in place at the time of their death were left to their own devices even though they had mobilized the law and asked the court for protection. They did everything they legally could to protect themselves by, at least, beginning the legal process to request the court's protection from their abuser. In furtherance of the fact that I.P.V. victims mobilize the law well, 73.8% of the P.I.F.P.s received a T.I.P. and 32.7% obtained an F.J.I.P. This means that almost one third of the I.P.V. victims followed through with their P.I.F.P.s to the final hearing to obtain an F.J.I.P. Given the obstacles I.P.V. victims face when attempting to obtain an F.J.I.P., including the fact that many of them are not represented by an attorney, this success rate is commendable.

The analysis of the P.I.F.P. narratives in this study help prevent turning the focus from the I.P.H. victim when they are killed with a protective order in place. Indeed, the perspective that the victim tried everything to protect themselves is lost in the rhetoric when such an occurrence happens because family, friends and the media often look to the court and the judicial system for blame. However, people who work for these institutions did not do the killing; the I.P.H. offender committed the crime. The "piece of paper" that must be strengthened are the laws that the courts must follow so that they have more choices to protect I.P.V. victims when facing the fact patterns before them, including those that rely more heavily on coercive control without physical violence. It is important that state laws allow for judges to review people's lives and the

continuum of behavior presented before them in P.I.F.P.s other than just having to parse out the simple battery or aggravated assault that may be before them. In fact, many lives might be saved if judges were not bound to only the acts of physical violence and threats to personal safety as the standard by which they must have evidence in order to grant a T.I.P. or F.J.I.P. Instead, the P.I.F.P. narratives in this study present rich details of important non-violent coercive control events that courts could, and indeed should, be able to consider under the law as valid evidence for issuance of a T.I.P. or F.J.I.P. regardless of any evidence of physical violence.

The Interactions of Coercive Control Tactics

Coercive control tactics work together against its victim to ensure that the ongoing continuum of abuse maintains its effectiveness. In this study, the non-violent tactics of intimidation and power and control had the most efficacy against the P.I.F.P. victim with 78.0% and 75.0% positive frequency rate in the 62 cases examined for content analysis, respectively [Table 4]. The fact that intimidation and power and control rate the highest of the tactics that are a result of abuse is reasonable because these abusive behaviors are comparable. Again, these themes are not mutually exclusive, and some of the actions the P.I.F.P. victims described in their narratives are analogous to many other themes or subthemes.

Physical violence had a positive frequency rate of 76.0% [Table 4]. With that said, resistance to abuse had a positive frequency rate of 75.0%, which is a direct result of, or response to, the abuse. For example, when a P.I.F.P. victim described being attacked, many of the narratives detailed responses that included calls to 911, speaking to the police, or the fact that the P.I.F.P. had been filed. These same reactions happened when P.I.F.P. victims described interactions with abusers who were intimidating and controlling to the point that the victim felt

threatened. Also, although the positive frequency rate for the theme fearful of the future was not as high with a rate of 43.0%, often, the victim described feeling fearful of the future when such threats from the abuser would occur [Table 4].

Isolation and humiliation, both with lower positive frequency rates than the previously discussed coercive control tactics at 38.0% and 33.0% respectively, function to strip the coercive control victim of their personhood [Table 4]. In this study, the P.I.F.P.s reveal details of victims feeling trapped in their own homes with no means of transportation to visit friends or family, as well as any way to call for help when abuse has occurred. These themes also work to ensure that the victims lose their sense of self-worth; so, over time, all the coercive control tactics begin to take their toll on the victim to where she loses her autonomy. However, the high positive frequency rate of resistance to abuse for this qualitative portion of the study is interesting because it indicates that many of the P.I.F.P. victims, who were focused on requesting protection from I.P.V. from the court, did not allow the coercive control in their lives to prevent them from being completely stripped of their autonomy. This is a testament to the strength of these victims.

CHAPTER SEVEN: QUANTITATIVE METHODS

The quantitative methods phase of this study utilizes the secondary data collected from this study, as described above in Chapter Four: Current Study Description, as well as the data collected from the qualitative phase of this study, to conduct a comprehensive quantitative analysis of the 493 I.P.H. cases for data set A and the 62 I.P.H. cases with P.I.F.P. filings for data set B.⁴² Because this innovative empirical research study incorporates data collected from the qualitative phase of the study, allowing the coercive control tactics coded through the content analysis to be measured against other quantitative data collected regarding I.P.H.s., this phase of the study is largely exploratory in nature. IBM SPSS®, an advanced statistical software analysis program, was used to perform the quantitative analyses discussed in this study. Logistic Regression was used as the multivariate analysis for data set A and B.

Data Set A: Variable Definitions and Measures

The population used for this study is the total population of I.P.H.s between heterosexual spouses in the state of Florida from January 1, 2006 to June 31, 2016, according to the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. As explained above in “Data and Methodology,” the purposive sample of 493 cases for data set A was drawn from the total population of 665 cases for this study due to the various reasons as described in detail in Chapter Four: Current Study Description, including

⁴² The original data set for this study was separated into two distinct data sets due to the extraordinarily high Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) and excluded variables that resulted when all the variables in the original data set were run in an OLS model to check for multicollinearity. All the results of the OLS model checking for multicollinearity for each data set can be found in Appendix C: V.I.F. Tables of Study Variables.

ensuring that the cases met the requirement of a heterosexual spousal I.P.H. The following is a list and description of the variables used in the logistic regression model for data set A, which are also shown in Table 10:⁴³

Dependent Variable:

The dependent variable measures whether there was a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement between the heterosexual spouses before the I.P.H.

PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT. The level of measurement for the dependent variable of PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT is nominal. It is a dummy variable with an I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement as the reference category. The dummy variable for PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT is I.P.H. without a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement = 1, I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement = 0 [Table 10].

Independent Variables:

I.P.H.S. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of I.P.H.S. is nominal. It is a dummy variable with Killing not an I.P.H.S. as the reference category. The dummy variable for I.P.H.S. is Killing was an I.P.H.S. = 1, Killing was not an I.P.H.S. = 0 [Table 10.]⁴⁴

⁴³ A complete list and description of all the study variables is in Appendix B.

⁴⁴ “Both the murder and subsequent suicide had to occur within 72 hours of each other” to be considered a murder-suicide for the purposes of this study (VPC, 2018, p. 1).

RECORD OF P.I.F.P. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of RECORD OF P.I.F.P. is nominal. It is a dummy variable with an I.P.H. with a Record of a filed P.I.F.P. as the reference category. The dummy variable for RECORD OF P.I.F.P. is I.P.H. without a Record of P.I.F.P. = 1, I.P.H. with a Record of P.I.F.P. = 0 [Table 10.]

WEAPON USED. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of WEAPON USED is nominal. It is a series of dummy variables. The first variable for WEAPON USED is Handgun = 1, Not a Handgun = 0. The second variable for WEAPON USED is Other Firearms = 1, Not Other Firearms = 0. The third dummy variable for WEAPON USED is Knife/Cutting Instrument = 1, Not Knife/Cutting Instrument = 0. The fourth variable for WEAPON USED is Hands/Fist/Feet = 1, Not Hands/Fist/Feet = 0. The fifth variable for WEAPON USED is Other Weapon = 1, Not Other Weapon = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR [Table 10.]

Table 10. Explanation of Quantitative Variables for Data Set A

Predictor Variables	Coding	Dependent Variable	Coding
Weapon Used		Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement	
Not a Handgun	0	I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement (reference category)	0
Handgun	1	I.P.H. without a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement	1
Not Other Firearms	0	Missing	9
Other Firearm	1		
Not Knife/Cutting Instrument	0		
Knife/Cutting Instr.	1		
Not Hands/Fist/Feet	0		
Hands/Fist/Feet	1		
Not Other Weapon	0		
Other Weapon	1		
		Predictor Variables	Coding
		I.P.H.S.	
		Killing was not an I.P.H.S. (reference category)	0
		Killing was an I.P.H.S.	1
		Missing	9
		Record of P.I.F.P.	
		I.P.H. with a Record of P.I.F.P. (reference category)	0
		I.P.H. without a Record of P.I.F.P.	1

Data Set A: Research Question and Quantitative Hypotheses

The following research question and hypotheses were tested in this quantitative phase of this exploratory quantitative study for data set A:

Research Question:

What influences do the independent variables, such as I.P.H.S., record of P.I.F.P., and weapon used, have on an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement for heterosexual spouses in Florida from 2006 to June 30, 2016?

Hypotheses:

I.P.H.S.:

H₀: I.P.H.S. does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₁: I.P.H.S. positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

RECORD OF P.I.F.P.:

H₀: Record of P.I.F.P. does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₂: Record of P.I.F.P. positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

WEAPON USED:

Handgun:

H₀: Handgun does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₃: Handgun positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

Knife/Cutting Instrument:

H₀: Knife/Cutting Instrument does not negatively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₄: Knife/Cutting Instrument negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

Hands/Fist/Feet:

H₀: Hands/Fist/Feet does not negatively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₅: Hands/Fist/Feet negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

Other Firearms:

H₀: Other firearms does not negatively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₆: Other firearms negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

Other Weapon:

H₀: Other weapon does not negatively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₇: Other weapon negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

Data Set A: Univariate and Bivariate Analyses

Descriptive statistical analyses were completed for all the variables in data set A, whether they were included in the logistic regression model.⁴⁵

Data Set A: Logistic Regression Model Variable Frequencies

The following tables explain the frequencies for each of the variables used in the logistic regression model for data set A.

Table 11. Dependent Variable Frequencies (Data Set A)

	<u>Frequency, N=493</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement	66	365	431	15.3%	84.7%

Note: N=493; there are 62 missing records for this variable

Table 11 explains that, of the 431 cases of data collected regarding whether the heterosexual couple involved in the I.P.H. had a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement before the killing, only 15.3% of the cases has a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement,

⁴⁵ Frequencies for all the variables in the original data set not used in the study logistic regression models are in Appendix D: Frequency Tables of Variables Not Used in Study Logistic Regression Models.

regardless of who made the report, i.e. the victim or the offender of the I.P.H.⁴⁶ Table 12 explains the number of I.P.H.s that resulted in an I.P.H.S. versus the number of I.P.H.s that did not result in an I.P.H.S. In contrast with Velopulos et al., (2018), this result is actual completed I.P.H.S.s as opposed to attempted I.P.H.S.s, meaning there are no attempted suicides included in these frequencies. Accordingly, based on the data, out of 492 cases, 50.2% of the cases did not result in an I.P.H.S. and 49.8.% of the cases did result in an I.P.H.S., which, as Velopulos et al. (2018) may agree, is quite astonishing given this percentage is approximately 15% higher than their completed I.P.H.S. percentage.⁴⁷ Table 13 explains the number of cases that had a record of a filed P.I.F.P. Based on the data, only 66 of the 493 cases had a record of a filed P.I.F.P., meaning 13.4% of the cases had a P.I.F.P.

Table 12. I.P.H.S. Variable Frequencies (Data Set A)

	<u>Frequency, N=493</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
I.P.H.S.	247	245	492	50.2%	49.8%	100%

Note: N=493; there is 1 missing record for this variable

Table 13. Record of P.I.F.P. Variable Frequencies (Data Set A)

	<u>Frequency, N=493</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Record of P.I.F.P.	66	427	493	13.4%	86.6%	100%

⁴⁶ One of the reasons for the 62 missing cases is due to the fact that, as explained in Chapter Four: Current Study Description, Data and Methodology, Florida Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 60 cases were affected by a lack of response by 20 agencies during the second request for records from law enforcement.

⁴⁷ The missing case for this variable is due to a sealed case whereby the information regarding whether the case was an I.P.H.S. was not available.

Table 14 explains the percentages of weapons used during the I.P.H.s. Out of the 493 cases, handguns were the most common weapons used, with 47.1% of the killing being accomplished with a handgun. Other firearms are the second most common weapon used, with 25.6% of the killings being accomplished using another type of firearm other than a handgun. Knife/cutting instrument is the third most common weapon for I.P.H.s, with 15.2% of the killings being accomplished using a knife or cutting instrument. The fourth most common weapon for an I.P.H. is hands/fist/feet, with 8.7% of the killings being accomplished this way. Finally, 3.4% of I.P.H.s are accomplished with other weapons not previously mentioned.

Table 14. Weapon Used Variable Frequencies (Data Set A)

	<u>Frequency, N=493</u>			<u>Valid Percent</u>		
	<u>Not the</u> <u>Weapon Used</u>	<u>Weapon</u> <u>Used</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Not the</u> <u>Weapon Used</u>	<u>Weapon</u> <u>Used</u>	<u>Total</u>
Handgun	261	232	493	52.9%	47.1%	100%
Other Firearms	367	126	493	74.4%	25.6%	100%
Knife/Cutting Instrument	418	75	493	84.8%	15.2%	100%
Hands/Fist/Feet	450	43	493	91.3%	8.7%	100%
Other Weapon	476	17	493	96.6%	3.4%	100%

Data Set A: Correlation Results

Data set A contains both continuous and dichotomous variables; however, the logistic regression model for data set A contains only dichotomous variables. Thus, it was deemed appropriate to run the Pearson Correlation for all variables in data set A and the Phi Correlation for the logistic regression model variables in data set A.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Appendix E: Correlation Matrices contains the Pearson Correlation and Phi Correlation for data set A.

Data Set A: Pearson Correlation⁴⁹

The following correlations have statistically significant association of $p < .01$ [Table 49]:⁵⁰

Victim Age and Victim Race have a weak, negative association (-.219) (KSU, 2019). Victim Age and Offender Age have a positive, strong association (.883). Victim Age and Offender Race have a weak, negative association (-.244). Victim Age and I.P.H.S. have a positive, weak association (.233). Victim Age and Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement have a weak, positive association (.191). Victim Age and Record of P.I.F.P. have a positive, weak association (.196). Victim Age and Handgun have a positive, weak association (.135). Victim Age and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a weak, negative association (-.128). Victim Age and Hands/Fist/Feet have a weak, negative association (-.119).

Victim Gender and Offender Gender have a positive, strong association (.991). Victim Gender and I.P.H.S. have a weak, negative association (-.273). Victim Gender and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a positive, weak association (.149). Victim Race and Offender Age have a weak, negative association (-.219). Victim Race and Offender Race have a positive, strong association (.851). Victim Race and I.P.H.S. have a negative, weak association (-.180). Victim Race and Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement have a weak, negative association (-.168). Victim Race and Record of P.I.F.P. have a negative, weak association (-.161). Victim Race and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a positive, weak association (.128).

Offender Age and Offender Race have a negative, weak association (-.264). Offender Age and I.P.H.S. have a weak, positive association (.311). Offender Age and Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement have a positive, weak association (.199). Offender Age

⁴⁹ Only those correlations with a statistically significant linear relationship of either $p < .01$ or $p < .05$ are reported.

⁵⁰ For ease of following Table 49, some paragraphs represent a row of the matrix. The correlations already explained from one row will not be repeated in later rows.

and Record of P.I.F.P. have a positive, weak association (.191). Offender Age and Handgun have a positive, weak association (.170). Offender Age and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a negative, weak association (-.175).

Offender Gender and I.P.H.S. have a negative, weak association (-.265). Offender Gender and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a weak, positive association (.145). Offender Race and I.P.H.S. have a weak, negative association (-.171). Offender Race and Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement have a negative, weak association (-.142). Offender Race and Record of P.I.F.P. have a negative, weak association (-.133). Offender Race and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a positive, weak association (.157).

I.P.H.S. and Handgun have a positive, weak association (.285). I.P.H.S. and Other Firearms have a positive, weak association (.123). I.P.H.S. and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a negative, weak association (-.332). I.P.H.S. and Hands/Fist/Feet have a negative, weak association (-.164). I.P.H.S. and Other Weapon have a negative, weak association (-.166). Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement and Record of P.I.F.P. have a strong, positive association (.468). Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement and Handgun have a positive, weak association (.168).

Handgun and Other Firearms have a strong, negative association (-.552). Handgun and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a moderate, negative association (-.399). Handgun and Hands/Fist/Feet have a negative, weak association (-.291). Handgun and Other Weapon have a negative, weak association (-.178). Other Firearms and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a weak, negative association (-.248). Other Firearms and Hands/Fist/Feet have a negative, weak association (-.181). Knife/Cutting Instrument and Hands/Fist/Feet have a weak, negative association (-.131).

The following correlations have statistically significant associations of $p < .05$ [Table 49]:⁵¹

Victim Gender and Offender Age have a negative, weak association (-.105). Victim Gender and Hands/Fist/Feet have a negative, weak association (-.100). Offender Age and Offender Gender have a negative, weak association (-.107). Offender Age and Hands/Fist/Feet have a negative, weak association (-.116). Offender Race and Other Firearms have a weak, negative association (-.094). Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement and Other Firearms have a weak, negative association (-.103). Record of P.I.F.P. and Handgun have a weak, positive association (.096). Other Firearms and Other Weapon have a weak, negative association (-.111).

Data Set A: Phi Correlation⁵²

The following correlations have statistically significant association of $p < .01$ [Table 51]:

I.P.H.S. and Handgun have a weak, positive association (.285) (McHugh, 2018). I.P.H.S. and Other Firearms have a weak, positive association (.123). I.P.H.S. and Hands/Fist/Feet have a negative, weak association (-.164). Record of P.I.F.P. and Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement have a moderate, positive association (.468). Knife/Cutting Instrument and Handgun have a moderate, negative association (-.399). Knife/Cutting Instrument and Hands/Fist/Feet have a weak, negative association (-.131). Knife/Cutting Instrument and Other Firearms have a weak, negative association (-.248). Other Weapon and Handgun have a weak, negative association (-.178).

⁵¹ The correlations already explained from one row will not be repeated in later rows.

⁵² Table 51 displays the results of sixteen (16) crosstab combinations for the Phi Correlation for the logistic regression model variables for data set A. Only those correlations with a statistically significant linear relationship of either $p < .01$ or $p < .05$ are reported.

The following correlations have a statistically significant association of $p < .05$ [Table 51]:

Record of P.I.F.P. and Handgun have a weak, positive association (.096). Other Weapon and Other Firearms have a negative, weak association (-.111).

Data Set A: Logistic Regression Results

Data set A addresses the research question using one dependent variable, i.e., prior report of physical violence to law enforcement, in this exploratory study.⁵³ The independent variables utilized for this logistic regression model are I.P.H.S., record of P.I.F.P., handgun, knife/cutting instrument, hands/fist/feet, other firearm, and other weapon.⁵⁴ The logistic regression model, as shown in Table 15, yielded a statistically significant model and statistically significant variable results. The full model was statistically significant, χ^2 (df=6, $n=493$) = 307.946, $P < 0.001$ (SPSSisFun, 2006, September 25). 68.2% of the variance is explained by the independent variables.

Table 15. Data Set A: Logistic Regression Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement for I.P.H. between Heterosexual Spouses in Florida, N=493

Variable	B	Exp(B)
I.P.H.S.	.382	1.465
Record of P.I.F.P.	2.656	14.245****
Knife/Cutting Instrument	-.843	.430**
Hands/Fist/Feet	-.136	.873
Other Firearms	-.912	.402***
Other Weapon	-.748	.473
χ^2	307.946****	
R^2	.682	

Note: * $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$, **** $p < .001$; there are 63 missing cases in this model; the variable “handgun” was used as the reference category in this model

⁵³ Because this is an exploratory study, values approaching significance at $p < .10$ for data set A are included.

⁵⁴ Additional independent variables were not utilized in this logistic regression model due to their high V.I.F. levels.

There were three independent variables of significance in the model. For the first variable, according to the model, the log odds of an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement was positively related to an I.P.H. with a record of P.I.F.P. (Peng, Lee, & Ingersoll, 2002). The odds of an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement are 14.245 times higher for I.P.H.s with a record of P.I.F.P. compared to I.P.H.s without a record of P.I.F.P. ($p < .001$) (L.R., 2018). For the second statistically significant variable, according to the model, the log odds of an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement was negatively related to an I.P.H. being carried out with a knife/cutting instrument. The odds of prior physical violence reported to law enforcement before an I.P.H. are 57% lower when knife/cutting instruments are used compared to when handguns are used ($p < .05$) (Statistics Solutions, 2019). For the third statistically significant variable, according to the model, the log odds of an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement was negatively related to an I.P.H. being accomplished with a firearm that is not a handgun, i.e., other firearms. The odds of prior physical violence reported to law enforcement before an I.P.H. are 59.8% lower when other firearms are used compared to when handguns are used ($p < .05$).

Data Set B: Variable Definitions and Measures

The population used for this study is the total population of I.P.H.s between heterosexual spouses in the state of Florida from January 1, 2006 to June 31, 2016, according to the F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. The purposive sample of 62 cases for data set B was drawn from the total population of 665 cases for this study since these cases had filed P.I.F.P.s for content analysis that

were subsequently able to be utilized for exploratory quantitative analysis.⁵⁵ The following is a list and description of the variables used in the logistic regression model for data set B:

Dependent Variables:

The first dependent variable measures whether there was a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement between the heterosexual spouses before the I.P.H. The second dependent variable measures whether Physical Violence was Reported to the Court by the I.P.V. victim through the P.I.F.P.

PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT. The level of measurement for the dependent variable of PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT is nominal. It is a dummy variable with an I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement as the reference category. The dummy variable for PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT is I.P.H. without a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement = 1, I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement = 0 [Table 16.]

PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO THE COURT. The level of measurement for the dependent variable of PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO THE COURT is nominal. It is a dummy variable with an I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court through a P.I.F.P. as the reference category. The dummy variable for PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO THE COURT is I.P.H. without a Prior

⁵⁵ The methodology for obtaining the 62 cases for data set B is set out in greater detail in Chapter 4: Current Study Description.

Report of Physical Violence to the Court = 1, I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court = 0 [Table 16.]

Independent Variables:

INTIMIDATION. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of INTIMIDATION is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Intimidation as the reference category. The dummy variable for INTIMIDATION is I.P.H. with Presence of Intimidation = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Intimidation = 0 [Table 16.]

ISOLATION. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of ISOLATION is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Isolation as the reference category. The dummy variable for ISOLATION is I.P.H. with Presence of Isolation = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Isolation = 0 [Table 16.]

HUMILIATION. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of HUMILIATION is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Humiliation as the reference category. The dummy variable for HUMILIATION is I.P.H. with Presence of Humiliation = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Humiliation = 0 [Table 16.]

POWER AND CONTROL. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of POWER AND CONTROL is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Power and Control as the reference category. The dummy variable for POWER AND CONTROL is I.P.H. with Presence of Power and Control = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Power and Control = 0 [Table 16.]

RESISTANCE TO ABUSE. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of RESISTANCE TO ABUSE is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Resistance to Abuse as the reference category. The dummy variable for RESISTANCE TO ABUSE is I.P.H. with Presence of Resistance to Abuse = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Resistance to Abuse = 0 [Table 16.]

FEARFUL OF THE FUTURE. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of FEARFUL OF THE FUTURE is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Fearful of the Future as the reference category. The dummy variable for FEARFUL OF THE FUTURE is I.P.H. with Presence of Fearful of the Future = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Fearful of the Future = 0 [Table 16.]

ABUSER MENTAL ILLNESS. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of ABUSER MENTAL ILLNESS is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Abuser Mental Illness as the reference category. The dummy variable for ABUSER MENTAL ILLNESS is I.P.H. with Presence of Abuser Mental Illness = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Abuser Mental Illness = 0 [Table 16.]

Table 16. Explanation of Quantitative Variables for Data Set B

Predictor Variable	Coding	Dependent Variables	Coding
Intimidation		Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement – <i>Dichotomous Variable</i>	
I.P.H. with No Presence of Intimidation (reference category)	0	I.P.H. with Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement (reference category)	0
I.P.H. with Presence of Intimidation	1	I.P.H. without Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement	1
Missing	9	Missing	9
Isolation		Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court – <i>Dichotomous Variable</i>	
I.P.H. with No Presence of Isolation (reference category)	0	I.P.H. with Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court (reference category)	0
I.P.H. with Presence of Isolation	1	I.P.H. without Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court	1
Missing	9	Missing	9
Humiliation		Predictor Variable	Coding
I.P.H. with No Presence of Humiliation (reference category)	0	Fearful of the Future	
I.P.H. with Presence of Humiliation	1	I.P.H. with No Presence of Fearful of the Future (reference category)	0
Missing	9	I.P.H. with Presence of Fearful of the Future	1
Power and Control		Missing	9
I.P.H. with No Presence of Power and Control (reference category)	0	Abuser Mental Illness	
I.P.H. with Presence of Power and Control	1	I.P.H. with No Presence of Abuser Mental Illness (reference category)	0
Missing	9	I.P.H. with Presence of Abuser Mental Illness	1
Resistance to Abuse		Missing	9
I.P.H. with No Presence of Resistance to Abuse (reference category)	0		
I.P.H. with Presence of Resistance to Abuse	1		
Missing	9		

Data Set B: Research Questions and Quantitative Hypotheses

The following research questions and hypotheses were tested in the quantitative phase of this exploratory study for data set B:

Research Questions:

1. What influences do the independent variables, such as resistance to abuse, fearful of the future, and abuser mental illness, have on an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement for heterosexual spouses in Florida from 2006 to June 30, 2016?
2. What influences do the independent variables, such as humiliation, intimidation, isolation, power and control, resistance to abuse, fearful of the future, and abuser mental illness, have on an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court for heterosexual spouses in Florida from 2006 to June 30, 2016?

Hypotheses:

RESISTANCE TO ABUSE:

H₀: Resistance to abuse does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H_s: Resistance to abuse positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₀: Resistance to abuse does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

H₉: Resistance to abuse positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

FEARFUL OF THE FUTURE:

H₀: Fearful of the future does not negatively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₁₀: Fearful of the future negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₀: Fearful of the future does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

H₁₁: Fearful of the future positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

ABUSER MENTAL ILLNESS:

H₀: Abuser mental illness does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₁₂: Abuser mental illness positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

H₀: Abuser mental illness does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

H₁₃: Abuser mental illness positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

HUMILIATION:

H₀: Humiliation does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

H₁₄: Humiliation positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

INTIMIDATION:

H₀: Intimidation does not positively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

H₁₅: Intimidation positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

ISOLATION:

H₀: Isolation does not negatively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

H₁₆: Isolation negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

POWER AND CONTROL:

H₀: Power and Control does not negatively influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

H₁₇: Power and Control negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court.

Data Set B: Univariate and Bivariate Analyses

Descriptive statistical analyses were completed for all the variables in data set B, whether they were included in the logistic regression model.

Data Set B: Logistic Regression Model Variable Frequencies

The following tables explain the frequencies for each of the variables used in the logistic regression model for data set B. Table 17 explains that, of the 55 cases of data collected regarding whether the heterosexual couple involved in the I.P.H. had a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement before the killing, 61.8% of the cases have a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement, regardless of who made the report, i.e., the victim or the offender of the I.P.H.⁵⁶ Additionally, of the 62 cases analyzed in data set B, 69.4% of the I.P.V. victims reported violence to the court through the filed P.I.F.P.s prior to the I.P.H.s.⁵⁷

Table 17. Dependent Variable Frequencies (Data Set B)

	<u>Frequency, N=62</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement	34	21	55	61.8%	38.2%	100%
Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court	43	19	62	69.4%	30.6%	100%

Note: N=62; there are 7 missing records for the variable “Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement”

⁵⁶ One of the reasons for the 7 missing cases is due to the fact that, as explained in Chapter Four: Current Study Description, Data and Methodology, Florida Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 60 cases were affected by a lack of response by 20 agencies during the second request for records from law enforcement.

⁵⁷ It is important to remember that, as explained previously and demonstrated in Chapter Five: Qualitative Methods, the I.P.V. victim may not always be the same person as the I.P.H. victim.

Table 18 explains the percentages of non-violent coercive control tactics reported by the I.P.V. victim in the P.I.F.P. filed with the court prior to the I.P.H.⁵⁸ Resistance to abuse, considered an I.P.V. victim's reaction to abuse, has the highest percentage of affirmative reporting at 87.1%. The second highest percentage, at 82.3%, is power and control, which is considered an abuser's tactic used against the I.P.V. victim. Third highest is intimidation, another abusive tactic, with a percentage of 77.4%. The fourth highest reporting percentage, at 58.1%, is fearful of the future, which describes the I.P.V. victim's state of mind in reaction to the abuse they have or are experiencing. Fifth is abuser mental illness at 51.6%, which describes the abuser's state of mind as understood by the I.P.V. victim. With 46.8%, isolation is another abusive tactic that was reported by I.P.V. victims through the P.I.F.P.s and ranks sixth out of the seven variables in Table 18. Finally, humiliation, with 44.3%, is the last abusive tactic to be reported affirmatively by I.P.V. victims to the court through the P.I.F.P.s prior to the I.P.H. taking place.

Table 18. Non-Violent Coercive Control Variable Frequencies (Data Set B)

	Frequency, N=62		Total	Valid Percent		Total
	No	Yes		No	Yes	
Humiliation	34	27	61	55.7%	44.3%	100%
Intimidation	14	48	62	22.6%	77.4%	100%
Isolation	33	29	62	53.2%	46.8%	100%
Power and Control	11	51	62	17.7%	82.3%	100%
Resistance to Abuse	8	54	62	12.9%	87.1%	100%
Fearful of the Future	26	36	62	41.9%	58.1%	100%
Abuser Mental Illness	30	32	62	48.4%	51.6%	100%

Note: N=62; there is 1 missing record for the variable "Humiliation"

⁵⁸ The coding coverage percentages referred to in Chapter Six: Qualitative Discussion were derived from NVivo Pro 12 and are not commensurate with the coercive control frequency percentages shown in Table 18. The frequencies of coercive control analyzed in Chapter Five: Qualitative Methods, The Frequencies of Coercive Control were based on the P.I.F.P.s rather than the I.P.H.s in this study [Table 4].

Data Set B: Correlation Results

Similar to data set A, data set B contains both continuous and dichotomous variables; but the logistic regression models for data set B contain only dichotomous variables. Thus, it was deemed appropriate to run the Pearson Correlation for all variables in data set B and the Phi Correlation for the logistic regression model variables in data set B.⁵⁹

Data Set B: Pearson Correlation⁶⁰

The following correlations have statistically significant associations of $p < .01$ [Table 50].⁶¹

Victim Age and Offender Age have a strong, positive association (.732). Victim Age and Isolation have a strong, negative association (-.485). Victim Gender and Offender Gender have a positive, strong association (1.000). Victim Race and Offender Race have a positive, strong association (.888). Offender Age and Isolation have a moderate, negative association (-.420). I.P.H.S. and Handgun have a moderate, positive association (.375). I.P.H.S. and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a negative, moderate association (-.380). Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement and Abuser Mental Illness have a positive, moderate association (.369). T.I.P. in Place at Time of I.P.H. and Hands/Fist/Feet have a strong, positive association (.487). Humiliation and Intimidation have a positive, weak association (.329). Humiliation and Fearful of the Future have a moderate, positive association (.434). Intimidation and Abuser Mental Illness have a positive, weak association (.326). Isolation and Power and Control have a positive, weak association (.266). Resistance to Abuse and Fearful of the Future have a moderate, positive

⁵⁹ Appendix E: Correlation Matrices contains the Pearson Correlation and Phi Correlation for data set B.

⁶⁰ Only those correlations with a statistically significant linear relationship of either $p < .01$ or $p < .05$ are reported.

⁶¹ The correlations already explained from one row will not be repeated in later rows.

association (.355). Handgun and Other Firearms have a strong, negative association (-.494).

Handgun and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a negative, weak association (-.332).

The following correlations have statistically significant associations of $p < .05$ [Table 50]:⁶²

Victim Age and F.J.I.P. in Place at Time of I.P.H. have a weak, negative association (-.312). Offender Age and I.P.H.S. have a positive, weak association (.258). Offender Age and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a negative, weak association (-.251). I.P.H.S. and Other Weapon have a negative, weak association (-.289). Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court and Resistance to Abuse have a weak, positive association (.256). Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court and Fearful of the Future have a weak, positive association (.281). T.I.P. in Place at Time of I.P.H. and Isolation have a weak, positive association (.288). F.J.I.P. in Place at Time of I.P.H. and Isolation have a positive, weak association (.273). F.J.I.P. in Place at Time of I.P.H. and Handgun have a positive, weak association (.298). Intimidation and Power and Control have a positive, weak association (.254). Intimidation and Other Weapon have a weak, negative association (-.252). Fearful of the Future and Other Firearms have a positive, weak association (.307). Handgun and Other Weapon have a weak, negative association (-.275). Other Firearms and Knife/Cutting Instrument have a negative, weak association (-.320). Other Firearms and Other Weapon have a negative, weak association (-.266).

⁶² The correlations already explained from one row will not be repeated in later rows.

Data Set B: Phi Correlation⁶³

The following correlations have statistically significant associations of $p < .01$ [Table 52]:

Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement and Abuser Mental Illness have a positive, moderate association (.369). Humiliation and Fearful of the Future have a moderate, positive association (.434). Intimidation and Abuser Mental Illness have a moderate, positive association (.326).

The following correlations have statistically significant associations of $p < .05$ [Table 52]:

Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court and Resistance to Abuse have a weak, positive association (.256). Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court and Fearful of the Future have a positive, weak association (.281). Intimidation and Power and Control have a positive, weak association (.254). Isolation and Power and Control have a weak, positive association (.266).

Data Set B: Logistic Regression Results

Data set B addresses three research questions utilizing the first dependent variable, i.e., prior report of physical violence to law enforcement, in this exploratory study.⁶⁴ There is a total of seven independent variables used in data set B. However, although there are no specific rules regarding adequacy of sample size for logistic regression, a minimum ratio of 10 to 1 is recommended (Peng et al., 2002). Thus, the non-violent coercive control tactic independent variables for the logistic regression models in data set B are divided into two groups: 1) Victims'

⁶³ Table 48 displays the results of twenty (20) crosstab combinations for the Phi Correlation for the logistic regression model variables for data set B. Only those correlations with a statistically significant linear relationship of either $p < .01$ or $p < .05$ are reported.

⁶⁴ Because this is an exploratory study, values approaching significance at $p < .10$ for data set B are included.

Reactions and 2) Abusers' Tactics. The group titled "victims' reactions" has three independent variables, i.e., resistance to abuse, fearful of the future, and abuser mental illness. "Abusers' Tactics" has four independent variables, humiliation, intimidation, isolation, power and control.

Table 19. Data Set B: Logistic Regression Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement for I.P.H. between Heterosexual Spouses in Florida, including Non-Violent Coercive Control (Victim Reaction Tactics), N=62

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Resistance to Abuse	-.457	.633
Fearful of the Future	-.836	.433
Abuser Mental Illness	1.138	3.121**
χ^2	6.530*	
R ²	.149	

Note: * $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$, **** $p < .001$; there are 7 missing cases in this model

The first logistic regression model explored the first dependent variable, prior report of physical violence to law enforcement, and applied three independent variables, i.e., resistance to abuse, fearful of the future, and abuser mental illness.⁶⁵ The logistic regression model as shown in Table 19 yielded statistically significance and statistically significant variable results. The full model was statistically significant, χ^2 (df=3, n=62) = 6.530, $P < 0.1$. 14.9% of the variance is explained by the independent variables. Abuser mental illness was the one variable of significance in the model. According to the model, the log odds of I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement was positively related to I.P.H. with abuser mental illness. The odds of an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement are 3.121 times

⁶⁵ Additional independent variables were not utilized in this logistic regression model due to their high V.I.F. levels. Of the independent variables that qualified for the model based on their V.I.F. levels, not more than four (4) variables were used in a model at a time due to the number of cases, i.e., N = 62.

higher for an I.P.H. with abuser mental illness compared to an I.P.H. with no abuser mental illness ($p < .05$).

Data set B addresses seven hypotheses utilizing the second dependent variable, i.e., prior report of physical violence to the court. There are two logistic regression models with this variable, which uses seven independent variables.⁶⁶ These independent variables are humiliation, intimidation, isolation, power and control, resistance to abuse, fearful of the future, and abuser mental illness. The recommended minimum ratio of 10 to 1 for adequacy of sample size for logistic regression was followed for the second dependent variable as well; thus, the independent variables were divided into the two groups, i.e., victims' reactions and abusers' tactics.

Table 20. Data Set B: Logistic Regression Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence to the Court for I.P.H. between Heterosexual Spouses in Florida, including Non-Violent Coercive Control (Victim Reaction Tactics), N=62

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Resistance to Abuse	-.913	.401*
Fearful of the Future	.905	2.472
Abuser Mental Illness	-.620	.538
χ^2	7.855**	
R^2	.159	

Note: * $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$, **** $p < .001$

The first logistic regression model for the dependent variable, prior report of physical violence to the court, used three independent variables, resistance to abuse, fearful of the future, and abuser mental illness [Table 20]. The full model was statistically significant, χ^2 (df=3, $n=62$) = 7.855, $P < 0.05$. 15.9% of the variance is explained by the independent variables. I.P.H. with resistance to abuse was the one variable of approaching statistical

⁶⁶ Additional independent variables were not utilized in either logistic regression model due to their high V.I.F. levels. Of the independent variables that qualified for the model based on their V.I.F. levels, not more than four (4) variables were used in a model at a time due to the number of cases, i.e., $N = 62$.

significance in the model. According to the model, the log odds of an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court was negatively related to an I.P.H. with resistance to abuse. An I.P.H. with resistance to abuse reduces the odds of having prior physical violence reported to the court before the killing by 59.9% ($p < 0.10$).

Table 21. Data Set B: Logistic Regression Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence to the Court for I.P.H. between Heterosexual Spouses in Florida, including Non-Violent Coercive Control (Abuser Tactics), N=62

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Humiliation	-.237	.789
Intimidation	.761	2.141
Isolation	-.548	.578
Power and Control	-1.202	.301*
χ^2	11.888**	
R^2	.236	

Note: * $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$, **** $p < .001$; There is one (1) missing case in this model.

The second logistic regression model for the second dependent variable in data set B has four independent variables, humiliation, intimidation, isolation, and power and control [Table 21]. The full model was statistically significant, χ^2 (df=4, $n=61$) = 11.888, $P < 0.05$. 23.6 % of the variance is explained by the independent variables. I.P.H. with power and control was the only variable of approaching statistical significance in the model. According to the model, the log odds of I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court was negatively related to I.P.H. with power and control. An I.P.H. with power and control reduces the odds of having prior physical violence reported to the court before the killing by 69.9% ($p < 0.10$).

CHAPTER EIGHT: QUANTITATIVE DISCUSSION

As stated in the beginning of this study and at the beginning of Chapter Six: Qualitative Discussion, it is important to remember that every case in this study represents an intimate partner homicide, i.e., I.P.H. between heterosexual spouses. Often, in scientific studies, among all the data and abbreviations, the people and the stories behind the data get lost. For a moment, it is appropriate to recognize that this study began with 665 homicide cases as provided by F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. that was subsequently divided into two data sets each with 493 and 62 cases, respectively. Through quantitative data, it is possible to learn from these cases and to predict the risk of lethality to reduce the number of I.P.H.s in the future, especially as it pertains to the non-violent tactics of coercive control.

Discussion: Data Set A - Frequencies⁶⁷

The first variable for discussion is “prior report of physical violence to law enforcement,” which was used as a dependent variable throughout this study. Although the predominant viewpoint is that recidivism, which must come from some form of reporting to or interaction with the police, is one of the greatest risk factors for lethality assessment for I.P.V. victims, data set A’s dependent variable indicates that only 15.3% of the victims of I.P.H. reported any physical violence to the police prior to their death [Table 11]. Indeed, because the outcome variable for this study is I.P.H., it is surprising to learn that this simple frequency turns the notion of recidivism and prearrest policies on their head. Stated another way, 84.7% of the I.P.H.

⁶⁷ The frequencies discussed in this section correspond only to those frequencies presented in Chapter Seven: Quantitative Methods, data set A Variable Definitions and Measures, data set A Univariate and Bivariate Analyses, data set A: Logistic Regression Model Variable Frequencies

heterosexual spouses in this study were not previously involved with law enforcement regarding their relationship and physical violence prior to the killing. To say the least, numbers this low were not expected. Based on these results, Black's (2010) behavior of law theory is supported by the empirical research suggesting that intimates do not mobilize the law against each other.

The next variable for discussion is I.P.H.S. Indeed, the percentage of I.P.H.s, 49.8%, that resulted in an I.P.H.S. was not expected but was not completely surprising either [Table 12]. Velopulos et al. (2018) reported a 35% success rate of male suicides after killing female intimate partners, and the Violence Policy Center reports that "65% of all murder-suicides involve an intimate partner" (VPC, 2018, p. 2). In fact, the most common type of murder-suicide is one that takes place between two intimate partners. However, the results from this study are much higher than the Velopulos et al. (2018) study, and the Violence Policy Center statistics do not completely comport with this study because its variable is compared to I.P.H.s as opposed to murder-suicides alone.

The variable, record of P.I.F.P., had only 13.4% of the cases with a filed P.I.F.P., which is commensurate to the number of cases having a P.I.F.P. for analysis in this study [Table 13]. It is interesting that less than 15% of the I.P.H. victims sought protection from the court prior to their death because victims are generally referred to the court by social worker, clergy, friends, neighbors, etc., especially when all other sources of assistance have failed. Nevertheless, there were more interactions with law enforcement, based on the frequencies represented in Table 11, than there were with the court [Table 13]. Thus, based on this variable, it is logical to conclude that Black's (2010) behavior of law theory is upheld because intimates did not mobilize the law against each other at a high occurrence rate.

Weapon used involves five variables that ranked in order of most used to least used. Table 14 shows that handgun and other firearms are the top two weapons used in an I.P.H. with a combined percentage of 72.7%. This is interesting because, 96% of I.P.H.S.s are accomplished with some type of gun, and approximately half of the I.P.H.s in this study resulted in an I.P.H.S. (VPC, 2018). Knife/cutting instrument was the third most common weapon used in this study, at 15.2%, which could mean anything from a common kitchen knife to a machete or anything in between. The next type of weapon in common usage for this study was hands/fist/feet at 8.7% which most likely includes strangulation, although not specifically identified by F.D.L.E. U.C.R.-S.H.R. As discussed in Chapter Two: Assessing the Risk: Understanding a Domestic Violence Victim's Risk of Death, non-fatal strangulation is a well-known indicator for I.P.H. and it carries a greater risk of death than those who have not been previously strangled. The last most common weapon was the other weapon category at 3.4%, which includes all other types of forms in which the I.P.H. victim died, such as by an intentional drug overdose by the offender, by an intentional vehicular homicide by the offender, by an intentional fire set by the offender, or by blunt force trauma by the offender.

Discussion: Data Set A – Correlations

For data set A, both Pearson and Phi Correlations were run to determine whether any association exists among the variables in the data set. For the reasons stated above in Chapter Seven, the Pearson Correlation has continuous and dichotomous variables; and the Phi Correlation has only dichotomous variables. However, the results for these correlations are remarkably similar in both the determination of whether an association exists between the variables but also the strength of that association. In fact, the ten statistically significant Phi

Correlations reported in Chapter Seven were identical in direction, strength, and significance compared to their Pearson Correlation results [Table 49 and Table 51].

Discussion: Data Set A - Logistic Regression

Because the logistic regression model is statistically significant at $p < 0.001$, indicating that at least one of the independent variables are statistically significant, it is important to identify which independent variable(s) is/are statistically significant to determine which hypothesis(es) to reject (L.R., 2018). Table 15 explains that the first independent variable tested, I.P.H.S., was not statistically significant. It is determined that I.P.H.S. does not influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement. This is not surprising because the percentage of I.P.H.S.s in data set A were split 50.2% for “was not an I.P.H.S” to 49.8% for “was an I.P.H.S.” [Table 12]. Indeed, as discussed in Chapter Two: The Role of Intimate Partner Homicide-Suicide in Intimate Partner Homicide, I.P.H.S.s are not often something that occurs without warning; rather, they take place after a long course of abusive behavior and struggle whereby the I.P.V. victim may attempt to leave the relationship, signifying an undeniable urge for the abuser to maintain control over the victim.

The next independent variable, record of P.I.F.P., was statistically significant at $p < .001$; thus, the null hypothesis for record of P.I.F.P. is rejected. It can be determined that an I.P.H. with a record of P.I.F.P. positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement. These findings are interesting when considering the processes of the legal system an I.P.V. victim must endure to ensure their safety. As discussed in Chapter Two: The Disillusionment of the Protections of an Injunction for Protection against Domestic Violence: Why and When are They Important to I.P.V. Victims?, I.P.V. victims must jump through many

legal hoops to try to obtain a court order that provides them the hope for some type of official protection from their abuser. Nevertheless, generally, once they choose to enter the legal system to ask for assistance or protection, they will continue to try to obtain resources. In fact, the odds of an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement are 14.245 times higher for I.P.H.s with a record of a filed P.I.F.P. compared to I.P.H.s without a record of a filed P.I.F.P. Therefore, based on these results, it is reasonable that the I.P.V. victim would also contact law enforcement if physical violence is one of the tactics of abuse that is being wielded against them. Thus, Black's (2010) behavior of law theory regarding an I.P.V. victim's lack of mobilization of the law is not upheld when an I.P.V. victim chooses to protect themselves from physical violence by filing a P.I.F.P. Intimates effectively mobilize the law against each other when physical violence is present in the relationship and the legal system is engaged.

Two weapon used variables tested were statistically significant. The null hypothesis for knife/cutting instrument is rejected. An I.P.H. carried out by a knife/cutting instrument negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement. The null hypothesis for other firearms is rejected. An I.P.H. carried out by a gun other than a handgun, i.e., other firearms, negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement. The odds of prior physical violence reported to law enforcement before an I.P.H. are 57% and 59.8% lower compared to when handguns are used for knife/cutting instruments and other firearms, respectively. This result is most interesting when put into the context of an issued T.I.P. and/or F.J.I.P., whereby the abuser would already have a handgun confiscated. Although there are fewer cases in this study that had both a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement and a record of a filed P.I.F.P., an order for an injunction for protection typically comes with an order to turn over all handguns or firearms. It is possible

that the handguns were removed from the offenders in these cases due to the prior report of physical violence to law enforcement and the success of a filed P.I.F.P.; so, they used other weapons for the I.P.H., such as a knife/cutting instrument or other firearms purchased after the issuance of the protective order.

Discussion: Data Set B - Frequencies⁶⁸

As with data set A, the first data set B variable for discussion, prior report of physical violence to law enforcement, was used as one of data set B's dependent variables. However, quite differently than data set A, which had only 15.3% of the victims of I.P.H. report any physical violence to the police prior to their death, data set B had 61.8% of the victims of I.P.H. report any physical violence to the police prior to their death [Table 11 and Table 17]. Additionally, for the second dependent variable in data set B, prior report of physical violence to the court, 69.4% of the victims of I.P.H. reported physical violence to the court prior to their death [Table 17]. These higher data set B percentages may be explained by the fact that all of the cases in data set B are P.I.F.P. cases; thus, they derive from I.P.H. cases whereby the victim and offender were engaged in court proceedings, meaning the legal system and available victim resources, prior to the killing. As a result, these cases would tend to mobilize the law for their own self-protection more readily, which does not support Black's (2010) behavior of law theory regarding mobilization of the law.

⁶⁸ The frequencies discussed in this section correspond only to those frequencies presented in Chapter Seven: Quantitative Methods, data set B Variable Definitions and Measures, data set B Univariate and Bivariate Analyses, data set B: Logistic Regression Model Variable Frequencies

This study focuses on seven non-violent tactics of coercive control, which were analyzed in data set B.⁶⁹ As explained in detail in Chapter Six: Qualitative Discussion, in this study, resistance to abuse does not refer to any type of physical violence as this variable represents a non-violent tactic of coercive control. Because data set B's cases are I.P.H.s with filed P.I.F.P.s, it is not surprising that resistance to abuse had the highest percentage frequency, 87.1%, among this study's non-violent coercive control variables [Table 18]. Indeed, I.P.V. victims who are willing to mobilize the law, such as filing a P.I.F.P., are actively working to resist the abuse they are experiencing. They have consciously made the decision to resist their abuser knowing the cost may very well be an escalation in physical violence or possible death; however, some realize that this option is better than the alternative of living with the abuse any longer. As such, Black's (2010) behavior of law theory regarding mobilization of the law is fallible based on this frequency because it shows that intimates effectively mobilized the law against each other.

Power and control, with 82.3%, was the next highest frequency, explaining the overarching theme of non-violent coercive control [Table 18]. As explained throughout this study, generally, coercive control tactics are not deployed in a vacuum, nor are they deployed one at a time. Indeed, coercive control tactics are not mutually exclusive. An abuser may rely on many of them, if not all of them, for effectiveness to keep his victim "in line" and under his power and control. Thus, the fact that power and control ranked so high among the tactics is not surprising because it is the most common tactic to result from many of the other tactics' implementation.

⁶⁹ The coding coverage percentages referred to in Chapter Six: Qualitative Discussion were derived from NVivo Pro 12 and are not commensurate with the coercive control frequency percentages shown in Table 18. The frequencies of coercive control analyzed in Chapter Five: Qualitative Methods, The Frequencies of Coercive Control were based on the P.I.F.P.s rather than the I.P.H.s in this study [Table 4].

As with power and control, intimidation works with the other coercive control tactics to produce an overall effect upon the victim. At a 77.4% frequency, intimidation is deployed often and is most likely very effective for the abuser, explaining the fact that I.P.H. victims described this type of behavior in their P.I.F.P.s at such a high frequency [Table 18]. Indeed, as explained in Chapter Two: Literature Review, Not All Domestic Violence is Created Equal, Coercive Control's Impact on Women, intimidation is one of the most effective non-violent tactics of coercive control because it compares to torture experienced by someone who was a prisoner of war. However, for the I.P.V. victim, coercive control's intimidation can inflict much worse psychological harm because the abuser was intimate with the victim rather than being an unknown assailant as in the prisoner of war scenario.

Culminating from the first three coercive control tactics' frequencies discussed above is the next highest frequency at 77.4% for fearful of the future [Table 18]. The ranking for fearful of the future after 1) resistance to abuse, 2) power and control, and 3) intimidation can be explained by the fact that many of the I.P.H. victims, when expressing their fears of the future in the P.I.F.P.s, were reacting to the other tactics of coercive control they were experiencing, such as resistance to abuse, power and control, and intimidation. Indeed, this reaction to coercive control tactics is an excellent example of how abusers can commingle their tactics to ensure compliance from their victims. However, it is also a good example of the fact that, even though I.P.V. victims are fearful of the future, they are willing to do what it takes to resist the abuse they are facing. Indeed, resistance to abuse had the highest frequency percentage; and fearful of the future had the fourth highest frequency percentage. Keeping in mind that, generally, I.P.H. victims were facing power and control and intimidation as well, they withstood their fears and

some of the most difficult forms of non-violent coercive control to resist the abuse and live their lives while working to protect themselves.

I.P.H. victims reported in their P.I.F.P.s that their abusers had some type of mental illness at a 51.6% frequency [Table 18]. Although this variable does not fundamentally represent a non-violent coercive control tactic, based on its frequency, it indicates that many I.P.H.s had a spouse of questionable mental health, at least as far as one of the spouses was concerned.⁷⁰ The subthemes in this theme are important to remember as they are described above in Chapter Five: Qualitative Methods, Abuser Mental Illness, especially as it pertains to drinking alcohol and paranoia. Indeed, these subthemes play a major role in the lives of abusive heterosexual marriages on a day-to-day basis, which helps to explain the frequency percentage for abuser mental illness. Although drinking alcohol is self-explanatory, paranoia needs clarification. As described in detail in Chapter Five, some of the most significant results from this abusive behavior were jealousy and possessiveness. In fact, as jealousy and possessiveness escalated, so did the power and control, as well as the intimidation. Abuser mental illness is one non-violent coercive control tactic that helps make clear that these behaviors work together to maintain the abusive relationship that is desired by the offender, without the need for physical violence.

Isolation was the next non-violent coercive control tactic, at 46.8%, in order of percentage of frequency [Table 18]. It is surprising that the frequency for isolation was not higher as it would be expected, based on the literature, to be at the same level as intimidation. However, it is possible that many I.P.H. victims did not believe reporting such behavior to the court was important enough to document on their P.I.F.P.s. As such, this would explain the lower

⁷⁰ Because 32.4% (N=108) of the P.I.F.P.s were not filed by the I.P.H. victim, it is important to refrain from accusing the I.P.H. offender of possibly having a mental illness because it is possible that the I.P.H. victim was the I.P.V. offender [Table 48].

frequency percentage compared to intimidation. Nevertheless, overall, the 46.8% frequency percentage for this study indicates that many I.P.H. victims, almost half, were able to communicate in their P.I.F.P.s some form of isolation that they were experiencing during their abusive relationship with their heterosexual spouse. Indeed, many of the I.P.H. victims experienced isolation in the form of being kept from their family and friends or false imprisonment. Others told the court about economic control they experienced, such as interference with their job or school. Still, others experienced isolation in the form of financial control whereby their personal bills were not paid by their abusers and money for essential living expenses was withheld.

Humiliation had the lowest percentage frequency of all the non-violent coercive control tactics with 44.3% [Table 18]. The fact that humiliation ranked the lowest of all the coercive control variables is surprising because it is very powerful when utilized by the abuser against the I.P.V. victim. However, it may be the simple fact that the I.P.V. victim is too embarrassed to explain in a P.I.F.P. the humiliation they have experienced at the hands of their abuser that this tactic ranked so low. Indeed, considering the humiliating facts an I.P.V. victim would have to write in a P.I.F.P., such as the degrading names their abuser called them for an extensive period of time, it is impressive that so many I.P.H. victims had the courage to come forward with their stories of humiliation to cause the frequency percentage to be as high as 44.3%.

Discussion: Data Set B - Correlations

As with data set A, both Pearson and Phi Correlations were run for data set B to determine whether associations exist among the variables in the data set. For the reasons stated above in Chapter Seven, the Pearson Correlation has continuous and dichotomous variables; and

the Phi Correlation has only dichotomous variables. However, the results for these correlations are remarkably similar in both the determination of whether an association exists between the variables but also the strength of that association [Table 50 and Table 52]. Of the seven statistically significant Phi Correlations reported in Chapter Seven, four were identical in direction, strength, and significance compared to their Pearson Correlation results; however, three had a difference of one one-thousandths in their significance but were otherwise identical in direction and strength [Table 50 and Table 52]. The four identical correlations were: 1) prior report of physical violence to law enforcement and abuser mental illness, 2) prior report of physical violence to the court and fearful of the future, 3) humiliation and fearful of the future, and 4) intimidation and abuser mental illness. The three correlations with significance were: 1) prior report of physical violence to the court and resistance to abuse, 2) intimidation and power and control, and 3) isolation and power and control.

Discussion: Data Set B - Logistic Regression

For data set B, the first logistic regression model, using prior report of physical violence to law enforcement as its dependent variable, was approaching statistical significance at $p < 0.10$, indicating that at least one of the three independent variables were statistically significant (L.R., 2018).⁷¹ As a result, it is important to identify which independent variable(s) is/are statistically significant to determine which hypothesis(es) to reject. Table 19 indicates that the first independent variable tested, I.P.H. with resistance to abuse, was not statistically significant. It is determined that an I.P.H. with resistance to abuse does not influence an I.P.H. with a prior report

⁷¹ As previously stated, this is an exploratory study; thus, values approaching significance at $p < .10$ for data set B are included.

of physical violence to law enforcement. The second independent variable tested, I.P.H. with fearful of the future, was not statistically significant. It is determined that an I.P.H. with fearful of the future does not influence an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement.

The third independent variable tested, I.P.H. with abuser mental illness, was statistically significant at $p < .05$; thus, the null hypothesis for an I.P.H. with abuser mental illness is rejected. So, it can be determined that an I.P.H. with abuser mental illness positively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement. Keeping in mind that the variable, abuser mental illness, includes drinking alcohol and paranoia, i.e., jealousy and possessiveness, it seems likely that physical violence between the spouses might result. The odds of an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to law enforcement are 3.121 times higher for an I.P.H. with abuser mental illness compared to an I.P.H. with no abuser mental illness. Is it possible that the I.P.H. victims did not want to report the physical violence for fear of some type of retaliation from their abusers?

The second logistic regression model for data set B uses prior report of physical violence to the court as its dependent variable and is statistically significant at $p < 0.05$, indicating that at least one of the three independent variables are statistically significant.⁷² Thus, determining which independent variable(s) is/are statistically significant and which hypothesis(es) to reject is important. Table 20 explains that the first independent variable tested, I.P.H. with resistance to abuse, was approaching statistical significance at $p < .10$. The null hypothesis for an I.P.H. with resistance to abuse is rejected; however, the hypothesized relationship is different than expected,

⁷² As previously stated, this is an exploratory study; thus, values approaching significance at $p < .10$ for data set B are included.

meaning it was negative rather than the hypothesized positive direction. So, it can be determined that an I.P.H. with resistance to abuse negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court. This result is logical because the I.P.H. victim works hard at protecting themselves once they determine it is time to stand up to their abuser in court. In fact, as this model found, an I.P.H. with resistance to abuse reduces the odds of having prior physical violence reported to the court before the killing by 59.9%. Thus, it seems that once the law is mobilized within the judicial system, the I.P.V. victim will continue to exhaust all judicial resources available to them to attempt to maintain their safety and well-being.

The third logistic regression model for data set B uses prior report of physical violence to the court as its dependent variable and is statistically significant at $p < 0.05$, indicating that at least one of the four independent variables are statistically significant.⁷³ As a result, it is important to determine which independent variable(s) is/are statistically significant and which hypothesis(es) to reject. The first three independent variables in the model were not statistically significant [Table 21].

The fourth independent variable tested in the third logistic regression model for data set B, I.P.H. with power and control, was approaching statistical significance at $p < .10$; thus, the null hypothesis for an I.P.H. with power and control is rejected. So, it can be determined that an I.P.H. with power and control negatively influences an I.P.H. with a prior report of physical violence to the court. The causal relationship between these variables is not surprising due to the commingling of coercive control tactics as described throughout this dissertation.⁷⁴ Indeed, it is no surprise that I.P.H.s with power and control influences I.P.H.s with prior reports of physical

⁷³ As previously stated, this is an exploratory study; thus, values approaching significance at $p < .10$ for data set B are included.

⁷⁴ Physical violence is a coercive control tactic; it is not a non-violent coercive control tactic.

violence to the court because it is a frequent form of coercive control to describe, meaning the abuser will prevent the I.P.V. victim from mobilizing the law if there is physical violence to report. An I.P.H. with power and control reduces the odds of having prior physical violence reported to the court before the killing by 69.9%. Having said this, it is remarkable that so many I.P.V. victims resisted the power and control deployed by their abuser and mobilized the law to file the P.I.F.P.s to ask the court for protection.

CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION

The introduction to this study began with a focus on a family whereby the abuser engaged in several non-violent tactics of coercive control against the spouse while the children were exposed to it as well. The abuser's acts were so egregious that he held a gun to each of the children's heads, as well as the mother's head. Immediately thereafter, the I.P.V. victim engaged in resistance to abuse by mobilizing the law when she filed a P.I.F.P and was granted a T.I.P. In fact, the court granted her an F.J.I.P. after a hearing, which was not to expire without further order of the court. However, the woman asked the court for the protection from the court in the form of the injunctions for protection to be dropped in favor of the abuser. Following this incident, the couple continued to live together for eight years without any reports of physical violence to law enforcement or the court. However, once the wife asserted that she was considering a divorce, the husband kidnapped her and killed her in an I.P.H.S.

Unfortunately, stories such as the one described above are all too familiar. This study contains 493 individual cases of heterosexual spouses with their own story to tell. Of these 493 cases, there were 62 in which the I.P.V. victim told their story through a P.I.F.P. narrative that was coded and analyzed in NVivo Pro 12, which allowed for the contextualization and operationalization of coercive control for this study. Additionally, because one of the goals of this study was to determine whether emphasizing physical violence for lethality assessment in high risk I.P.V. cases is appropriate, the I.P.V. victims' stories helped to achieve that goal because coercive control was operationalized. The cases in this study involved with the court helped to fill part of the gap of the empirical literature analyzing the effects of I.P.V. on the victim because so many other cases in this study did not engage the court relative to P.I.F.P.s.

Additionally, it is important to remember that one-third of the P.I.F.P.s were written by the I.P.H. offender. Indeed, without the P.I.F.P. narratives, it would have been very difficult to determine the non-violent tactics of coercive control's role in heterosexual spousal relationships prior to an I.P.H. from the point of view of the I.P.H. victim.

In the qualitative phase of the study, the question asked was: "What role does the non-violent tactics of coercive control play in I.P.V. compared to physical violence prior to the I.P.H.?" This question was answered by the coercive control frequencies in Table 4 where it was discovered that physical violence was not the most reported coercive control tactic by the I.P.V. victims in their P.I.F.P. narratives. In fact, physical violence, at 76%, came close to a second-place tie with power and control, as well as resistance to abuse.⁷⁵ Additionally, the narratives of the I.P.V. victims are quite revealing as to the role the non-violent tactics of coercive control play in I.P.V. compared to physical violence prior to the I.P.H. Indeed, many of the I.P.V. victims described in great detail the non-violent tactics of coercive control they were enduring prior to their deaths, whether the I.P.H. occurred almost immediately after the narrative was written or years after the narrative was filed with the court.

In assessing whether the non-violent tactics of coercive control should be legislated and how such laws can be implemented, as Hanna (2009) argues, it is important to consider the I.P.V. victim's willingness to participate in the legal process. Unlike physical violence that is possible to litigate without a victim's participation, non-violent coercive control is more difficult to prosecute or argue against without the I.P.V. victim's involvement, especially if they are the only person who is witness to these tactics of abuse. For example, this study shows that I.P.H.

⁷⁵ Power and control and resistance to abuse equaled 75%.

victims who experience the non-violent tactic of power and control are less likely to report physical violence to the court by 69.9% than those I.P.H. victims who do not experience power and control. As a result, I.P.V. victims are silenced due to a possibility of a variety of reasons that may include the fear of retribution from their abuser, an inability to mobilize the law due to the extreme power and control their abuser invokes upon them, or the fact that physical violence is not present in the abusive relationship. It is the last reason that is the focus of this study.

One of the components of the significance of this study is the challenge to the notion that reported physical violence is always present in an intimate partner relationship prior to an I.P.H., including the possibility that the implementation of non-violent coercive control by the abuser against the I.P.V. victim is extremely effective until the time of death. In other words, the first occurrence of physical violence between the couple is at the time of the I.P.H. Thus, for the non-violent tactic of power and control to be a non-violent coercive control tactic that, potentially, works in the abuser's favor so much so to the point that physical violence is not necessary for victim compliance is remarkable but not entirely unexpected. This result supports the policy implications discussed throughout this dissertation regarding legislative change and for including the non-violent tactics of coercive control as indicators for I.P.H. on lethality risk assessments.

Limitations to the Study

This study found its rewards but also found its challenges. In order to properly discuss a path forward for future research, it is important to recognize this study's limitations. The data collected were limited to the jurisdictions in which the I.P.H.s occurred. In other words, it is possible that some of the heterosexual spousal couples had a history of prior reports of physical violence in other jurisdictions than where the I.P.H. happened. Based on time and resources, the

data collection efforts were limited to the specific locale in which the I.P.H. happened rather than being able to determine whether the couples had any prior reports of physical violence in their relationship in other jurisdictions. Future studies would benefit from expanding outward from the I.P.H. jurisdiction to determine whether law enforcement or the court were contacted in other jurisdictions.

Another issue with data collection relating to the jurisdiction where the records were requested pertains to the richness of the data. This is because each law enforcement agency's protocol in providing public records may be different from another. Some missing data in this study were because each law enforcement agency has autonomy throughout the state of Florida regarding their policies for fulfilling public records requests from the public. Additionally, the incident reports themselves are not standardized throughout the state of Florida; thus, one report might provide very detailed information regarding the events of the I.P.H. or the I.P.V. incident but another may provide very limited information. Also, the data collection was dependent upon each agency's rules of disclosure. Although Florida is governed by the Sunshine Law, many agencies followed their own jurisdictional rules which made it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain their records (AG Ashley Moody, 2018). When pushed to provide the information, using the Sunshine Law, some agencies responded positively with the requested information; however, other agencies were unresponsive, even with repeated efforts over an extended period of time. Thus, the decision to terminate attempting to collect data from the unresponsive agencies was necessary based on the completion time for this study.

The data collected for this study were limited to law enforcement agencies and court documents, limiting the scope of this study to publicly accessible data. However, with additional time and funding for future research, there are other means of obtaining details of an I.P.V.

victim's life and willingness to disclose abuse. Family, friends, neighbors, coworkers, etc., i.e., covictims and proxies are valuable resources to obtain data for an in-depth study regarding physical violence, as well as non-violence tactics of coercive control (Campbell et al., 2003; Sheehan et al., 2015). These resources for data collection may have details about prior physical violence, as well as non-violent coercive control tactics, that were not accessed in this study. Indeed, accessing these resources for an expanded study regarding whether an I.P.H. victim divulged to their family, friends, neighbors, coworkers, etc. the physical abuse and/or the non-violent tactics of coercive control they were enduring would be similar to the type of case study a fatality review board conducts but on a much larger scale.

The notion that I.P.V. victims do not report to law enforcement or the court for fear of retaliation from their abuser is valid and should be considered with the results of this study (Iyengar, 2009). It is possible the I.P.H. victims reported physical abuse and/or non-violent tactics of abuse to family, friends, neighbors, coworkers, etc., which would cause the results of a study that included such data to be quite different from this one. With such intimate details, it would be possible to understand what the victims endured prior to the killings. It would shed light into the extent of the coercive control that was not understood in this study because so many cases did not have filed P.I.F.P.s. Truly, an expansive, generalizable study that provides details surrounding the lives of I.P.H. victims, as well as the person they were before they were killed, is one of the best ways to begin to stop the scourge of these types of deaths.

Another source for determining the existence of physical violence in an abusive relationship, whether the I.P.V. victim reports it or not, is by accessing medical records. This study did not obtain medical or hospital records, as well as information from family, friends, clergy, coworkers, etc.; but, a future study that could include these data might realize different

results in terms of the prior physical violence, as well as non-violent coercive control, between the heterosexual spouses before the I.P.H.

It is possible that some I.P.V. victims are not as inclined to explain in their P.I.F.P.s all the non-violent tactics of coercive control they are experiencing because most state laws focus on physical violence or threats of physical violence. Indeed, the instructions on many P.I.F.P. forms direct the affiant to provide details about physical violence and threats rather than asking for information relating to non-violent coercive control tactics as well. It is only when an I.P.V. victim is willing to elaborate on their abusive relationship to the court that data regarding non-violent coercive control is collected. Thus, the results of this study, with the high percentage and emphasis of the non-violent coercive control tactics is remarkable and indicates a need for further investigation into the role they play in I.P.H.

Future Directions for Research

This study is exploratory and is intended to lay the groundwork for future studies of this nature; thus, this discussion of future directions for research is essential. A study that is able to incorporate the type of details, on a case-by-case basis, similar to a fatality review board would be one way to expand the existing research from this study, as well as the F.A.G.S.D.V.F.R.T.'s information, to generalizable findings. Such findings may, in fact, increase the ability for policy change to provide I.P.V. victims protections from the non-violent tactics of coercive control because this study's findings suggest the tactics influence reporting of physical violence to law enforcement or the court. Additionally, in obtaining this detailed information, the timing of any reporting of physical violence to law enforcement or the court compared to when the I.P.H. occurred is an area for future research that deserves attention. Indeed, one law enforcement

agency, during data collection, indicated that there was a “3-week window of danger” that the I.P.H. victim would be in if there were to be any reports of physical violence to law enforcement prior to the I.P.H., suggesting that an I.P.H. victim is *only in danger from their abuser three weeks prior to the killing*. However, many of the I.P.H.s in this study, such as the one discussed in the introduction and this conclusion, had police reports of physical violence and/or P.I.F.P.s with reports of physical violence long before and, some, decades before the I.P.H. Thus, a study regarding the length of time between contact with law enforcement and/or the court regarding physical violence, the non-violent tactics of coercive control, and the I.P.H. is warranted. The results of this type of study would be especially useful for law enforcement, judicial training, and policy review purposes.

The high percentages of I.P.H.S. frequencies for data set A and B indicate the need for further research into this topic, especially because this study is one of the few that determines the rate of I.P.H.S. from I.P.H. itself rather than from murder-suicide. Indeed, most studies report about I.P.H.S. stemming from murder-suicide (Morton, 1998; Richards et al., 2014; Salari & Sillito, 2015; VPC, 2018). However, similar to this study, Caman et al. (2017) and Velopulos et al. (2018) are two of the few studies that report I.P.H.S. rates from I.P.H. cases; and Caman et al. (2017) consider, on average for their twenty-three-year study, that a 15.5% I.P.H.S. rate was profound (Caman et al., 2017, p. 18). Also, as stated above, at a rate of 35% success for completed I.P.H.S.s, Velopulos et al. (2018) asserts that this rate is staggering and warrants further research into both I.P.V. and suicidality. Thus, with this study’s 49.8% success rate for completed I.P.H.S. for data set A and 50% for data set B, it is impossible to do anything but conclude that further research into I.P.H.S. as it relates to the non-violent tactics of coercive

control, as well as the prior reporting of physical violence to law enforcement and the court and I.P.V. in general, is warranted.

The concept of an order for protection just being a “piece of paper” is continuously challenged but is not rigorously tested (Garcia et al., 2007). However, future directions from this study suggests that determining the efficacy of orders for protection, as well as the judicial process I.P.V. victims must go through, is possible and necessary. The data set for this study contains information regarding certain aspects of the process for obtaining and maintaining a protective order, such as whether the I.P.V. victim had an order for protection at the time of the I.P.H. As a result, there are several topics surrounding this field of study that are suggested for future research.

The first topic details whether the I.P.H. victim applied for and received a T.I.P. and/or F.J.I.P. The frequency rates for the success of an I.P.V. victim obtaining a T.I.P. was 73.8%; however, it dropped to 32.7% for F.J.I.P.s [Table 6]. This discrepancy warrants further research because the apparent reasons for the discrepancy in the rate of success of obtaining an F.J.I.P. as opposed to a T.I.P. for an I.P.V. victim vary and should be analyzed further. Additionally, for those cases with multiple P.I.F.P. filings, even if the I.P.V. victim was denied the first time a P.I.F.P. was filed, it is possible another one was filed by the same I.P.V. victim for the same occurrence or for another abusive episode days, months, or years later as explained in Chapter Six: Qualitative Discussion, The Effectiveness of Injunctions for Protection Against Domestic Violence [Table 9]. Also, these multiple filings could be from both spouses, which warrants further investigation rather than assuming the I.P.V. victim is always one and the same as the person who becomes the I.P.H. victim. Furthermore, there does not appear to be another study that focuses on the prevalence of multiple filings of P.I.F.P.s by the same I.P.V. victim or

between the same set of victim/offender. Thus, additional research into this topic is imperative, especially if it is coupled with the efficacy of orders of protection.

The second topic regarding P.I.F.P.s emerges as one whereby, if the P.I.F.P. was denied, determining why it was denied. There are many possible reasons a T.I.P. and/or F.J.I.P. is denied, such as the fact that the victim does not appear at the hearing, the judge determines there is not enough evidence to justify the issuance of a T.I.P. and/or F.J.I.P., or the parties reconcile. Thus, this topic warrants further investigation as this study suggests there is much more to the story behind the numbers of the P.I.F.P.s, the T.I.P.s, and the F.J.I.P.s.

Finally, a future study on I.P.V. and I.P.H. offenders and their sentencing is a much-needed topic for further empirical research. As discussed in the introduction and literature review above, most I.P.V. studies related to harms against women focus on arrest rates and offenders' interactions with police. Indeed, it is rare, if not at all possible, to find these types of studies that follow I.P.H. cases through to sentencing. But it is important to understand how the I.P.H. offender is sentenced, especially due to the percentage of I.P.H.S.s found in this study and the potential risk of bias it brings to such research (Caman et al., 2017). Indeed, because I.P.H.S. cases are often, if not every time, closed without investigation and are not charged or convicted because there is no living defendant to prosecute, it is important to ensure that these cases are included in the research. This study, compared to the Velopulos et al. (2018) and the Caman et al. (2017) studies has the highest rate of I.P.H.S.s for analysis and includes known victim-offender relationships, which Caman et al. (2017) explain is less common within the scientific field of I.P.H. Thus, such a study is ideal for future directions for research because the I.P.V. and I.P.H. offenders, as well as those who committed I.P.H.S., are already identified.

One Final Word

The comprehensive goal for this study was to determine whether the non-violent tactics of coercive control affect I.P.H. without interference from physical violence, i.e., reports of physical violence to law enforcement or the court. In developing this study's methodology to collect the required data, there was no motive to create a study that would forge new territory in the areas of I.P.H., I.P.H.S., and I.P.V. research as explained above; however, there is a certain, exceptional responsibility that comes with the data that resulted from this study. The homicide reports reviewed for the data collection for this study were gut-wrenching to read. The police reports that were reviewed for reports of physical violence were, often, just as difficult to read because there was a known outcome between the parties to the reports. The P.I.F.P.s were heartbreaking, especially the ones where the I.P.V. victims *absolutely knew with certainty* their lives were in danger; and they begged the court for protection.

The experience working with this study has been rewarding and well worth the heartache because there is such a need for research that views I.P.H. from the I.P.V. victims' viewpoint. They need their voices heard, especially the ones who did not survive. They have the most to teach us. Through innovative research methods and a willingness to provide resources towards this type of data collection, I.P.H. victims may explain what we do not already know but must learn if we are going to save the lives of those who beg to be saved.

**APPENDIX A:
NVIVO 12 PRO CODEBOOK -
COERCIVE CONTROL THEMES AND SUBTHEMES**

Name	Description
Abuser Mental Illness	Narrative indicates the abuser has a history of or tendency towards a wide range of conditions that affect mood, thinking, and behavior, i.e., mental disorder or is dealing with some type of mental disorder
Drinking Alcohol	Narrative indicates the abuser drinks alcohol in excess or to the point that the I.P.V. victim believed it necessary to raise this fact
Drug Use	Narrative indicates the abuser uses illegal drugs or prescription drugs other than as prescribed
Paranoia	Narrative describes “a mental disorder characterized by systematized delusions, as of grandeur or, esp., persecution, often, except in a schizophrenic state, with an otherwise relatively intact personality” that manifests in statements or acts by the abuser, such as threats to kill themselves or accusing the I.P.V. victim of seeing another person (Webster’s, 2005, pg. 1045)
Fearful of the Future	Narrative indicates the I.P.V. victim has expressed a fear or dread of something happening in the future due to the abuser’s actions
Fear of Child(ren)'s safety	Narrative describes the I.P.V. victim’s fear of the abuser’s ability to harm the child(ren) and/or stepchild(ren) of or those in common with the abuser and the I.P.V. victim
Pregnant	Narrative explains that the victim was pregnant at the time of the incident
Humiliation	Narrative describes acts the abuser did to the I.P.V. victim to evoke feelings of mortification
Degradation	Narrative describes a range of non-violent tactics used by the abuser to disrespect or show contempt for the I.P.V. victim, whether in public or private
Name Calling	Narrative explains situations in which the abuser calls the I.P.V. victim humiliating and/or degrading names either in public or in private
Intimidation	Narrative describes acts by the abuser that are meant to create fear in the I.P.V. victim in general, such as threatening suicide or making the I.P.V. victim afraid by using certain behaviors and gestures
Animal abuse	Narrative describes acts committed by the abuser that are abusive towards animals that are loved by the I.P.V. victim or are threats by the abuser to commit abusive acts against animals that are loved by the I.P.V. victim

Name	Description
Harassment	Narrative describes the abuser continuously contacting the I.P.V. victim or doing something the victim has asked the abuser to stop doing
Surveillance	Narrative describes acts by the abuser intended to maintain constant information about what the I.P.V. victim is doing and with whom they are doing it
Threatens Friends and Family	Narrative describes acts or words by the abuser towards the I.P.V. victim's friend(s) and/or family that are meant to evoke immense fear in the I.P.V. victim that there is imminent danger of something terrible happening to their friend(s) or family
Threats	Narrative describes acts or words by the abuser towards the I.P.V. victim that are meant to evoke immense fear of imminent danger or worry of something to occur in the future
Weapons	Narrative describes the abuser's possession of weapons, threat to use a weapon against the I.P.V. victims, or intent to purchase a weapon
Isolation	Narrative describes acts by the abuser that causes the I.P.V. victim to feel alone or secluded
Economic Control	Narrative describes the abuser preventing the victim from going to work or school, as well as interfering with the I.P.V. victim's work or school activities
False Imprisonment	Narrative describes the abuser confining or restraining the I.P.V. victim against their will
Financial Control	Narrative describes the abuser's ability to control certain aspects of the I.P.V. victim's financial resources, such as money, shelter, car etc.
Physical Violence	Narrative describes acts of physical violence by the abuser against the I.P.V. victim; these acts may be simple battery not resulting in the I.P.V. victim claiming cuts or bruising, such as having their shirt pulled
Non-fatal Strangulation	Narrative explains the I.P.V. victim having their normal breathing or blood flow to the brain obstructed during violent acts committed by the abuser against the I.P.V. victim
Rape and Sexual Abuse	Narrative describes various forced sexual acts and other types of unwanted sexual violence forced on the I.P.V. victim by the abuser
Power and Control	Narrative describes acts of authority and regulation the abuser restrains over the I.P.V. victim to maintain compliance from the victim

Name	Description
Child Abuse	Narrative indicates the abuser has committed acts of child maltreatment and/or neglect or has threatened to commit acts of child maltreatment and/or neglect, including physical violence, sexual abuse, or psychological abuse against the child(ren) and/or step-child(ren) of or those in common with the abuser and the I.P.V. victim
Deprivation of Necessities	Narrative explains non-violent tactics the abuser uses to deprive the I.P.V. victim of necessities such as food, medicine, showering, toileting, etc.
Household, Clothes and Personal Belongings Destroyed	Narrative describes the abuser destroying property including home, household furnishings and the victim's personal belongings
Psychologically Controlling	Narrative explains acts by the abuser whereby non-violent tactics are for maintaining a form of mental control over the I.P.V. victim
Taking Children from Victim	Narrative explains situations in which the abuser either did take the child(ren) from the I.P.V. victim or threatened to take the child(ren) from the victim
Verbal Abuse	Narrative describes verbal acts of vitriol and invective spewed by the abuser towards the I.P.V. victim
Violent Acts towards Family and Friends	Narrative describes violence by the abuser towards family and friends of the I.P.V. victim
Resistance to Abuse	Narrative describes acts by the I.P.V. victim that constitute resistance to the abuser's tactics of abuse, including fighting back during a physical altercation, calling the police, filing the P.I.F.P., leaving the abuser, etc.
Helping Abuser	Narrative contains a description by the I.P.V. victim whereby the victim helped the abuser, even though the victim also described being abused in the same narrative
Separated or Estranged	Narrative explains that the I.P.V. victim and the abuser are no longer living together or are living together but in different quarters of the marital home

APPENDIX B:
COMPLETE LIST AND DESCRIPTION OF STUDY VARIABLES

Dependent Variables:

PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT. The level of measurement for the dependent variable of PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT is nominal. It is a dummy variable with an I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement as the reference category. The dummy variable for PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT is I.P.H. without a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement = 1, I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO THE COURT. The level of measurement for the dependent variable of PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO THE COURT is nominal. It is a dummy variable with an I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court through a P.I.F.P. as the reference category. The dummy variable for PRIOR REPORT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE TO THE COURT is I.P.H. without a Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court = 1, I.P.H. with a Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court = 0.

Independent Variables:

AGE. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of AGE of the **victim/offender** is interval/ratio. It is a continuous variable. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

GENDER. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of GENDER of the **victim** is nominal. It is a dummy variable with Female as the reference category. The dummy variable for GENDER is Male = 1, Female = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

The level of measurement for the predictor variable of GENDER of the **offender** is nominal. It is a dummy variable with Male as the reference category. The dummy variable for GENDER is Female = 1, Male = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

RACE. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of RACE of the **victim/offender** is nominal. It is a dummy variable with White as the reference category. The dummy variable for RACE is Non-White = 1, White = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

I.P.H.S. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of I.P.H.S. is nominal. It is a dummy variable with Killing was not an I.P.H.S. as the reference category. The dummy variable for I.P.H.S. is Killing was an I.P.H.S. = 1, Killing was not an I.P.H.S. = 0.⁷⁶

T.I.P. GRANTED. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of T.I.P. GRANTED is nominal. It is a dummy variable with T.I.P. Denied as the reference category. The dummy variable for T.I.P. GRANTED is T.I.P. Granted = 1, T.I.P. Denied = 0.

T.I.P. IN PLACE AT TIME OF I.P.H. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of T.I.P. IN PLACE AT TIME OF I.P.H. is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H. as the reference category. The dummy variable for T.I.P. IN PLACE AT TIME OF I.P.H. is T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H. = 1, No T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H. = 0.

F.J.I.P. GRANTED. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of F.J.I.P. GRANTED is nominal. It is a dummy variable with F.J.I.P. Denied as the reference category. The dummy variable for F.J.I.P. GRANTED is F.J.I.P. Granted = 1, F.J.I.P. Denied = 0.

⁷⁶ “Both the murder and subsequent suicide had to occur within 72 hours of each other” to be considered a murder-suicide for the purposes of this study (VPC, 2018).

F.J.I.P. IN PLACE AT TIME OF I.P.H. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of F.J.I.P. IN PLACE AT TIME OF I.P.H. is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H. as the reference category. The dummy variable for F.J.I.P. IN PLACE AT TIME OF I.P.H. is F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H. = 1, No F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H. = 0.

AGE OF P.I.F.P. VICTIM/OFFENDER. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of AGE OF P.I.F.P. VICTIM/ OFFENDER is interval/ratio. It is a continuous variable. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

RACE OF P.I.F.P. VICTIM/OFFENDER. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of RACE OF P.I.F.P. VICTIM/ OFFENDER is nominal. It is a dummy variable with White as the reference category. The dummy variable for RACE OF P.I.F.P. VICTIM/ OFFENDER is Non-White = 1, White = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

GENDER OF P.I.F.P. VICTIM. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of GENDER OF P.I.F.P. VICTIM is nominal. It is a dummy variable with Female as the reference category. The dummy variable for GENDER OF P.I.F.P. VICTIM is Male = 1, Female = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

GENDER OF P.I.F.P. OFFENDER. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of GENDER OF P.I.F.P. OFFENDER is nominal. It is a dummy variable with Male as the reference category. The dummy variable for GENDER OF P.I.F.P. OFFENDER is Female = 1, Male = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

HUMILIATION. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of HUMILIATION is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Humiliation as the reference category. The dummy variable for HUMILIATION is I.P.H. with Presence of Humiliation = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Humiliation = 0.

INTIMIDATION. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of INTIMIDATION is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Intimidation as the reference category. The dummy variable for INTIMIDATION is I.P.H. with Presence of Intimidation = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Intimidation = 0.

ISOLATION. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of ISOLATION is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Isolation as the reference category. The dummy variable for ISOLATION is I.P.H. with Presence of Isolation = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Isolation = 0.

POWER AND CONTROL. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of POWER AND CONTROL is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Power and Control as the reference category. The dummy variable for POWER AND CONTROL is I.P.H. with Presence of Power and Control = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Power and Control = 0.

RESISTANCE TO ABUSE. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of RESISTANCE TO ABUSE is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Resistance to Abuse as the reference category. The dummy variable for RESISTANCE TO ABUSE is I.P.H. with Presence of Resistance to Abuse = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Resistance to Abuse = 0.

FEARFUL OF THE FUTURE. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of FEARFUL OF THE FUTURE is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Fearful of the Future as the reference category. The dummy variable for FEARFUL OF THE FUTURE is I.P.H. with Presence of Fearful of the Future = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Fearful of the Future = 0.

ABUSER MENTAL ILLNESS. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of ABUSER MENTAL ILLNESS is nominal. It is a dummy variable with No Presence of Abuser Mental Illness as the reference category. The dummy variable for ABUSER MENTAL ILLNESS is I.P.H. with Presence of Abuser Mental Illness = 1, I.P.H. with no Presence of Abuser Mental Illness = 0.

WEAPON USED. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of WEAPON USED is nominal. It is a series of dummy variables. The first variable for WEAPON USED is Handgun = 1, Not a Handgun = 0. The second variable for WEAPON USED is Other Firearms = 1, Not Other Firearms = 0. The third dummy variable for WEAPON USED is Knife/Cutting Instrument = 1, Not Knife/Cutting Instrument = 0. The fourth variable for WEAPON USED is Hands/Fist/Feet = 1, Not Hands/Fist/Feet = 0. The fifth variable for WEAPON USED is Other Weapon = 1, Not Other Weapon = 0. The data are provided by the FDLE UCR-SHR.

RECORD OF P.I.F.P. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of RECORD OF P.I.F.P. is nominal. It is a dummy variable with an I.P.H. with a filed P.I.F.P. as the reference category. The dummy variable for RECORD OF P.I.F.P. is I.P.H. without a Record of P.I.F.P. = 1, I.P.H. with a Record of P.I.F.P. = 0.

P.I.F.P. VICTIM WAS I.P.H. VICTIM. The level of measurement for the predictor variable of P.I.F.P. VICTIM WAS I.P.H. VICTIM is nominal. It is a dummy variable with P.I.F.P. Victim was I.P.H. Victim as the reference category. The dummy variable for P.I.F.P. VICTIM WAS I.P.H. VICTIM is P.I.F.P. Victim was not I.P.H. Victim =1, P.I.F.P. Victim was I.P.H. Victim=0.

APPENDIX C:
V.I.F. TABLES OF STUDY VARIABLES

Table 22. V.I.F.s of Original Data Set with All Variables

Variable	VIF	Variable	VIF
Victim Age	235.259	Gender of P.I.F.P. Offender	2.208
Offender Age	237.547	Humiliation	1.633
Offender Gender	2.247	Intimidation	2.441
Offender Race	10.410	Isolation	2.997
I.P.H.S.	2.233	Power and Control	2.157
Prior Report of PV to the Court	1.822	Resistance to Abuse	1.762
T.I.P. Granted	2.744	Fearful of the Future	2.078
T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	2.069	Abuser Mental Illness	1.691
F.J.I.P. Granted	3.139	Handgun	2.238
F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	2.503	Knife/Cutting Instrument	3.006
Age of P.I.F.P. Victim	245.960	Hands/Fist/Feet	2.324
Age of P.I.F.P. Offender	237.801	Other Weapon	2.352
Race of P.I.F.P. Victim	9.475		

Note: Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement was used as the dependent variable; the independent variable "Record of P.I.F.P." was deleted from the analysis because it was a constant or had a missing correlation; excluded variables are 1) Victim Gender, 2) Victim Race, 3) Gender of P.I.F.P. Victim, 4) Race of P.I.F.P. Offender, 5) P.I.F.P. Victim was I.P.H. Victim, and 6) Other Firearm.

Table 23. V.I.F.s of Data Set A with All Variables

Variable	VIF	Variable	VIF
Victim Age	5.127	Record of P.I.F.P.	1.085
Offender Age	5.331	Other Firearm	1.158
Offender Gender	1.228	Knife/Cutting Instrument	1.328
Victim Race	3.499	Hands/Fist/Feet	1.214
Offender Race	3.578	Other Weapon	1.100
I.P.H.S.	1.454		

Note: Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement was used as the dependent variable; excluded variables are 1) Victim Gender and 2) Handgun.

Table 24. V.I.F.s of Data Set A: Variables used in BLR Model

Variable	VIF	Variable	VIF
I.P.H.S.	1.255	Knife/Cutting Instrument	1.304
Record of P.I.F.P.	1.020	Hands/Fist/Feet	1.167
Other Firearm	1.151	Other Weapon	1.092

Note: Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement was used as the dependent variable; excluded variable is Handgun.

Table 25. V.I.F.s of Data Set B using Dependent Variable - Prior Report of PV to Law Enforcement: All Variables

Variable	VIF	Variable	VIF
Victim Age	4.408	Isolation	2.210
Offender Age	3.613	Power and Control	1.361
Offender Gender	1.659	Resistance to Abuse	1.397
Victim Race	8.134	Fearful of the Future	2.333
Offender Race	7.979	Abuser Mental Illness	1.496
I.P.H.S.	1.846	Handgun	17.669
Prior Report of PV to the Court	1.690	Other Firearm	20.344
T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	1.869	Knife/Cutting Instrument	10.969
F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	1.440	Hands/Fist/Feet	3.550
Humiliation	2.005	Other Weapon	10.772
Intimidation	1.942		

Note: Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement was used as the dependent variable; excluded variable is Victim Gender.

Table 26. V.I.F.s of Data Set B using Dependent Variable - Prior Report of PV to Law Enforcement: Variables used in BLR Model

Variable	VIF	Variable	VIF
Humiliation	1.311	Resistance to Abuse	1.143
Intimidation	1.328	Fearful of the Future	1.320
Isolation	1.150	Abuser Mental Illness	1.182
Power and Control	1.206		

Note: Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement was used as the dependent variable

Table 27. V.I.F.s of Data Set B using Dependent Variable - Prior Report of PV to the Court: All Variables

Variable	VIF	Variable	VIF
Victim Age	4.062	Isolation	2.069
Offender Age	3.601	Power and Control	1.380
Offender Gender	1.629	Resistance to Abuse	1.543
Victim Race	8.044	Fearful of the Future	2.430
Offender Race	8.125	Abuser Mental Illness	1.639
I.P.H.S.	1.845	Handgun	17.091
Prior Report of PV to Law Enforcement	1.571	Other Firearm	18.950
T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	1.849	Knife/Cutting Instrument	10.441
F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	1.478	Hands/Fist/Feet	3.519
Humiliation	2.007	Other Weapon	10.238
Intimidation	1.878		

Note: Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court was used as the dependent variable; excluded variable is Victim Gender.

Table 28. V.I.F.s of Data Set B using Dependent Variable - Prior Report of PV to the Court: Variables used in BLR Model

Variable	VIF	Variable	VIF
Humiliation	1.357	Resistance to Abuse	1.154
Intimidation	1.298	Fearful of the Future	1.405
Isolation	1.112	Abuser Mental Illness	1.144
Power and Control	1.142		

Note: Prior Report of Physical Violence to the Court was used as the dependent variable

**APPENDIX D:
FREQUENCY TABLES OF VARIABLES NOT USED IN STUDY LOGISTIC
REGRESSION MODELS**

Age Characteristics

Table 29. Victim Age Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set and Data Set A

Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent
20	1	0.2%	38	10	2.0%	56	8	1.6%	74	1	0.2%
21	1	0.2%	39	9	1.8%	57	10	2.0%	75	4	0.8%
22	1	0.2%	40	12	2.4%	58	7	1.4%	76	6	1.2%
23	3	0.6%	41	18	3.7%	59	8	1.6%	77	9	1.8%
24	7	1.4%	42	11	2.2%	60	1	0.2%	78	5	1.0%
25	3	0.6%	43	11	2.2%	61	4	0.8%	79	5	1.0%
26	8	1.6%	44	19	3.9%	62	7	1.4%	80	5	1.0%
27	5	1.0%	45	11	2.2%	63	3	0.6%	81	3	0.6%
28	8	1.6%	46	8	1.6%	64	2	0.4%	82	1	0.2%
29	10	2.0%	47	12	2.4%	65	3	0.6%	83	4	0.8%
30	9	1.8%	48	13	2.6%	66	5	1.0%	84	2	0.4%
31	11	2.2%	49	11	2.2%	67	9	1.8%	85	5	1.0%
32	7	1.4%	50	8	1.6%	68	5	1.0%	86	3	0.6%
33	11	2.2%	51	13	2.6%	69	3	0.6%	87	3	0.6%
34	12	2.4%	52	6	1.2%	70	3	0.6%	88	2	0.4%
35	13	2.6%	53	11	2.2%	71	3	0.6%	89	2	0.4%
36	19	3.9%	54	10	2.0%	72	8	1.6%	91	1	0.2%
37	8	1.6%	55	8	1.6%	73	4	0.8%	93	1	0.2%

Note: N=493

Table 30. Offender Age Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set and Data Set A

Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent
20	1	0.2%	39	10	2.0%	57	5	1.0%	75	10	2.0%
21	2	0.4%	40	19	3.9%	58	7	1.4%	76	2	0.4%
23	2	0.4%	41	20	4.1%	59	7	1.4%	77	3	0.6%
24	3	0.6%	42	6	1.2%	60	7	1.4%	78	8	1.6%
25	3	0.6%	43	14	2.8%	61	7	1.4%	79	1	0.2%
26	4	0.8%	44	23	4.7%	62	4	0.8%	80	5	1.0%
27	1	0.2%	45	19	3.9%	63	5	1.0%	81	2	0.4%
28	5	1.0%	46	7	1.4%	64	7	1.4%	82	5	1.0%
29	2	0.4%	47	10	2.0%	65	6	1.2%	83	4	0.8%
30	5	1.0%	48	17	3.4%	66	9	1.8%	84	4	0.8%
31	3	0.6%	49	19	3.9%	67	2	0.4%	85	2	0.4%
32	8	1.6%	50	15	3.0%	68	10	2.0%	86	4	0.8%
33	10	2.0%	51	8	1.6%	69	6	1.2%	87	3	0.6%
34	6	1.2%	52	10	2.0%	70	5	1.0%	88	3	0.6%
35	12	2.4%	53	11	2.2%	71	3	0.6%	89	2	0.4%
36	9	1.8%	54	10	2.0%	72	5	1.0%	91	1	0.2%
37	8	1.6%	55	11	2.2%	73	3	0.6%	92	1	0.2%
38	9	1.8%	56	9	1.8%	74	3	0.6%	95	1	0.2%

Note: N=493

Table 31. Age of P.I.F.P. Victim Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set

Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent
24	1	0.9%	34	1	0.9%	44	1	0.9%	54	4	3.7%
25	1	0.9%	35	5	4.6%	46	4	3.7%	55	3	2.8%
26	2	1.9%	36	11	10.2%	47	4	3.7%	56	1	0.9%
27	1	0.9%	37	4	3.7%	48	4	3.7%	58	6	5.6%
28	6	5.6%	38	3	2.8%	49	6	5.6%	59	1	0.9%
30	3	2.8%	39	1	0.9%	50	2	1.9%	66	1	0.9%
31	7	6.5%	40	3	2.8%	51	3	2.8%	67	1	0.9%
32	1	0.9%	41	6	5.6%	52	1	0.9%			
33	3	2.8%	43	6	5.6%	53	1	0.9%			

Note: N=108 for this variable as the P.I.F.P. was reported for 108 injunctions in the Main Data Set

Table 32. Age of P.I.F.P. Offender Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set

Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent
26	1	0.9%	36	2	1.9%	45	3	2.8%	53	5	4.6%
27	2	1.9%	37	4	3.7%	46	2	1.9%	55	4	3.7%
28	6	5.6%	38	5	4.6%	47	3	2.8%	56	1	0.9%
30	2	1.9%	39	1	0.9%	48	7	6.5%	58	4	3.7%
31	2	1.9%	40	6	5.6%	49	5	4.6%	59	2	1.9%
32	3	2.8%	41	6	5.6%	50	5	4.6%	66	1	0.9%
33	4	3.7%	43	3	2.8%	51	7	6.5%	67	3	2.8%
35	3	2.8%	44	3	2.8%	52	1	0.9%	69	2	1.9%

Note: N=108 for this variable as the P.I.F.P. was reported for 108 injunctions in the Main Data Set

Table 33. Victim Age Variable Frequencies: Data Set B

Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent
24	1	1.6%	34	1	1.6%	44	1	1.6%	54	2	3.2%
25	1	1.6%	35	2	3.2%	46	1	1.6%	55	2	3.2%
26	1	1.6%	36	5	8.1%	47	4	6.5%	56	1	1.6%
28	2	3.2%	37	2	3.2%	48	1	1.6%	58	1	1.6%
30	4	6.5%	38	4	6.5%	49	2	3.2%	59	2	3.2%
31	4	6.5%	40	3	4.8%	50	1	1.6%	67	1	1.6%
32	1	1.6%	41	4	6.5%	52	1	1.6%			
33	1	1.6%	43	4	6.5%	53	2	3.2%			

Note: N=62

Table 34. Offender Age Variable Frequencies: Data Set B

Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Age	Frequency	Valid Percent
27	1	1.6%	37	3	4.8%	45	2	3.2%	52	1	1.6%
28	2	3.2%	38	1	1.6%	46	2	3.2%	53	1	1.6%
30	1	1.6%	39	1	1.6%	47	1	1.6%	55	1	1.6%
32	1	1.6%	40	6	9.7%	48	4	6.5%	59	1	1.6%
33	4	6.5%	41	3	4.8%	49	4	6.5%	66	1	1.6%
35	4	6.5%	43	3	4.8%	50	2	3.2%	67	2	3.2%
36	2	3.2%	44	2	3.2%	51	4	6.5%	69	2	3.2%

Note: N=62

Gender Characteristics**Table 35. Victim/Offender Gender Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set and Data Set A**

	Frequency, N=493		Total	Valid Percent		Total
	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	
Victim Gender	427	66	493	86.6%	13.4%	100%
Offender Gender	67	426	493	13.6%	86.4%	100%

Table 36. Gender of P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set

	Frequency, N=108		Total	Valid Percent		Total
	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	
Victim Gender	89	19	108	82.4%	17.6%	100%
Offender Gender	19	89	108	17.6%	82.4%	100%

Table 37. Victim/Offender Gender Variable Frequencies: Data Set B

	Frequency, N=62		Total	Valid Percent		Total
	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	
Victim Gender	54	8	62	87.1%	12.9%	100%
Offender Gender	8	54	62	12.9%	87.1%	100%

Race Characteristics

Table 38. Victim/Offender Race Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set and Data Set A

	<u>Frequency, N=493</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>White</u>	<u>Non-White</u>		<u>White</u>	<u>Non-White</u>	
Victim Race	400	93	493	81.1%	18.9%	100%
Offender Race	395	98	493	80.1%	19.9%	100%

Table 39. Race of P.I.F.P. Victim/Offender Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set

	<u>Frequency, N=108</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>White</u>	<u>Non-White</u>		<u>White</u>	<u>Non-White</u>	
Victim Race	68	40	108	63.0%	37.0%	100%
Offender Race	65	43	108	60.2%	39.8%	100%

Table 40. Victim/Offender Race Variable Frequencies: Data Set B

	<u>Frequency, N=62</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>White</u>	<u>Non-White</u>		<u>White</u>	<u>Non-White</u>	
Victim Race	42	20	62	67.7%	32.3%	100%
Offender Race	43	19	62	69.4%	30.6%	100%

Weapon Used Characteristics

Table 41. Weapon Used Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set

	<u>Frequency, N=535</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	
	<u>Not the Weapon Used</u>	<u>Weapon Used</u>		<u>Not the Weapon Used</u>	<u>Weapon Used</u>
Handgun	291	244	535	54.4%	45.6%
Other Firearms	396	139	535	74.0%	26.0%
Knife/Cutting Instrument	448	87	535	83.7%	16.3%
Hands/Fist/Feet	525	10	535	98.1%	1.9%
Other Weapon	481	54	535	89.9%	10.1%

Note: N=535 since additional injunction cases were added when the variable was transformed for analysis.

Table 42. Weapon Used Variable Frequencies: Data Set B

	<u>Frequency, N=62</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	
	<u>Not the Weapon Used</u>	<u>Weapon Used</u>		<u>Not the Weapon Used</u>	<u>Weapon Used</u>
Handgun	41	21	62	66.1%	33.9%
Other Firearms	42	20	62	67.7%	32.3%
Knife/Cutting Instrument	51	11	62	82.3%	17.7%
Hands/Fist/Feet	61	1	62	98.4%	1.6%
Other Weapon	54	8	62	87.1%	12.9%

I.P.H.S. Characteristics**Table 43. I.P.H.S. Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set**

	<u>Frequency, N=493</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
I.P.H.S.	247	245	492	50.2%	49.8%	100%

Note: N=493; there is 1 missing record for this variable

Table 44. I.P.H.S. Variable Frequencies: Data Set B

	<u>Frequency, N=62</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
I.P.H.S.	31	31	62	50%	50%	100%

Miscellaneous Variables Characteristics**Table 45. Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set**

	<u>Frequency, N=493</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement	66	365	431	15.3%	84.7%	100%

Note: N=493; there are 62 missing records for this variable

Table 46. Record of P.I.F.P. Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set

	<u>Frequency, N=493</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Record of P.I.F.P.	66	427	493	13.4%	86.6%	100%

Table 47. T.I.P. and F.J.I.P. Variable Frequencies: Data Set B

	<u>Frequency, N=62</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
T.I.P. in place at time of I.P.H.	57	4	61	93.4%	6.6%	100%
F.J.I.P. in place at time of I.P.H.	45	16	61	73.8%	26.2%	100%

Note: N=62; there is 1 missing record for the variable "T.I.P. in place at time of I.P.H." and for the variable "F.J.I.P. in place at time of I.P.H."

Table 48. P.I.F.P. Victim was I.P.H. Victim Variable Frequencies: Original Data Set

	<u>Frequency, N=108</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
P.I.F.P. Victim was I.P.H. Victim	73	35	108	67.6%	32.4%	100%

APPENDIX E: CORRELATION MATRICES

Pearson Correlation Matrices

Table 49. Data Set A - Pearson Correlation: All Variables

		Victim Age	Victim Gender	Victim Race	Offender Age	Offender Gender	Offender Race	I.P.H.S.	Prior Report of PV to LE	Record of P.I.F.P.	Handgun	Other Firearms	Knife/ Cutting Inst.	Hands/ Fist/ Feet	Other Weapon
Victim Age	Pearson Correlation	1	.055	-.219**	.883**	.053	-.244**	.233**	.191**	.196**	.135**	.039	-.128**	-.119**	-.026
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.220	.000	.000	.243	.000	.000	.000	.000	.003	.394	.004	.008	.566
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Victim Gender	Pearson Correlation	.055	1	.039	-.105*	.991**	.013	-.273**	-.021	-.003	-.037	-.012	.149**	-.100*	-.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.220		.390	.020	.000	.771	.000	.662	.949	.419	.793	.001	.026	.842
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Victim Race	Pearson Correlation	-.219**	.039	1	-.219**	.036	.851**	-.180**	-.168**	-.161**	-.060	-.069	.128**	-.002	.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.390		.000	.429	.000	.000	.000	.000	.184	.128	.004	.964	.078
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Offender Age	Pearson Correlation	.883**	-.105*	-.219**	1	-.107*	-.264**	.311**	.199**	.191**	.170**	.040	-.175**	-.116*	-.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.020	.000		.018	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.380	.000	.010	.407
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Offender Gender	Pearson Correlation	.053	.991**	.036	-.107*	1	.010	-.265**	-.021	-.001	-.042	-.015	.145**	-.081	-.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.243	.000	.429	.018		.823	.000	.662	.991	.354	.736	.001	.074	.824
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Offender Race	Pearson Correlation	-.244**	.013	.851**	-.264**	.010	1	-.171**	-.142**	-.133**	-.042	-.094*	.157**	-.028	.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.771	.000	.000	.823		.000	.003	.003	.353	.037	.000	.537	.105
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
I.P.H.S.	Pearson Correlation	.233**	-.273**	-.180**	.311**	-.265**	-.171**	1	.071	-.002	.285**	.123**	-.332**	-.164**	-.166**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.139	.972	.000	.006	.000	.000	.000
	N	492	492	492	492	492	492	492	430	492	492	492	492	492	492
Prior Report of PV to LE	Pearson Correlation	.191**	-.021	-.168**	.199**	-.021	-.142**	.071	1	.468**	.168**	-.103*	-.083	-.019	-.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.662	.000	.000	.662	.003	.139		.000	.000	.032	.086	.695	.609
	N	431	431	431	431	431	431	430	431	431	431	431	431	431	431

		Victim Age	Victim Gender	Victim Race	Offender Age	Offender Gender	Offender Race	I.P.H.S.	Prior Report of PV to LE	Record of P.I.F.P.	Handgun	Other Firearms	Knife/ Cutting Inst.	Hands/ Fist/ Feet	Other Weapon
Record of P.I.F.P.	Pearson Correlation	.196**	-.003	-.161**	.191**	-.001	-.133**	-.002	.468**	1	.096*	-.056	-.032	-.047	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.949	.000	.000	.991	.003	.972	.000		.033	.211	.472	.294	.842
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Handgun	Pearson Correlation	.135**	-.037	-.060	.170**	-.042	-.042	.285**	.168**	.096*	1	-.552**	-.399**	-.291**	-.178**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.419	.184	.000	.354	.353	.000	.000	.033		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Other Firearms	Pearson Correlation	.039	-.012	-.069	.040	-.015	-.094*	.123**	-.103*	-.056	-.552**	1	-.248**	-.181**	-.111*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.394	.793	.128	.380	.736	.037	.006	.032	.211	.000		.000	.000	.014
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Knife/ Cutting Inst.	Pearson Correlation	-.128**	.149**	.128**	-.175**	.145**	.157**	-.332**	-.083	-.032	-.399**	-.248**	1	-.131**	-.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.001	.004	.000	.001	.000	.000	.086	.472	.000	.000		.004	.076
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Hands/ Fist/ Feet	Pearson Correlation	-.119**	-.100*	-.002	-.116*	-.081	-.028	-.164**	-.019	-.047	-.291**	-.181**	-.131**	1	-.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.026	.964	.010	.074	.537	.000	.695	.294	.000	.000	.004		.195
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493
Other Weapon	Pearson Correlation	-.026	-.009	.079	-.037	-.010	.073	-.166**	-.025	.009	-.178**	-.111*	-.080	-.058	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.566	.842	.078	.407	.824	.105	.000	.609	.842	.000	.014	.076	.195	
	N	493	493	493	493	493	493	492	431	493	493	493	493	493	493

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 50. Data Set B - Pearson Correlation: All Variables

		Victim Age	Victim Gender	Victim Race	Offender Age	Offender Gender	Offender Race	I.P.H.S.	Prior Report of PV to LE	Prior Report of PV to Court	T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	Humili- ation
Victim Age	Pearson Correlation	1	.204	.017	.732**	.204	-.047	.230	.033	-.144	-.029	-.312*	-.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.111	.895	.000	.111	.719	.072	.812	.265	.826	.014	.852
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Victim Gender	Pearson Correlation	.204	1	.146	-.149	1.000**	.162	-.192	.012	.057	-.103	-.121	.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.111		.257	.247	.000	.210	.134	.932	.659	.430	.352	.731
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Victim Race	Pearson Correlation	.017	.146	1	-.129	.146	.888**	-.138	-.091	.215	.097	.060	.042
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.895	.257		.317	.257	.000	.285	.507	.094	.456	.647	.748
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61

		Victim Age	Victim Gender	Victim Race	Offender Age	Offender Gender	Offender Race	I.P.H.S.	Prior Report of PV to LE	Prior Report of PV to Court	T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	Humili- ation
Offender Age	Pearson Correlation	.732**	-.149	-.129	1	-.149	-.204	.258*	-.047	-.116	.059	-.180	.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.247	.317		.247	.111	.043	.733	.367	.651	.166	.578
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Offender Gender	Pearson Correlation	.204	1.000**	.146	-.149	1	.162	-.192	.012	.057	-.103	-.121	.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.111	.000	.257	.247		.210	.134	.932	.659	.430	.352	.731
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Offender Race	Pearson Correlation	-.047	.162	.888**	-.204	.162	1	-.105	-.061	.241	-.035	.162	.075
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.719	.210	.000	.111	.210		.417	.658	.059	.788	.212	.567
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
I.P.H.S.	Pearson Correlation	.230	-.192	-.138	.258*	-.192	-.105	1	.098	-.035	.137	.084	-.084
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.072	.134	.285	.043	.134	.417		.477	.787	.293	.518	.518
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Prior Report of PV to LE	Pearson Correlation	.033	.012	-.091	-.047	.012	-.061	.098	1	.041	.064	.173	-.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.812	.932	.507	.733	.932	.658	.477		.765	.643	.212	.934
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	54	54	54
Prior Report of PV to Court	Pearson Correlation	-.144	.057	.215	-.116	.057	.241	-.035	.041	1	-.035	.082	.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.265	.659	.094	.367	.659	.059	.787	.765		.788	.531	.986
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	Pearson Correlation	-.029	-.103	.097	.059	-.103	-.035	.137	.064	-.035	1	-.007	-.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.826	.430	.456	.651	.430	.788	.293	.643	.788		.955	.725
	N	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	54	61	61	61	60
F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	Pearson Correlation	-.312*	-.121	.060	-.180	-.121	.162	.084	.173	.082	-.007	1	.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.352	.647	.166	.352	.212	.518	.212	.531	.955		.768
	N	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	54	61	61	61	60
Humili- ation	Pearson Correlation	-.024	.045	.042	.073	.045	.075	-.084	-.012	.002	-.046	.039	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.852	.731	.748	.578	.731	.567	.518	.934	.986	.725	.768	
	N	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	54	61	60	60	61
Intimi- dation	Pearson Correlation	-.147	-.022	.043	-.099	-.022	.108	.077	.116	.192	.145	-.029	.329**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.255	.864	.742	.446	.864	.404	.551	.401	.136	.266	.824	.010
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Isolation	Pearson Correlation	-.485**	.025	-.094	-.420**	.025	-.062	.032	.109	-.062	.288*	.273*	.173
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.848	.469	.001	.848	.631	.803	.427	.631	.025	.033	.183
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Power And Control	Pearson Correlation	.045	.053	-.041	.035	.053	-.058	-.042	-.018	-.058	.124	-.011	.160
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.730	.684	.753	.787	.684	.657	.745	.898	.657	.340	.932	.217
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61

		Victim Age	Victim Gender	Victim Race	Offender Age	Offender Gender	Offender Race	I.P.H.S.	Prior Report of PV to LE	Prior Report of PV to Court	T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	Humili- ation
Resistance to Abuse	Pearson Correlation	.068	.005	.163	-.034	.005	.151	.000	.188	.256*	.103	.011	.151
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.602	.972	.206	.791	.972	.240	1.000	.170	.045	.430	.934	.246
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Fearful of the Future	Pearson Correlation	-.002	.132	.097	-.069	.132	.069	-.065	-.034	.281*	-.049	.118	.434**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.989	.306	.453	.593	.306	.596	.614	.804	.027	.710	.365	.000
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Abuser Mental Illness	Pearson Correlation	.071	-.109	-.091	.111	-.109	-.056	.194	.369**	.014	.120	.045	.216
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.586	.400	.480	.388	.400	.663	.132	.006	.917	.359	.729	.094
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Handgun	Pearson Correlation	.002	-.072	.016	.081	-.072	.042	.375**	.249	-.106	.097	.298*	.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.987	.577	.899	.532	.577	.747	.003	.066	.412	.456	.020	.937
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Other Firearms	Pearson Correlation	.208	.043	-.107	.159	.043	-.084	.207	-.229	.215	-.044	-.178	-.130
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.104	.739	.407	.218	.739	.514	.106	.092	.094	.737	.169	.317
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Knife/ Cutting Inst.	Pearson Correlation	-.235	.199	.041	-.251*	.199	.149	-.380**	-.044	-.034	-.124	.011	.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.065	.121	.753	.049	.121	.247	.002	.749	.793	.340	.932	.457
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Hands/ Fist/ Feet	Pearson Correlation	-.042	-.049	.186	.024	-.049	-.085	-.128	-.107	-.085	.487**	-.077	-.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.745	.704	.149	.851	.704	.511	.321	.437	.511	.000	.555	.377
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
Other Weapon	Pearson Correlation	-.018	-.148	-.060	-.053	-.148	-.151	-.289*	.100	-.047	-.103	-.121	.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.889	.251	.645	.684	.251	.240	.023	.466	.716	.430	.352	.731
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	55	62	61	61	61
		Intimi- dation	Isolation	Power And Control	Resistance to Abuse	Fearful of the Future	Abuser Mental Illness	Handgun	Other Firearms	Knife/ Cutting Inst.	Hands/ Fist/ Feet	Other Weapon	
Victim Age	Pearson Correlation	-.147	-.485**	.045	.068	-.002	.071	.002	.208	-.235	-.042	-.018	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.255	.000	.730	.602	.989	.586	.987	.104	.065	.745	.889	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Victim Gender	Pearson Correlation	-.022	.025	.053	.005	.132	-.109	-.072	.043	.199	-.049	-.148	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.864	.848	.684	.972	.306	.400	.577	.739	.121	.704	.251	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Victim Race	Pearson Correlation	.043	-.094	-.041	.163	.097	-.091	.016	-.107	.041	.186	-.060	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.742	.469	.753	.206	.453	.480	.899	.407	.753	.149	.645	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Offender Age	Pearson Correlation	-.099	-.420**	.035	-.034	-.069	.111	.081	.159	-.251*	.024	-.053	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.446	.001	.787	.791	.593	.388	.532	.218	.049	.851	.684	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	

		Intimi- dation	Isolation	Power And Control	Resistance to Abuse	Fearful of the Future	Abuser Mental Illness	Handgun	Other Firearms	Knife/ Cutting Inst.	Hands/ Fist/ Feet	Other Weapon	
Offender Gender	Pearson Correlation	-.022	.025	.053	.005	.132	-.109	-.072	.043	.199	-.049	-.148	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.864	.848	.684	.972	.306	.400	.577	.739	.121	.704	.251	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Offender Race	Pearson Correlation	.108	-.062	-.058	.151	.069	-.056	.042	-.084	.149	-.085	-.151	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.404	.631	.657	.240	.596	.663	.747	.514	.247	.511	.240	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
I.P.H.S.	Pearson Correlation	.077	.032	-.042	.000	-.065	.194	.375**	.207	-.380**	-.128	-.289*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.551	.803	.745	1.000	.614	.132	.003	.106	.002	.321	.023	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Prior Report of PV to LE	Pearson Correlation	.116	.109	-.018	.188	-.034	.369**	.249	-.229	-.044	-.107	.100	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.401	.427	.898	.170	.804	.006	.066	.092	.749	.437	.466	
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	
Prior Report of PV to Court	Pearson Correlation	.192	-.062	-.058	.256*	.281*	.014	-.106	.215	-.034	-.085	-.047	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.136	.631	.657	.045	.027	.917	.412	.094	.793	.511	.716	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
T.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	Pearson Correlation	.145	.288*	.124	.103	-.049	.120	.097	-.044	-.124	.487**	-.103	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.266	.025	.340	.430	.710	.359	.456	.737	.340	.000	.430	
	N	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	
F.J.I.P. in Place at time of I.P.H.	Pearson Correlation	-.029	.273*	-.011	.011	.118	.045	.298*	-.178	.011	-.077	-.121	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.824	.033	.932	.934	.365	.729	.020	.169	.932	.555	.352	
	N	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	
Humili- ation	Pearson Correlation	.329**	.173	.160	.151	.434**	.216	.010	-.130	.097	-.115	.045	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.183	.217	.246	.000	.094	.937	.317	.457	.377	.731	
	N	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	
Intimi- dation	Pearson Correlation	1	.197	.254*	.137	.245	.326**	.060	.043	.049	.069	-.252*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.125	.046	.287	.055	.010	.641	.742	.706	.593	.048	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Isolation	Pearson Correlation	.197	1	.266**	.072	.142	.131	.149	-.163	.072	.137	-.072	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125		.037	.581	.272	.308	.249	.206	.576	.290	.581	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Power And Control	Pearson Correlation	.254*	.266**	1	.073	.033	.057	.065	-.131	.105	.059	-.073	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046	.037		.572	.798	.659	.617	.310	.416	.646	.572	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Resistance to Abuse	Pearson Correlation	.137	.072	.073	1	.355**	.012	-.030	.060	-.073	.049	.005	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.287	.581	.572		.005	.924	.820	.645	.572	.704	.972	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	

		Intimi- dation	Isolation	Power And Control	Resistance to Abuse	Fearful of the Future	Abuser Mental Illness	Handgun	Other Firearms	Knife/ Cutting Inst.	Hands/ Fist/ Feet	Other Weapon	
Fearful of the Future	Pearson Correlation	.245	.142	.033	.355**	1	.158	-.151	.307*	-.119	-.151	.035	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.055	.272	.798	.005		.219	.240	.015	.358	.242	.790	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Abuser Mental Illness	Pearson Correlation	.326**	.131	.057	.012	.158	1	.079	.047	-.057	-.132	-.012	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.308	.659	.924	.219		.541	.718	.659	.306	.924	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Handgun	Pearson Correlation	.060	.149	.065	-.030	-.151	.079	1	-.494**	-.332**	-.092	-.275*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.641	.249	.617	.820	.240	.541		.000	.008	.479	.030	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Other Firearms	Pearson Correlation	.043	-.163	-.131	.060	.307*	.047	-.494**	1	-.320*	-.088	-.266*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.742	.206	.310	.645	.015	.718	.000		.011	.495	.037	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Knife/ Cutting Inst.	Pearson Correlation	.049	.072	.105	-.073	-.119	-.057	-.332**	-.320*	1	-.059	-.179	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.706	.576	.416	.572	.358	.659	.008	.011		.646	.164	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Hands/ Fist/ Feet	Pearson Correlation	.069	.137	.059	.049	-.151	-.132	-.092	-.088	-.059	1	-.049	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.593	.290	.646	.704	.242	.306	.479	.495	.646		.704	
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	
Other Weapon	Pearson Correlation	-.252*	-.072	-.073	.005	.035	-.012	-.275*	-.266*	-.179	-.049	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.048	.581	.572	.972	.790	.924	.030	.037	.164	.704		
	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Phi Correlations

Table 51. Data Set A - Phi Correlation: Logistic Regression Model Variables

Case Processing Summary							
Crosstabs		Valid		Missing		Total	
		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
I.P.H.S. * Prior Report of PV to Law Enforcement		430	87.2%	63	12.8%	493	100.0%
I.P.H.S. * Handgun		492	99.8%	1	0.2%	493	100.0%
I.P.H.S. * Hands/Fist/Feet		492	99.8%	1	0.2%	493	100.0%
I.P.H.S. * Other Firearm		492	99.8%	1	0.2%	493	100.0%
Record of P.I.F.P. * Prior Report of PV to LE		431	87.4%	62	12.6%	493	100.0%
Record of P.I.F.P. * Handgun		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Record of P.I.F.P. * Hands/Fist/Feet		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Record of P.I.F.P. * Other Firearm		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Knife/Cutting Instrument * Prior Report of PV to LE		431	87.4%	62	12.6%	493	100.0%
Knife/Cutting Instrument * Handgun		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Knife/Cutting Instrument * Hands/Fist/Feet		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Knife/Cutting Instrument * Other Firearm		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Other Weapon * Prior Report of PV to LE		431	87.4%	62	12.6%	493	100.0%
Other Weapon * Handgun		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Other Weapon * Hands/Fist/Feet		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Other Weapon * Other Firearm		493	100.0%	0	0.0%	493	100.0%
Crosstab and Symmetric Measures							
Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement				Handgun			
I.P.H.S.	.00	1.00	Total	I.P.H.S.	.00	1.00	Total
	.00	39	179		.00	166	81
	1.00	27	185		1.00	95	150
	Total	66	364		Total	261	231
		Value	Appr. Significance			Value	Appr. Significance
N = 430	Phi	.071	.138	N = 492	Phi	.285	.000**
Hands/Fist/Feet				Other Firearm			
I.P.H.S.	.00	1.00	Total	I.P.H.S.	.00	1.00	Total
	.00	214	33		.00	197	50
	1.00	235	10		1.00	169	76
	Total	449	43		Total	366	126
		Value	Appr. Significance			Value	Appr. Significance
N = 492	Phi	-.164	.000**	N = 492	Phi	.123	.006**
Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement				Handgun			
Record of P.I.F.P.	.00	1.00	Total	Record of P.I.F.P.	.00	1.00	Total
	.00	34	25		.00	43	23
	1.00	32	340		1.00	218	209
	Total	66	365		Total	261	232
		Value	Appr. Significance			Value	Appr. Significance
N = 431	Phi	.468	.000**	N = 493	Phi	.096	.033*

Crosstab and Symmetric Measures									
Hands/Fist/Feet					Other Firearm				
Record of P.I.F.P.		.00	1.00	Total	Record of P.I.F.P.		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	58	8	66		.00	45	21	66
	1.00	392	35	427		1.00	322	105	427
	Total	450	43	493		Total	367	126	493
		Value	Appr. Significance				Value	Appr. Significance	
N = 493	Phi	-.047	.293		N = 493	Phi	-.056	.210	
Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement					Handgun				
Knife/ Cutting Instrument		.00	1.00	Total	Knife/ Cutting Instrument		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	52	317	369		.00	186	232	418
	1.00	14	48	62		1.00	75	0	75
	Total	66	365	431		Total	261	232	493
		Value	Appr. Significance				Value	Appr. Significance	
N = 431	Phi	-.083	.086		N = 493	Phi	-.399	.000**	
Hands/Fist/Feet					Other Firearm				
Knife/ Cutting Instrument		.00	1.00	Total	Knife/ Cutting Instrument		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	375	43	418		.00	292	126	418
	1.00	75	0	75		1.00	75	0	75
	Total	450	43	493		Total	367	126	493
		Value	Appr. Significance				Value	Appr. Significance	
N = 493	Phi	-.131	.004**		N = 493	Phi	-.248	.000**	
Prior Report of Physical Violence to Law Enforcement					Handgun				
Other Weapon		.00	1.00	Total	Other Weapon		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	63	353	416		.00	244	232	476
	1.00	3	12	15		1.00	17	0	17
	Total	66	365	431		Total	261	232	493
		Value	Appr. Significance				Value	Appr. Significance	
N = 431	Phi	-.025	.608		N = 493	Phi	-.178	.000**	
Hands/Fist/Feet					Other Firearm				
Other Weapon		.00	1.00	Total	Other Weapon		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	433	43	476		.00	350	126	476
	1.00	17	0	17		1.00	17	0	17
	Total	450	43	493		Total	367	126	493
		Value	Appr. Significance				Value	Appr. Significance	
N = 493	Phi	-.058	.195		N = 493	Phi	-.111	.014*	

Table 52. Data Set B - Phi Correlation: Logistic Regression Model Variables

Case Processing Summary									
Crosstabs				Valid		Missing		Total	
				N	Percent	N	N	Percent	N
Humiliation * Resistance to Abuse				61	98.4%	1	1.6%	62	100.0%
Humiliation * Fearful of the Future				61	98.4%	1	1.6%	62	100.0%
Humiliation * Abuser Mental Illness				61	98.4%	1	1.6%	62	100.0%
Intimidation * Power and Control				62	100.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%
Intimidation * Resistance to Abuse				62	100.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%
Intimidation * Fearful of the Future				62	100.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%
Intimidation * Abuser Mental Illness				62	100.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%
Isolation * Power and Control				62	100.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%
Isolation * Resistance to Abuse				62	100.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%
Isolation * Fearful of the Future				62	100.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%
Isolation * Abuser Mental Illness				62	100.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%
Crosstab and Symmetric Measures									
Power and Control					Resistance to Abuse				
Prior Report of PV to LE		.00	1.00	Total	Prior Report of PV to LE		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	6	28	34		.00	6	28	34
	1.00	4	17	21		1.00	1	20	21
	Total	10	45	55		Total	7	48	55
				Value					Appr. Significance
N = 55	Phi	-.018		.896	N = 55	Phi	.188		.164
Fearful of the Future					Abuser Mental Illness				
Prior Report of PV to LE		.00	1.00	Total	Prior Report of PV to LE		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	15	19	34		.00	21	13	34
	1.00	10	11	21		1.00	5	16	21
	Total	25	30	55		Total	26	29	55
				Value					Appr. Significance
N = 55	Phi	-.034		.800	N = 55	Phi	.369		.006**
Power and Control					Resistance to Abuse				
Prior Report of PV to the Court		.00	1.00	Total	Prior Report of PV to the Court		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	7	36	43		.00	8	35	43
	1.00	4	15	19		1.00	0	19	19
	Total	11	51	62		Total	8	54	62
				Value					Appr. Significance
N = 62	Phi	-.058		.650	N = 62	Phi	.256		.044*
Fearful of the Future					Abuser Mental Illness				
Prior Report of PV to the Court		.00	1.00	Total	Prior Report of PV to the Court		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	22	21	43		.00	21	22	43
	1.00	4	15	19		1.00	9	10	19
	Total	26	36	62		Total	30	32	62
				Value					Appr. Significance
N = 62	Phi	.281		.027*	N = 62	Phi	.014		.915
Power and Control					Resistance to Abuse				
Humilia- tion		.00	1.00	Total	Humilia- tion		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	8	26	34		.00	6	28	34
	1.00	3	24	27		1.00	2	25	27
	Total	11	50	61		Total	8	53	61
				Value					Appr. Significance
N = 61	Phi	.160		.210	N = 61	Phi	.151		.239

Crosstab and Symmetric Measures									
Fearful of the Future					Abuser Mental Illness				
Humilia- tion		.00	1.00	Total	Humilia- tion		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	21	13	34		.00	20	14	34
	1.00	5	22	27		1.00	10	17	27
	Total	26	35	61		Total	30	31	61
		Value		Appr. Significance			Value		Appr. Significance
N = 61	Phi	.434	.001**		N = 61	Phi	.216	.091	
Power and Control					Resistance to Abuse				
Intimida- tion		.00	1.00	Total	Intimida- tion		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	5	9	14		.00	3	11	14
	1.00	6	42	48		1.00	5	43	48
	Total	11	51	62		Total	8	54	62
		Value		Appr. Significance			Value		Appr. Significance
N = 62	Phi	.254	.045*		N = 62	Phi	.137	.280	
Fearful of the Future					Abuser Mental Illness				
Intimida- tion		.00	1.00	Total	Intimida- tion		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	9	5	14		.00	11	3	14
	1.00	17	31	48		1.00	19	29	48
	Total	26	36	62		Total	30	32	62
		Value		Appr. Significance			Value		Appr. Significance
N = 62	Phi	.245	.054		N = 62	Phi	.326	.010**	
Power and Control					Resistance to Abuse				
Isolation		.00	1.00	Total	Isolation		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	9	24	33		.00	5	28	33
	1.00	2	27	29		1.00	3	26	29
	Total	11	51	62		Total	8	54	62
		Value		Appr. Significance			Value		Appr. Significance
N = 62	Phi	.266	.036*		N = 62	Phi	.072	.573	
Fearful of the Future					Abuser Mental Illness				
Isolation		.00	1.00	Total	Isolation		.00	1.00	Total
	.00	16	17	33		.00	18	15	33
	1.00	10	19	29		1.00	12	17	29
	Total	26	36	62		Total	30	32	62
		Value		Appr. Significance			Value		Appr. Significance
N = 62	Phi	.142	.265		N = 62	Phi	.131	.301	

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

**APPENDIX F:
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION**

RE: Permission to use The Maze of Coercive Control

K Joy Jones <dvsur5r@yahoo.com>

Sat 5/18/2019 3:37 AM

To: Donna King <donna.king@knights.ucf.edu>

Good Morning, Ms. King—

I am pleased to grant you the permission necessary to utilize my Maze of Coercive Control in your doctoral dissertation as requested below. The most recent version can be found [here](#). To give you fair warning (you're the first to hear of it), I anticipate making one last update, for protective parents. I hope to have it out within the month.

Please do me the honor and favor of forwarding me a copy of your dissertation upon completion. If you have any questions about the Maze, or my development of it, feel free to give me a call or review my website at: <http://dvsur5r.com/dvsur5r-training-tools/>.

I wish you success with your final project!

Sincerely,

Kathy Jones, DVSur5r Network
Family Violence Response Innovations
PO Box 604, Plaistow, NH 03865
978.378.0611
dvsur5r@hotmail.com
www.dvsur5r.com

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Donna King

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 1:09 PM

To: dvsur5r@yahoo.com

Cc: Donna King

Subject: Permission to use The Maze of Coercive Control

Importance: High

Good Afternoon Ms. Jones,

My name is Donna King, and I am in the process of completing a doctoral dissertation at the University of Central Florida entitled "I Decide when You Die: A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Prior Reporting of Physical Violence for Intimate Partner Homicides by Heterosexual Spouses in Florida." One of the main focuses of the study is whether there is an association between the non-violent tactics of coercive control and intimate partner homicide.

I would like your permission to reprint in my dissertation your work, The Maze of Coercive Control, that I retrieved from the National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence website.

Because the dissertation is archived and ultimately made available on the Web, the requested permission extends to any future revisions and editions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your authorization allowing me to use the maze will also confirm that you own the copyright to The Maze of Coercive Control.

If these arrangements meet with your approval, please respond to this email stating that you grant me permission for the use of your maze as requested above. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you very much for your consideration in this matter.

Donna King, J.D.

Doctoral Candidate

Department of Sociology
University of Central Florida
donna.king@knights.ucf.edu

Victims' Safe Harbor Foundation, Inc.

www.victimssafeharbor.org

LIST OF REFERENCES

- AAPA. (2014). Intimate partner violence among Asian American and Pacific Islander women. Retrieved from https://aapaonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/AA_IPV-final-web.pdf
- Agnew-Brune, C., Moracco, K. E. (B.), Person, C. J., Bowling, J. M. (2017). Domestic violence protective orders: A qualitative examination of judges' decision-making processes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(13) 1921-1942.
- Aldridge, M. L., & Browne, K. D. (2003). Perpetrators of spousal homicide: A review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 4(3), 265-276.
- Anderson, K. L. (2009). Gendering coercive control. *Violence Against Women*, 15(12), 1444-1457.
- Arnold, G. (2009). A battered women's movement perspective of coercive control. *Violence Against Women*, 15(12), 1432-1443.
- Attorney General Ashley Moody, Florida Office of the Attorney General. (2019). *Open Government-The "Sunshine" Law*. Retrieved from <http://myfloridalegal.com/pages.nsf/Main/DC0B20B7DC22B7418525791B006A54E4>
- Attorney General's Statewide Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team. (2018). Faces of fatality: Report of the Attorney General's Statewide Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team. Retrieved from <https://www.fcadv.org/sites/default/files/FACES%20OF%20FATALITY%20VIII%20web.pdf>

- Avakame, E. F., Fyfe, J. J., & McCoy, C. (1999). "Did you call the police? What did they do?" An empirical assessment of Black's theory of mobilization of law. *Justice Quarterly*, 16(4), 765-792.
- Bellew, K. (2005). Silent suffering: Uncovering and understanding domestic violence in affluent communities. *Women's Rights Law Reporter*, 26(1), 39-52.
- Berns, N. (2004). *Framing the victim: Domestic violence, media, and social problems*. New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.
- Birenbaum J., & Grant, I. (2013). Taking threats seriously: Section 264.1 and threats as a form of domestic violence. *Criminal Law Quarterly*, 59, 1-35. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2159498
- Black, D. J. (1970). Production of crime rates. *American Sociological Review*, 35(4), 733-748.
- Black, D. (2010). *The behavior of law: Special edition*. Bingley, UK; Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Block, C. R., & Christakos, A. (1995). Intimate partner homicide in Chicago over 29 years. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41(4), 496-526.
- Bowman, C. G., Rosenbury, L. A., Tuerkheimer, D., & Yuracko, K. A. (2011). *Feminist jurisprudence: Cases and materials*. 4th Ed. St. Paul, MN: West publishing Co.
- Caman, S., Kristiansson, M., Granath, S., & Sturup, J. (2017). Trends in rates and characteristics of intimate partner homicides between 1990 and 2013. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 49, 14-21.
- Campbell, J.C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C., Campbell, D., Curry, M. A., . . . Laughon, K. (2003). Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: Results from a multisite case control study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(7), 1089-1097.

- Campbell, J. C., Glass, N., Sharps, P. W., Laughon, K., & Bloom, T. (2007). Intimate partner homicide: Review and implications of research and policy. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 8(3), 246-269.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC 24/7: Saving Lives, Protecting People. (2017). *Preventing Intimate Partner Violence*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/ipv-factsheet.pdf>
- Chapter 5. (n.d.). *Conceptualization, Operationalization, and Measurement*. Retrieved from <http://content.csbs.utah.edu/~fan/fcs3200/slides/chapter05.pdf>
- Crowley, J. E. (2003). *The politics of child support in America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton, C., & Schneider, E. M. (2001). *Battered women and the law*. New York, NY: Foundation Press.
- Davies, L., Ford-Gilboe, M., & Hammerton, J. (2009). Gender inequality and patterns of abuse post leaving. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24, 27-39.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2009). *Dangerous exits: Escaping abusive relationships in rural America*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (2011). What were they thinking? Men who murder an intimate partner. *Violence Against Women*, 17, 111-134.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (2015). *When men murder women*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K. (2009). "Out of the blue": Men who murder an intimate partner. *Feminist Criminology*, 4(3), 194-225.

- Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., & Medina-Ariza, J. (2007). Lethal and nonlethal violence against and intimate female partner: Comparing male murderers to nonlethal abusers. *Violence Against Women, 13*, 329-353.
- Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs. (1984). *Power and Control Wheel*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncdsv.org/images/powercontrolwheelnoshading.pdf>.
- Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs (2017, January 6). Get Trained. Get Resources. Be Effective. Retrieved from <http://www.theduluthmodel.org/training/wheels.html>.
- Douglas, H. (2012). Battered women's experiences of the criminal justice system: Decentring the law. *Feminist Legal Studies, 20*, 121-134.
- Dragiewicz, M. (2010a). A left realist approach to antifeminist fathers' rights groups. *Crime Law and Social Change, 54*, 197-212.
- Dragiewicz, M. (2010b). Gender bias in the courts: Implications for battered mothers and their children. In M.T. Hannah & B. Goldstein (Eds.), *Domestic Violence, Abuse, and Child Custody: Legal Strategies and Policy Issues* (pp. 5-1 to 5-19). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute, Inc.
- Dragiewicz, M. (2011). *Equality with a vengeance: Men's rights groups, battered women, and antifeminist backlash*. Boston, MA: University Press of New England.
- Dutton, M. A., & Goodman, L. A. (2005). Coercion in intimate partner violence: Toward a new conceptualization. *Sex Roles, 52*(11/12) 743-756.
- Dutton, M. A., Goodman, L., Schmidt, R. J. (2006). *Development and validation of a coercive control measure for intimate partner violence: Final technical report*. (Document No. 214438) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Ellis, D. (1989). Male abuse of a married or cohabitating female partner: The application of sociological theory to research findings. *Violence and Victims*, 4(4), 235-255.
- Eubanks Fleming, C.J. & Resick, P.A. (2016). Predicting three types of dissociation in female survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 17(3), 267-285. doi: 10.1080/15299732.2015.1079807
- Florida Department of Law Enforcement. (2017). *FDLE's Guide to Public Records Requests*. Retrieved from <https://www.fdle.state.fl.us/cms/Open-Government/Documents/FDLEGuidetoPublicRecords-pdf.aspx>
- Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (Dec. 20, 1993), G.A. Res. 48/104, Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/48/a48r104.htm>
- Garcia, L., Soria, C., & Hurwitz, E. L. (2007). Homicides and intimate partner violence: A literature review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 8(4), 370-383.
- Garner, B. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Black's law dictionary*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.
- Glass, N., Laughon, K., Campbell, J., Block, C. R., Hanson, G., Sharps, P. W., & Taliaferro, E. (2008). Violence: Recognition, management, and prevention – non-fatal strangulation is an important risk factor for homicide of women. *The Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 35(3), 329-335.
- Gwinn, C. G. & O'Dell, A. (1992). Stopping the violence: The role of the police officer and the prosecutor. Retrieved from <http://www.ncdsv.org/images/StoppingViolence.pdf>
- Hanna, C. (2009). The paradox of progress: Translating Evan Stark's coercive control into legal doctrine for abused women. *Violence Against Women*, 15(12), 1458-1476.
- Hirschel, D., & Buzawa, E. (2002). Understanding the context of dual arrest with directions for future research. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1449-1473.

- Iyengar, R. (2009). Does the certainty of arrest reduce domestic violence?: Evidence from mandatory and recommended arrest laws. *Journal of Public Economics*, 93, 85-98.
- Johnson, M. E. (2009). Redefining harm, reimagining remedies, and reclaiming domestic violence law. *U. C. Davis Law Review*, 42(4), 1107-1164.
- Johnson, M. P. (2010). 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." *Sex Roles*, 62(3-4), 212-219.
- Jones, A. S., Heckert, D. A., Gondolf, E. D., Zhang, Q., & Ip, E. H. (2010). Complex behavioral patterns and trajectories of domestic violence offenders. *Violence and Victims*, 25(1), 3-17.
- Jones, K. (2019a). DVSur5r training tools. Retrieved from <http://dvsur5r.com/dvsur5r-training-tools/>
- Jones, K. (2019b). The maze of coercive control: The (new!) recreated power & control wheel. Retrieved from <http://dvsur5r.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/2017.11-NEW-Maze-of-Coercive-Control.pdf>
- Kalmanson, M. (2017). Filling the gap of domestic violence protection: Returning human rights to U.S. victims. *Florida State University Law Review*, 43(4), 1359-1408.
- Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review*, 46(3), 476-499.
- Kent State University. (2019). SPSS tutorials: Pearson correlation. Retrieved from <https://libguides.library.kent.edu/spss/pearsoncorr>

- King, D. J. (2012a). Naming the judicial terroristSM: An exposé of an abuser's successful use of a judicial proceeding for continued domestic violence. *Tennessee Journal of Race, Gender & Social Justice*, 1(1), 153-178. Retrieved from <http://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1009&context=rgsj>
- King, D. J. (2012b). The war on women's fundamental rights: Connecting U.S. Supreme Court originalism to rightwing, conservative extremism in American politics. *Cardozo Journal of Law & Gender*, 19, 99-146.
- King, D. J., Kalmanson, C., & Huff-Corzine, L. (2019, May). *Coercive control legislation: Legislating against non-violent forms of domestic violence*. Forthcoming paper presentation at the meeting of Homicide Research Working Group, Clearwater, Florida.
- King, J. D., & King, D. J. (2017). A call for limiting absolute privilege: How victims of domestic violence, suffering with post-traumatic stress disorder, are discriminated against by the U.S. judicial system. *DePaul Journal of Women, Gender & the Law*, 6(1), 1-54.
Retrieved from <http://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=jwgl>
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2010). Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence in the United States. *Sex Roles*, 62(3-4), 179-193.
- Libal, K., & Parekh, S. (2009). Reframing violence against women as a human rights violation: Evan Stark's coercive control. *Violence Against Women*, 15(12), 1477-1489.
- Lininger, T. (2009). The sound of silence: Holding batterers accountable for silencing their victims. *Texas Law Review*, 87(5), 857-911.
- Logan, T.K., & Walker, R. (2010). Civil protective order effectiveness: Justice or just a piece of paper? *Violence and Victims*, 25(3), 2010.

- Logan, T.K., Shannon, L., Walker, R., & Faragher, T. M. (2006). Protective orders: Questions and conundrums. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 7(3) 175-205.
- Logistic Regression. (2018). *Chapter 13: Logistic regression*. Sage Publications, Inc.: Thousand Oaks, CA. Retrieved from https://us.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/87150_Ch_13.pdf
- McConnell, J. & Sikora, K.F. (2000). Gender bias and the institutionalization of change: Lessons from the California experience. *The Judge's Journal*, Summer 2000.
- McFarlane, J. M., Campbell, J. C., Wilt, S., Sachs, C. J., Ulrich, Y., & Xu, X. (1999). Stalking and intimate partner femicide. *Homicide Studies*, 3(4), 300-316.
- McHugh, M. L. (2018). Phi correlation coefficient. In B. B. Frey (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluation* (pp. 1252-1253). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mears, D. P. (2003). Research and interventions to reduce domestic violence revictimization. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 4(2), 127-147.
- Motion for Modification of Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence, 001235. Davenport v. Davenport, 2004DR001235 (Clerk of the Circuit Court, Citrus County).
- Mossman, M. J. (1991). Feminism and legal method: The difference it makes. In Fineman, M. A., & Thomadsen, N. S. (Eds.). *At the boundaries of law: Feminism and legal theory* (pp. 281-300). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Moracco, K., Runyan, C. W., & Butts, J. D. (1998). Femicide in North Carolina, 1991-1993: A statewide study of patterns and precursors. *Homicide Studies*, 2(4), 422-446.

- Morton, E., Runyan, C., W., Moracco, K. E., & Butts, J. (1998). Partner homicide-suicide involving female homicide victims: A population-based study in North Carolina, 1988-1992. *Violence and Victims, 13*(2), 91-106.
- Myhill, A. (2015). Measuring coercive control: What can we learn from national population surveys? *Violence Against Women, 21*(3), 355-375.
- Owens, N. L. (2015). *The interspecies family: Attitudes and narratives*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://stars.library.ucf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2393&context=etd>
- Özçakar, N., Yeşiltepe, G., Karaman, G., & Ergönen, A. T. (2016). Domestic violence survivors and their experiences during legal process. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine, 40*, 1-7.
- Parker, R. N., & Toth, A. M. (1990). Family, intimacy, and homicide: A macro-social approach. *Violence and Victims, 5*(3), 195-210.
- Payne, B. K., & Triplett, R. (2009). Assessing the domestic violence training needs of benefits workers. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 243-253.
- Peng, C. J., Lee, K. L., & Ingersoll, G. M. (2002). An introduction to logistic regression analysis and reporting. *The Journal of Educational Research, 96*(1), 3-14.
- Person, C. J., Moracco, K. E. (B.), Agnew-Brune, C., & Bowling, J. M. (2018). “I don’t know that I’ve ever felt like I got the full story”: A qualitative study of courtroom interactions between judges and litigants in domestic violence protective order cases. *Violence Against Women, Jan. 01*, 1-23.
- Petition for Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence, 001235. Davenport v. Davenport, 2004DR001235 (Clerk of the Circuit Court, Citrus County).

- Raphael, J., (2000). *Saving Bernice: Battered women, welfare, and poverty*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Reckdenwald, A., King, Donna J., & Pritchard, A. (2019). *Prosecutorial Response to Non-Fatal Strangulation in Domestic Violence Cases*. Manuscript under review.
- Richards, T. N., Gillespie, L. K., & Givens, E. M. (2014). Reporting femicide-suicide in the news: The current utilization of suicide reporting guidelines and recommendations for the future. *Journal of Family Violence*, 29, 453-463.
- Riger, S., Ahrens, C., & Blickenstaff, A. (2000). Measuring interference with employment and education reported by women with abusive partners: Preliminary data. *Violence and Victims*, 15(2), 161-172.
- Roberts, J. M. (2015). U.S. spousal homicide rates by racial composition of marriage. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 25, 668-673.
- Salari, S. & Sillito, C. L. (2015). Intimate partner homicide-suicide: Perpetrator primary intent across young, middle, and elder adult age categories. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 26, 26-34.
- Schafran, L.H. & Wikler, N. J. (1986). Operating a task force on gender bias in the courts: A manual for action. *The Foundation for Women Judges*. Retrieved from <https://www.legalmomentum.org/node/210>
- Schafran, L.H. & Wikler, N. J. (2001). Gender fairness in the courts: Action in the new millennium. *National Judicial Education Project*. Retrieved from <https://www.legalmomentum.org/node/209>

- Schwaeber, L. (2010). Recognizing domestic violence: How to know it when you see it and how to provide appropriate representation. In Hannah, M. T., & Goldstein, B. (Eds.). *Domestic Violence, Abuse, and Child Custody: Legal Strategies and Policy Issues*. (pp. 2-1 to 2-29). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute, Inc.
- Secured Courts Online Record Search System, Citrus County Clerk of Court. (2018). *Davenport v. Davenport* (2004DR001235). Retrieved from <https://scorss.citrusclerk.org/case>
- Sev'er, A. (1997). Recent or imminent separation and intimate violence against women: A conceptual overview and some Canadian examples. *Violence Against Women*, 3, 566-589.
- Sheehan, B. E., Murphy, S. B., Moynihan, M. M., Dudley-Fennessey, E., & Stapleton, J. G. (2015). Intimate partner homicide: New insights for understanding lethality and risks. *Violence Against Women*, 21(2), 269-288.
- SPSSisFun. (2006, September 25). Binary Logistic Regression: Part 3 – Interpreting output (model significance and variance) [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MybWvtRYEg4&t=2s>
- Stark, E. (1994). Re-presenting woman battering: From battered woman syndrome to coercive control. *Albany Law Review*, 58, 973-1026.
- Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Stark, E. (2009). Rethinking coercive control. *Violence Against Women*, 15(12), 1509-1525.
- Statistics Solutions. (2019). Using Logistic Regression in Research. Retrieved from <https://www.statisticssolutions.com/using-logistic-regression-in-research/>

- Suburban Stats (2018). Population demographics for Florida 2017, 2018. Retrieved from <https://suburbanstats.org/population/how-many-people-live-in-florida>
- The Florida Mental Health Act, FLA. STAT. §§ 394.451-394.47891 (2016).
- Tuerkheimer, D. (2004). Recognizing and remedying the harm of battering: A call to criminalize domestic violence. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 94(4), 959-1032.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). Facts for features: American Indian and Alaskan native heritage month: November 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2015/cb15-ff22.html>
- U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. (1992). *Questions and answers in lethal and non-lethal violence. Proceedings of the first annual workshop of the homicide research working group*. (NCJ 147480). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/147480NCJRS.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, National Center on Full Faith and Credit. (2006). *Violence against native women: A guide for practitioner action*. Retrieved from https://www.bwjp.org/assets/documents/pdfs/ncpoffc_violence_against_native_women.pdf
- Velopulos, C. G., Carmichael, H., Zakrison, T. L., and Crandall, M. (2018, September). *Comparison of male and female victims of intimate partner homicide and bidirectionality – An analysis of the National Violent Death Reporting System*. Paper presented at the 77th Meeting of AAST & Clinical Congress of Acute Care Surgery, San Diego, CA.
- Ventimiglia, L. (2012). *Incident/investigation report*. (Case No. 2012-00137133). Citrus County Sheriff Office.

Violence Policy Center. (2018). American roulette: Murder-suicide in the United States.

Retrieved from <http://www.vpc.org/studies/amroul2018.pdf>

Walby, S., & Towers, J. (2018). Untangling the concept of coercive control: Theorizing domestic violent crime. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 18(1), 7-28.

Walker, L.E. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Walker, L.E.A. (1994). *Abused women and survivor therapy: A practical guide for the psychotherapist*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Waller, G. (2010). The yuck factor, the Oprah factor, and the “stickiness” factor: Why the mainstream media has failed to expose the custody court scandal. In M. T. Hannah & B. Goldstein (Eds.), *Domestic violence, abuse, and child custody (15-1 to 15-29)*, Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute, Inc.

Websdale, N. (2010). *Familicidal hearts: The emotional styles of 211 killers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Weitzman, S. (2000). “Not to people like us”: Hidden abuse in upscale marriages. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Wright, C. (2013). Torture at home: Borrowing from the Torture Convention to define domestic violence. *Hastings Women’s Law Journal*, 24, 457-564.