



UNIVERSITY OF  
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following in press document and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

**Monckton-Smith, Jane ORCID: 0000-0001-7925-5089 (2019) Intimate Partner Femicide: using Foucauldian analysis to track an eight stage relationship progression to homicide. Violence Against Women. ISSN 1077-8012 (In Press)**

Official URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219863876>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801219863876>

EPrint URI: <http://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/6896>

#### **Disclaimer**

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

## IPF: an eight stage progression

### Intimate Partner Femicide: using Foucauldian analysis to track an eight stage relationship progression to homicide

The killing of women by their intimate, or former intimate partners, known as Intimate Partner Femicide (IPF), is a serious social, criminal justice, and public health issue. Globally, homicide statistics show that men dominate as both perpetrators and victims of homicide (95% and 80% respectively) except in the Intimate Partner Homicide (IPH) category where women account for around 82% of victims, and the vast majority of these were in heterosexual relationships involving a male perpetrator when they died (UNODC, 2018). The UK Femicide Census reported that between 2009 and 2015, 598 women were identified as killed by their male partner (Brennan, 2016), and similar ratios are broadly replicated across the western world (Dobash and Dobash, 2015; Monckton Smith, 2012). The real number of deaths is difficult to estimate as, amongst other things, problems in defining the category can mask the true scale of the issue (Fairbairn *et al*, 2017; Devaney and Lazenbatt, 2016). There are significant pressures in the UK on public services to reduce the number of deaths, and a need for more information to aid in assessing risk of homicide in intimate relationships (Monckton Smith *et al*, 2014). The aim of this paper is to develop understanding of non-clinical risk assessment to aid professionals, such as police officers, working on the frontline. It was found in the literature review that competing discursive positions impact on the assessment of risk in this context (Monckton Smith *et al*, 2014), and this was the basis for the methodological approach. Using the principles of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, two competing discursive positions were identified that appear to dominate the way risk is perceived in this context. One is the *coercive control discourse*, that represents IPF

as part of a predictable process involving domestic abuse, and the other is the *crime of passion discourse*, that represents IPF as a spontaneous incident occurring in response to a proximal provocation and which may or may not involve domestic violence.

#### DOMESTIC ABUSE AND IPF

The links between IPF and domestic abuse are powerful, and a history of domestic abuse is a key risk marker in those who are IPF killers (Dawson and Piscitelli, 2017). A history of domestic abuse is also anecdotally increasingly linked to other homicide categories, notably mass homicides (De Haldevang, 2018; Everytown, 2017), and its association to criminal activity more generally is being recognised. Research suggests that domestic abuse characterised by patterns of coercive control and/or stalking is more likely to end in homicide (Dobash and Dobash, 2015; Stark, 2009; Campbell *et al.*, 2007; Campbell *et al* 2003, Mullen *et al.*, 2000). The coercive control discourse is a resistance to more traditional and dominant rationalisations for domestic homicide which have been explained with reference to the crime of passion.

Recent legislative changes in the UK and Ireland have criminalised controlling patterns (see s.76 Serious Crimes Act 2015 (UK); Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018; and Domestic Violence Act 2018 (Ireland), also stalking patterns (see Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 (UK)). These political moves, at least in part, reflect the importance and value of control and stalking in predicting serious harm and homicide. For example, Johnson (2008, 2011) identifies three typologies of domestic abuse, broadly organised around perpetrator motivation, which are referred to as *intimate terrorism*, *violent resistance*, and *situational couple violence*. The pattern *intimate terrorism* has the strongest links to controlling patterns and the highest risk for homicide. Stark's (2009) work described and defined *coercive control* which he constructs as a liberty crime, arguing that it erodes personal freedoms and choice leading the victim to a state of subjugation. Again,

perpetrator motivation is set around a need for control, and challenges to that control produce an environment where homicide is more likely. Research in an Australian study by Johnson *et al* (2019) found that controlling patterns were found in most cases of IPF. Some argue that domestic abuse cannot be split into mutually exclusive categories (Gulliver & Fanslow 2015), but describing heterogeneity in behaviour and motivation through typologies can help organise approaches to risk. For example, there is a precedent in stalking research that motivation can be categorised and has a relationship to risk and threat (Mullen *et al.*, 2000). The notion that IPF is part of a process motivated by control, rather than a response to an incident, is central to considering risk in this paper.

#### RISK ASSESSMENT AND IPF

Predicting if, and when, homicide may occur dominates UK police and professional responses to disclosures of domestic abuse and stalking, as it does in many jurisdictions. Two key risk approaches are taken, especially in triage: an actuarial and a clinical approach. There are problems inherent in any risk assessment model, and the history of assessing risk of violence specifically, suggests that it is not a precise science (Shapiro and Noe, 2015). Police assess the imminence of homicide using a quasi-actuarial approach which identifies and measures presence of domestic abuse or stalking using Risk Identification Checklists (RICs). Such RICs are lists of known behavioural markers which have been found to be present in previous research into domestic homicides. Thus they identify if known high-risk markers are present in any relationship where domestic abuse is suspected. Broadly, in practice, the number of markers identified on the list will influence whether the victim is considered high, medium or standard risk for homicide. This risk level will then determine the type of resources allocated to that victim (Monckton Smith *et al.*, 2014). However, there is little support for the idea that sheer numbers of risk markers alone

equate to imminence of homicide (Shapiro & Noe, 2015). The presence of some high-risk markers on RICs, like violence, fear and control may identify domestic abuse, but markers like separation and escalation in control, better identify the potential for imminent homicide (Dobash & Dobash, 2015; Gilchrist, 2013; Stark 2009, Johnson, 2008; Websdale & Dedolph, 2000). It is probably more accurate to say that markers interact with each other in quantifying risk, but this is not always reflected in use of RICs. Clusters of risk markers are considered more predictive than numbers of them; for example, where there is control, violence and a separation after living together there is said to be a 900% increase in the potential for homicide (NCICP 2003).

A clinical approach to risk assessment is also argued to be problematic. Domestic abuse, coercive control and stalking are not clinical conditions, but patterns of behaviour. There is a strong backlash noted in Feminist scholarship which constructs clinical explanations for domestic abuse as excusing the patterns of behaviour. It is argued that social and cultural belief systems, and systemic gender inequality are more influential (Hall, 2015; Johnson, 2011; Dobash & Dobash, 1998; Yllo & Bograd, 1988). Mental illness, and drug and alcohol misuse are thought to exacerbate the predicament the behaviours create, but they are not considered to be causative (Stark, 2009). Johnson (2008) identifies two distinct typologies of abuser who are controlling and dangerous, but neither has significant links to mental illness, though there is a relationship to personality disorder. Profiles of rejected stalkers (dominated by intimate partner stalking) also reveal personality disorders to be more of a problem than mental illness (Farnham, 2018; Mullen *et al.*, 2006; Mullen, Pathé and Purcell, 2000). The emergence of stalking clinics in England and Wales which employ a dual approach to risk assessment, and use both actuarial and clinical models in triage (Farnham, 2018), reveal the importance of both, and the multi-faceted nature of domestic abuse and IPF.

The introduction of Domestic Homicide Reviews in England and Wales (DHRs) in 2011 as part of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act (2004) was another move towards identifying opportunities to prevent future homicide and forms part of the Government's strategy to end violence against women and girls (Home Office 2016d). The model used in the DHR focuses on tracking the antecedent histories in cases of IPF (and other categories of domestic homicide) to produce a chronology which may go back many years. Opportunities for intervention are then identified by looking at the chronology and especially interactions with professionals and agencies. Research has revealed that there are many consistent themes in the chronologies of IPF cases in the DHRs (Home Office 2016c, Standing Together 2016). Chronologies and temporal sequences are potentially useful in understanding the dynamic nature of risk, and how and when it can escalate.

#### TEMPORAL SEQUENCING

Temporal sequencing has an established presence in homicide studies, from Luckenbill's (1977) micro level situational analysis producing the six stages of male confrontational homicide, to Stanton's (2016) macro level structural analysis producing the ten stages of genocide. Wertham's (1937) thesis on catathymic crisis as an explanation for apparently motiveless violent crimes, produced a five stage sequence, which has been more recently developed to understand an offender's psychiatric progression to a decision to kill in cases of serial killing (Schlesinger, 2002; Garrison, 1996). Mullen (2004) and Adams (2007) analyses of mass homicides and IPH respectively, mapped the consistencies in the antecedent histories of the homicides to understand the progression to fatal violence. This approach is therefore potentially useful.

The diversity of methods, perspectives and categories of homicide in temporal sequencing notwithstanding, there is a unifying idea articulated by Stanton (2016) that the later stages in the

sequences are preceded by the earlier stages, and the progression helps understand the motivation to kill, and identify opportunities at each stage to prevent the homicide happening.

The theoretical positions around the motivation to kill in IPF are important in constructing and organising a temporal sequence. I draw from Stark (2009) and Johnson's (2008) work which situates controlling patterns as driving domestic abuse, and any threats to that control as raising risk for homicide. I also consider the work of Mullen *et al* (2000) around motivation in the *rejected stalker* category to be important, as the literature builds a picture of stalking and controlling characteristics interacting together and simultaneously present in cases of IPF (Monckton Smith, Haile & Szymanska, 2017). The literature also tells us about motivation to *kill* in IPF, and Dobash and Dobash's work which concludes that, 'a man may decide to "change the project" from attempting to keep her (the victim) within the relationship to destroying her for leaving it' (2015:39) most clearly articulates that a change in thinking may precede homicide in this context. Changes in thinking are often a specific stage in homicide sequencing and so-called 'last chance' thinking, where an individual may feel there is nothing left for them, is a risk marker for imminent homicide. Mullen (2004) describes this in his description of the change in thinking in autogenic massacre (for example, mass killings). Mullen argues that autogenic homicide is 'self-generated' that is, the perpetrator generates frustration, anger and rage in respect of specific issues or challenges, and moves increasingly towards considering homicide as the only relief. A decision to kill is made and acted on, rather than the killing being a spontaneous response to a proximal provocation. Schlesinger's (2002) description of the change in thinking during catathymic crisis, is also helpful. Along with Mullen (2004), this establishes thinking change which situates homicide as a relief or solution to challenges. Although I do not argue that IPF is the result of catathymic crisis, the description of the change in thinking is useful:

*“there is a change in thinking whereby the offender comes to believe that he can resolve his inner conflict by committing an act of extreme violence against someone to whom he feels emotionally bonded” (2002:64).*

Thereby, changes in thinking, especially a move to last chance thinking, which lead to a decision to kill, are established in homicide temporal sequencing, and also in the literature surrounding IPF. Scholars argue that IPF killers respond to a trigger with an attitude captured in the often used quote ‘if I can’t have you, no-one can’. It is recognised that some IPF appear to be more spontaneous, especially where there is little temporal distance between a provocation or challenge and the fatal violence. Whilst this is certainly the case, it is possible, that the risk of homicide in such relationships follows a similar, if condensed, pattern. It is also recognised that there is a body of work which looks at psychodynamic stages in such homicides (Johnson & Sachman, 2014) and more nuanced and detailed individual psychopathologies, especially in familicide (Websdale, 2010). The argument proposed is that IPF is part of a journey where the motivation to abuse (need for control) is linked to the motivation to kill (loss of, or threat to, control). Breakdown in control can be preceded by a somewhat broad spectrum of triggers, and this often revolves around separation, but also financial ruin and mental or physical health crises. This means that there will be many more relationships where there is a breakdown in control, than there are homicides. However, if the response shows signs of last chance thinking, or determined revenge, then risk of homicide escalates.

#### THE FOUCAULDIAN APPROACH

Foucault characterised discourse as more than merely a linguistic concept, he saw it as a way of *knowing* about something (1972). Domestic abuse discourses for example, tells us, amongst



other things, what domestic abuse is, who its victims and perpetrators are, what motivates it, and how we should respond. There will be multiple discourses in circulation at any point in time, but some become dominant. Foucault saw no linear progression or incremental building of knowledge within discourse, merely various constructions of it with varying degrees of power to assert their position as the truth. His genealogical approach is characterised by ‘digging’ through discourses across time, and producing a history of the present. In this paper, I specifically focus on how discourse impacts on assessment of, and response to, risk of homicide in domestic abuse. I identified two discourses, which I call the *crime of passion* discourse and the *coercive control* discourse, which are key. The crime of passion discourse shares knowledge with dominant discourses of domestic violence and romantic heterosexual love. There is heavy focus on gender, gendered roles, and perceived differences in male and female behaviours, responsibilities and expectations (Monckton Smith 2010, Dobash and Dobash 2002, Websdale 1999). More importantly, this discursive position prescribes the gendered order where women take a subservient position, as normal or natural, providing justifications for violence and homicide against women should the ‘natural order’ of things be broken (Monckton Smith 2012). These justifications have even formed legal defences to murder and excused violence against women (Lees 1997). A *crime of passion* homicide is characterised by spontaneous and unpredictable violence motivated by something the victim has done, and which is perceived by the perpetrator to be intolerable. What can be considered intolerable is also discursively constructed and Lees (1997) research of Old Bailey trials identified three key behaviours sanctioned as bad enough to potentially produce justifiable fatal violence. They are: nagging, infidelity, and rejecting the gendered order. The coercive control discourse, which has its theoretical roots in Feminism, is a resistance to this knowledge and constructs IPF as preceded and motivated by a breakdown in the control the

perpetrator has of the relationship (and which they may feel entitled to) and their perceived loss of status or stability as a result. Traditional gendered roles are represented as socially constructed and discriminatory, and not natural. These two discourses, which both have a footprint in professional responses to domestic abuse victims, represent risk very differently. Risk of homicide in crime of passion discourse is seen as partly the product of victim behaviours and provocations. The homicides are only seen as predictable where the perpetrator displays routine serious violence. In this paper I look at the way risk escalates when considering control, rather than passion and violence as preceding homicide, taking account of knowledge produced in coercive control discourse. My specific aim was to identify a typical risk escalation in cases of IPF.

I followed Carabine's (2001) process for performing a Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. The first stage was to find all possible sources of information for the chosen topic, which is IPF chronologies. It is necessary for the researcher to *know* this data, to keep re-reading it, and become immersed in it (Carabine 2001). Foucauldian analytical tools which focus on concepts of power, truth and knowledge, are particularly useful in exploring social issues. Knowledge is seen to be produced within discourse in this approach, so it is important to consider who has the power to present their perspective as the truth. This may be through medical, legal, political, cultural or social institutions, and where a number of these institutions share and agree a perspective as the truth, what is called a discursive formation is built. Where this is the case contrasting opinion can become a mere resistance to what is accepted. In many ways the coercive control discourse is a resistance to traditional truths, having its roots in feminist scholarship, which has been a resistance to most institutional knowledge around gender. However, it is gaining dominance, and institutional endorsement, and this makes it an important discourse to consider. The truths presented in the

coercive control discourse direct this analysis, and I set them in contrast to the dominant crime of passion discursive traditions.

To begin, 575 homicide cases involving women killed by men were identified using the *Counting Dead Women* database (Ingala Smith 2018). This was all cases from 2012 to 2015. There were found to be 372 IPF cases from the total of 575 homicides. Every case was reviewed drawing from published media and homicide reviews to establish the broad history and circumstances of the homicide, and to identify common and consistent themes. Those themes were placed into a simple temporal sequence. The sequence was initially formed of three stages: pre-relationship themes, relationship themes, and post relationship themes. Dominant pre-relationship themes were identified as: perpetrator has history of domestic abuse, controlling patterns or stalking; relationship themes were identified as presence of domestic abuse, controlling patterns and monitoring/stalking behaviours; post relationship themes were identified as separation instigated by the victim, stalking, threats to kill, or a threat to control or status (like illness or financial ruin). Then, risk markers appearing on standard RICs used by police (DASH 2009) which were found to be present in the cases, were placed in the three stage sequence, and any marker could potentially appear in more than one stage. These markers are consistent in research and histories of IPF cases, and are considered to identify domestic abuse and predict risk of homicide (DASH 2009). The markers were: history of abuse or stalking; possessiveness; control; monitoring; violence; sexual violence; isolation; threats to kill; threats to suicide; stalking; separation; escalating control or violence. Each marker had a working definition for consistency. Then additional recurring themes identified through the analysis were included, and the combined data produced five additional stages to the sequence, creating eight stages which are named: Pre-relationship; early relationship; relationship; trigger event; escalation; change in thinking; planning; homicide.

The coercive control discourse gives meaning to the sequence and when control is considered as influencing every stage, this more nuanced sequence emerges.

This sequence then formed the basis for a deeper analysis, which involved focusing on a convenience sample of twenty-five cases of IPF drawn from the researcher's professional work. These cases provided much more detailed information about the progression of the relationships. All cases were of women killed by a male intimate partner within the last fifteen years and all cases provided detailed data beyond what could be obtained through a media search. All possible sources of information about the cases were gathered, and there were different types of data available for each case, but information came from Domestic Homicide Reviews, news and media reports, documentaries, court reporting, Hansard reports, and professional, perpetrator and family reflections and perspectives. Because of the inclusion of personal comment in the cases, all remain anonymised, and no identifying information is included in this paper. The sample, with its diverse sources of data, provided detailed information which allowed a concentrated examination of each identified stage. The following analysis explains how each of the eight-stages was identified and developed.

#### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

**Stage One: pre-relationship:** There was information available about perpetrator's histories before they entered the relationship. Previous history of abuse is acknowledged in research to predict future abuse (Websdale, 1999). It was found that a history of controlling patterns, domestic abuse, or stalking was present in every case where a pre-relationship history was recorded. In some of the cases this was a criminal record, or arrest record for domestic abuse related offending; in some cases, there were informal and formal reports from previous partners of

control, violence, or stalking. Victims had often been aware that the perpetrator had a history of abuse on entering a relationship, but did not always believe reports from former partners.

‘he said his ex-wife accused him of domestic violence but she (the victim) didn’t believe that it was true. She believed him when he said his ex was just vindictive’ (014)

‘his ex got him arrested for harassment or something, but he said it was all about getting access to his kid’ (012)

Dominant discourses construct domestic abuse as a ‘couples’ problem which is generated through the particular dynamics in any relationship between the two people. This position, considered a domestic abuse myth, suggests that domestic abuse is situational and provoked (Dobash and Dobash 2002). It was not only victims basing decisions on this discourse, but professionals and others too. There was resistance to ‘labelling’ men as abusive because of their histories. In contrast, discourses of coercive control situate the problems and the abuse within the perpetrator, arguing they will continue with the same behavioural patterns in all relationships (Stark 2009). The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme (DVDS) which allows police to disclose past histories of abuse to new partners is official recognition and acceptance of the risk of history, and is evidence of the increasing reach of the coercive control discourse. The DVDS does not seem to yet, have widespread support in practice with the Home Office identifying only pockets of good practice (Home Office 2016a). A DVDS disclosure in one case in our sample led to the victim being given responsibility for leaving ‘now she had the facts’. There is an expectation that women who are suffering control should just leave. McLaren (2013) in discussions of discourse around mothers blamed for their husband’s sexual abuse of their children, notes that women are shamed and blamed for failing to leave abusive men. The *risk* of leaving was not given much consideration in our case. This again suggests that there is often a belief that domestic abuse is a ‘couple’

problem. The importance of a history of controlling patterns, stalking or domestic abuse, situates the problem of abuse within the abuser, and has yet to achieve dominance. It does however, form the first stage in this common progression towards IPF.

**Stage Two - Early Relationship:** The data suggested that the way a relationship started, was different to what it would become. For example, the relationships often started with the perpetrator being attentive, and progressed to possessiveness and control in most cases. This is an identifiable stage which is not characterised by abuse, but more about seeking commitment from the victim. It appeared that normal romantic expectations and activities were present, but speeded up. In one case this commitment was achieved before the two had physically met (004), in another case the perpetrator moved into the family home on the night they got together (020). In another case, the victim was pregnant within a month and the two married within 6 months (013). There was a tendency noted for perpetrators to use possessive language like ‘you’re mine’ and ‘we’ll be together forever’ and early declarations of love were also common. Families and friends noted these things, and often felt concern at the speed of the commitment. It was also common for family to note an early change in the routines and behaviours of the victim:

‘she started spending all her time with him, we hardly ever saw her. She always spent a lot of time with us before, but that all stopped’ (006)

‘she changed so much, as soon as she got with him. He was her priority and he didn’t like us. He wouldn’t even come out of the bedroom if we were there’ (012)

Discourses of heterosexual romantic love normalise an all-encompassing ‘grand passion’ (Fisher 2004). Jealousy is constructed as a normal output of love, as is possessiveness (Borochowitz and Eisikovitz 2002) and love becomes a powerful justification for all sorts of possessive and fixated behaviours. These discourses where love justifies possessiveness and even violence and homicide, have power not only in masking risk, but in mitigating charging and

sentencing decisions in court (Monckton Smith 2012). Many of the attempts to secure early commitment and control in these cases were justified by both victim and perpetrator through the narrative and language of romantic love.

‘he turned up unexpectedly when she was out with her friends and took her home. He said he was worried about her’ (012)

‘he said he couldn’t bear to see her talking to other men, he loved her so much. She believed him’ (022)

This stage appears dominated by attempts to seek early and firm commitment. Once commitment is secured, this seems to convey certain gendered rights and responsibilities, and once commitment is given by the female, it cannot be withdrawn. Beliefs and legislation which didn’t allow women to divorce, or restricted the reasons they could divorce, whilst giving men those rights, and certain proprietary rights, are part of a heterosexual intimate relationship genealogy (Bourne and Derry 2004). Some of these beliefs are argued to be deep in the bone marrow of the culture (Websdale, 1999) and justifications for IPF in court, and in media reports, suggest that women must be careful when withdrawing their commitment to an intimate relationship (Lees, 1997).

**Stage Three - Relationship:** When the relationship was confirmed and committed, at least some of the high risk behavioural markers were noted in all cases. The giving of commitment seemed to coincide with rights to control. There were controlling patterns in every case study. Some were referred to as domestic abuse or violence, with the language of control conflated with the language of abuse. Stalking and monitoring patterns were significantly present, sometimes accompanied by paranoia that the woman was being unfaithful. This again is part of a discursive tradition where women are not to be trusted and are represented as inherently dishonest which has

a philosophical history going back at least, to the theories of Pollack (1950). Constant demonstrations of devotion and loyalty characterised the dynamics of most of the relationships. For example, one victim had a timetable of domestic and social activities that were never altered, and she never broke the pattern. To break the pattern would be a sign that something more fundamental was wrong, and that there was a challenge to control which would have consequences. One victim had to structure her life around the perpetrator's strict rules around meals. She would organise her life around this daily commitment, and any deviation was questioned. Following the routines for many victims was a way of keeping calm in the household, and demonstrating their commitment. Many times this was justified through a common phrase spoken by victims, 'it's not worth the trouble, it's better to just do what he wants'. Coercive control discourse constructs these routines as the abuse, whereas dominant discourses construct the routines as abusive only if they have violent or abusive elements and this has effect in terms of risk assessment. Consequences of upsetting a perpetrator were not necessarily always violent, however, the potential for violence seemed to be ever-present. Sexual violence was spoken of in some cases, but because victims often considered they acquiesced to pressure or force, patterns were not always defined as abuse. In one case for example, the perpetrator would sit and expose himself in the living room and say nothing. The victim would not challenge him and an atmosphere of menace was created. Sexual violence is heavily laden with meaning, and has a place in discourse around gendered rights and responsibilities. It cannot be ignored that sex is one of the most controlled and heavily policed female behaviours (Lees 1997). There are discursive justifications for male violence against women who are considered promiscuous, unfaithful or 'frigid'.

'he used to terrify her, he beat her and he strangled her. She told us he raped her, but he thought it was his right' (009)



‘(she) used to have sex with him to buy (herself) some peace. (she) knew (she) had three weeks’ peace if (she) let him rape (her)’ (011)

Discourses of coercive control which characterise reductions in choice and freedom as a liberty crime (Stark 2008), are in fundamental contradiction with traditional discourses which give justifications and permission for men to restrict the liberty of their female partners. This conflict appears to create the most confusion in risk assessment, the dominant discourse which normalises gendered control does not identify these controls as raising risk.

This stage was found to have the most diversity in length of time. Some cases saw this stage last as little as 3 – 6 weeks, in others it was as long as 50 years. Where control was maintained, or the man did not want to end the relationship, it could potentially last a lifetime. Discursive knowledge around female roles and behaviours within relationships constructs many of the demands made by perpetrators as expected or reasonable, and in some cases to be tolerated or endured as part of married life. Sechrist and Weil (2017) report on the Offender Focused Domestic Violence Initiative (OFDVI), the backbone of which is to make sure that there is multi-agency and community intolerance of domestic abuse, and a strategy to make sure offenders suffer consequences for their abuse. This initiative is an official challenge and resistance to dominant beliefs, and has seen some success. Physical violence is less acceptable now than it was, but still justified in some cases. In terms of risk, control alone is not always recognised or considered as dangerous, though there is more acceptance that it constitutes abuse. There is also little acknowledgement in dominant discourses that leaving escalates risk. Separation is however, significantly associated with IPF (Brennan 2016) but dominant discourses represent offenders as more heartbroken, than vengeful. Heartbreak has a strong presence in discourses of romantic

heterosexual love (Fisher 2004) but it seems to be the loss of the ‘relationship’ rather than an individual which creates the response to separation.

**Stage Four - Trigger/s:** The reasons given for men killing their partners overwhelmingly revolved around withdrawal of commitment, or separation. This separation could be real or imagined, or just threatened. This is supported in the Femicide Census (Brennan, 2016) and other research (Dobash & Dobash 2015). Attempts to separate were in all our cases which progressed to this stage, met with significant resistance. Dominant discourses provide justifications for restricting the civil liberties of women in heterosexual relationships and construct female rejection, infidelity or disloyalty as provocation. Lees defined three key discursive justifications for IPF after analysing Old Bailey trials, as representing the victims as ‘naggers, whores and libbers’ (Lees 1997). Lees considered that discourse justified violence within an intimate relationship if the women, ‘nagged’ too much, exercised civil rights, or were promiscuous. The idea that women have less power to end a relationship was again part of justifying violence:

‘I will decide when this marriage is over, and I will let you know my decision’ (001)

‘you’re mine and you always will be’ (009)

‘I will never let you go’ (005)

‘if I can’t have you, no-one can’ (009)

Historically women have been legally unable to ask for a divorce, and subsumed into the legal persona of their husbands through the concept of ‘femme covert’ (Monckton Smith 2010). The residue of these practices and beliefs are still evident, and Websdale’s archival studies reveal them as more than a mere ‘cultural residue’ in those men who kill their partners, they are in fact ‘beliefs, values and norms deep in their ideological bone marrow’ (1999:206). It is interesting to

note that in Guzik's (2008) study, intimate partner abusers felt that punishment or sanction for their domestic abuse was meted out by an unjust system, which suggests that control is perceived as a right. This seems to relate to a perceived loss of status, where control is threatened through separation or other triggers. There is a discursive link between losing control, and losing status.

**Stage Five - Escalation:** Escalation is an increase in frequency, severity or variety of abuse, control or stalking. Escalation appeared to be an attempt to re-establish control or status. This could involve a variety of behaviours with perpetrators using a number of tactics to re-establish their control, like begging, crying, threats of violence, violence, stalking, or suicide threats. The length of this stage is difficult to estimate and seemed to differ across cases. Stalking was widespread, especially monitoring and tracking. The stalking focused on intelligence gathering, and in some cases, on instilling fear and anxiety. In some cases, perpetrators told friends of their stalking. The friends didn't call the police, or tell the victim. The fact that perpetrators disclosed a criminal behaviour indicates that they expected some kind of passive solidarity and understanding that they were justified. In one case the perpetrator called his friend when he broke into his former partner's home and told him about going through her things searching for 'evidence' of a new man. This was not a cry for the friend to stop him, but for support and solidarity. This stage is very common and escalation appears on RICs as a risk marker, but progression to stage six is not inevitable. Interventions at this stage may be particularly effective to reduce feelings of entitlement to act, and build feelings of status.

**Stage Six – A change in thinking/decision:** This stage seems to occur in or at the end of a period of escalation, and may be a response to perceived irretrievable loss of control and/or status. The idea that homicide may be a possibility, may occur at this time. It is difficult to establish the timing of a change in thinking, but there was evidence in some cases, which suggest this as an

identifiable stage. Stalking risk establishes that 'last chance thinking' may characterise this stage where homicide risk escalates. That is the idea that there is nowhere left to go to resolve the perpetrator's outrage or sense of injustice. In many cases, the level of planning found in homicide investigations suggests that there had been a considered decision to kill made at some point. Research also suggests that when people take an emotional decision to kill in this context, and especially where revenge is a motive, they can be rigid in their adherence to their plan (Mullen, 2004; Adams, 2007). There was evidence however, that considerations of homicide and decisions to kill are dynamic and may be dependent on many things. The decision may be reversed, or reliant on opportunity. For example, in one case, a man broke into his former partner's home and she woke to find him astride her strangling her. She managed to convince him that she would reinstate the relationship and he stopped, and she managed to call the police. However, he killed his next partner when she separated from him in practically identical circumstances; in this case she was recorded on the 999 system asserting that the relationship was over. In some cases, opportunities were manipulated by the perpetrator, but it is equally possible that an opportunity presenting itself may increase risk for the victim when at this stage. Not all consideration of homicide will end in homicide, but it is an escalation in risk to the victim. The change in thinking appears to have an association with feelings of injustice, entitlement to act, and a belief there is social or cultural solidarity with the offender's position. Discursive truths that not only normalise, but justify stalking and threats, and victim blaming, have the potential to raise the level of risk that a serious assault will happen. This passive solidarity, underpinned by beliefs that the perpetrator is the real victim, the system is against them, and the ex-partner is in some way to blame and deserving of the abuse, powerfully merge and can facilitate high risk outcomes. In some cases, there were other challenges. Illness which brings outside influence from medics and carers can create challenge and

some of these killings were described as 'mercy' killings where the perpetrator received sympathy. However, where the perpetrator has gone through all the stages this should be questioned.

**Stage Seven - Planning:** Indicators or evidence of planning were often discovered after the homicide. Some indicators showed written plans around how the killing would happen (stabbing, shooting, etc.), and some were evidence of creating opportunities for the killing to happen. There were internet searches on specific methods to kill; attempts to isolate the victim (via a holiday request, collect belongings, or child contact for example); purchasing weapons (guns, knives, hammers and so on); plans to conceal a body (grave digging for example); organising finances and papers (especially where homicide/suicide is planned); reconnaissance; and stalking with surveillance and intelligence gathering. In some cases, perpetrators told others of their plans to kill. In conversations with police, a case was discussed where police had arrested a man who had recently split with his wife and was stalking her. When he was arrested for the stalking, a 'murder kit' was found in the boot of his car containing everything he would need to abduct, subdue, and kill his wife. The planning stage could potentially last anywhere from a couple of hours to one case where it lasted over twelve months. Where stalking continues, the risk remains high.

**Stage Eight - Homicide:** The final stage is the homicide itself and this may involve extreme levels of violence (even in previously non-violent people) where the level of violence used appears to have no direct relation to the level of violence evidenced in the relationship. However, lack of violence in the relationship can become a soft, but effective, defence to murder (Monckton Smith, 2012); the homicide may involve suicide; it may involve killing children; it may involve attempts to cover up the homicide; it may involve immediate confession; it may be completely hidden as homicide; it may involve killing others who are blocking completion of the

homicide; it may involve a victim going missing. The homicide itself may occur in public, or more usually in the home of the victim or their place of work (Brennan, 2016). More recently there has been an increase in the 'sex game gone wrong'. In one of the cases a woman's body was dressed after death in 'sexy' clothes to make it appear as if she had consented to the strangulation she died from. There was also evidence of forced ingestion of illicit drugs with claims of suicide or misadventure. But in all these cases the perpetrator had travelled through all the stages. These differences in the homicide characteristics indicate ostensible diversity in the population of controlling perpetrators who kill, but accentuate the relative stability of the preceding stages, which are more consistent irrespective of homicide style and characteristics.

#### OBSERVATIONS

Drawing from coercive control discourse the eight stages which show a risk escalation can be explained through a narrative of controlling patterns being central to a perpetrator's motivation and behaviours, and forming the homicide trigger. However, dominant discourses are in conflict in many respects, and construct risk and culpability as lying more equally between perpetrator and victim, and control as an abusive 'action' rather than the core motivation and driver of domestic abuse. This conflict could potentially have significant impact in risk assessment.

Another point of conflict is that in some cases the temporal distance between the homicide trigger and the homicide was represented as very short, just a matter of hours. It could be argued that this short time lag may indicate that some stages were missed, specifically the stages between a trigger (stage 4) and the homicide (stage 8). To travel from homicide trigger to homicide in less than twenty-four hours may suggest that there was an emotional and spontaneous response to the trigger, and this is part of thinking in the crime of passion discourse. For example, in one case a temporal gap of around three to four hours was accepted in court as an *immediate* response.

However, that presupposes there was no other trigger preceding the identified provocation. It could also be argued that three hours could be time enough to consider options; this depends on the discursive position taken. Further complicating these short gap cases was another consistency - there had been use of serious domestic violence in the history of most of these cases. This may suggest that the perpetrator resorted to violence routinely and this was a step too far. This again would be part of the crime of passion discourse. However, it is equally possible that there was a rapid progression through the final stages, with violent perpetrators more likely to proceed rapidly. A key consistent theme supporting the possibility that all eight stages were present, is the difference in the quality and type of violence used in the domestic violence history, and that used in the homicide, which is also found in previous research (Monckton Smith 2014). These short gap IPFs are more likely to be constructed in defence narratives and media reports as routine violence taken 'a step too far' or even accidental, with the homicide seen as a natural and inevitable progression of the history of violence. However, if the quality of the violence changes, and homicide is a direct result of the type of violence used, there may have been a change in thinking. In the initial sweep of 372 cases, these short gap homicides made up around 30% of the sample. It was considered at first that there may be two homicide progressions, but rapid travel through the final stages may be just as likely.

This eight-stage progression, as a discourse, is a resistance to dominant discourses of domestic abuse and IPF at many levels. It subverts discursive knowledge in the crime of passion discourse that suggests that IPF is preceded by a proximal provocation, is characterised by a loss of control, and is passionate. This coercive control discursive position in contrast, suggests that perpetrators are not representative of all men, but are representative of each other in many ways. It may be that perpetrators feel the need for control as a complex amalgam of individual personal

histories and experiences, and cultural authorisation of entitlement, but their route to feeling this way, is less important in this discourse, than the fact they feel it.

The hypothesis that IPF is part of a journey where the motivation to abuse (need for control), is linked to the motivation to kill (loss of, or threat to, control) drives the interpretation of the data, and the findings around risk. The more positive message might be that the coercive control discourse suggests these homicides are predictable, and therefore there may be opportunities for prevention. In the eight-stage progression travel through all eight stages is not inevitable. However, what was found was that perpetrators may get to stage 5, regain control, and return to stage 3. They may get to stage 5 and move on to their next victim. These circular journeys within the eight stages sequence were common. Even where a change in thinking has happened, opportunity and circumstances play a role, and this is important in terms of risk. Interventions at any stage can be qualitatively different, but may be effective in stopping the progression.

Where the early stages 1-2 are positively identified there is much higher likelihood that attempts at separation, should the relationship continue, will be met with significant resistance. It is important to note that a relationship can be established in the mind of the perpetrator through as little as one date or one sexual coupling, and this is supported in stalking research (Mullen *et al* 2000). Where there is progression through stage 3, irrespective of the length of that stage, there is much higher likelihood that separation will be very difficult, or even dangerous. Travel through stages 4 and 5 are clearest indication of the increased potential for homicide. Travel through stages 6 to 8 may be very rapid where there has been routine and serious domestic violence. In most cases of IPF travel through stages 6 to 8 takes longer, often around one to two months, and thus interventions may be useful.



Finally, the sequence and coercive control discourse give opportunities to think about possible interventions at each and every stage. It also has value in identifying high-threat individuals and where in the temporal journey any relationship may be.

## CONCLUSIONS

The coercive control discourse provides a plausible and logical interpretation of the common characteristics and behaviours noted in the extant research that precede IPF. It is a resistance to the idea that violence alone is the most significant predictive risk marker, and also that IPF is spontaneous and situational. As in stalking research, the sequence suggests that motivation is central to understanding risk of homicide. In terms of assessing risk, the temporal sequence has utility in tracking an escalation, and understanding the dynamics of increasing and decreasing risk. There are some interesting areas for further research which are suggested which include; exploring the benefits of identifying control issues by clinicians, health professionals, social workers or others, and interventions which may address their impact. Perpetrator programmes that focus on control may also be an interesting area for development. More research into ways in which victims may exit controlling relationships safely is urgently indicated, as is research into what may cause men to become controlling or need such control in their lives, and the way they can safely exit intimate relationships.

The eight stage sequence has utility when used in tandem with current risk processes and may add an extra dimension in decision making for victims and professionals.

## References

- Adams, D. (2007). *Why do they kill? Men who murder their intimate partners*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Borochowitz, D. and Eisikovitz, Z. (2002) To Love Violently: Strategies for reconciling love and violence *Violence Against Women* 8;476
- Campbell, J. C., Webster, D., KoziolMcLain, 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, 1089-1097.
- Bourget, D., Gagne, P., & Whitehurst, L. (2010). Domestic Homicide and Homicide-Suicide: The Older Offender. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, 38, (3), 305-311.
- Bourne, J. and Derry, C. (2004) *Women and Law* London: Old Bailey Press
- Brennan, D. (2016). *Femicide Census*. Retrieved March 30, 2018, from <http://www.northwales-pcc.gov.uk/Document-Library/Advice/Femicide-Census-Report-2016.pdf>
- Campbell, C., Glass, N., Sharps, P., Laughon, K., & Bloom, T. (2007) Mortality Related to Intimate Partner Violence: a review of research and implications for the advocacy, criminal justice, and healthcare systems. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 8, (3), 246-269.
- Carabine, J. (2001) Unmarried Motherhood 1830-1990: A genealogical analysis in Wetherall, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S.J. (eds) *Discourse as Data. A guide for analysis* London: Sage
- DASH (2009) available at <http://www.dashriskchecklist.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/DASH-2009.pdf>

- Dawson, M. and Piscitelli, A. (2017) *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* available at <http://www.violenceresearch.ca/sites/default/files/RISK%20FACTORS%20IN%20DOMESTIC%20HOMICIDES%252c%20COMMON%20CLUSTERS.pdf>
- Fairbairn, J., Jaffe, P. and Dawson, M. (2017) Challenges in Defining Domestic Homicide: considerations for research and practice. In Dawson, M. (ed) *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: an international perspective* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan
- De Haldevang, M. (2018, February 15). Florida shooter Nikolas Cruz shared a trait with other mass killers: He abused women. *Quartz Media*. Retrieved February 17, 2018, from <https://qz.com/1208345/parkland-florida-attack-school-shooter-nikolas-cruz-abused-women-like-most-mass-killers/>
- Devaney, J., Lazenbatt, A. (2016) *Domestic Violence Perpetrators: Evidence-Informed Responses* London: Routledge
- Dobash, R.E. and Dobash, R.P. (2015). *When Men Murder Women (interpersonal violence)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dobash, R.E. and Dobash, R.P. (2002) *Women, Violence and Social Change* London: Routledge
- Dobash, R.E. and Dobash, R.P. (1998). *Rethinking Violence Against Women*. London: Sage.
- Dutton, D. and Corvo, K. (2006). Transforming a flawed policy: A call to revive psychology and science in domestic violence research and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*, 457-483.
- Everytown (2017). Mass Shootings in the United States 2009 – 2016. *Everytown Gun Safety research report*. Retrieved March 30, 2018, from [https://everytownresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Analysis\\_of\\_Mass\\_Shooting\\_033117.pdf](https://everytownresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Analysis_of_Mass_Shooting_033117.pdf)

- Farnham, F. (2018) *Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (Psychology Division) Conference on Stalking* Leicestershire Police Headquarters. 4.08.18
- Fisher, H. (2004) *Why We Love: The Nature and Chemistry of Romantic Love* New York: Holt McDougal
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith New York: Pantheon
- Garrison, A.H. (1996). The Catathymic Crisis: An explanation of the serial killer. *The Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 11, (1), 5-12.
- Gilchrist, E. (2013) Domestic Abuse in the UK: Why we need to understand perpetrators. In N. Lombard, & E. McMillan, (Eds.), *Violence Against Women: Current Theory and Practice in Domestic Abuse, Sexual Violence and Exploitation* 159 – 176. London: Jessica Kingsley
- Gondolf, E.W. (2007). *Theoretical and Research Support for the Duluth Model: a reply to Dutton and Corvo*. Retrieved February 19, 2018, from <https://www.theduluthmodel.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Theoretical-and-Research-Support.pdf>
- Gulliver, P. & Fanslow, J.L. (2015). The Johnson Typologies of Intimate Partner Violence: an investigation of their representation in a general population of New Zealand women. *Journal of Child Custody*, 12, 1, pp 25-46
- Guzik, K. (2008) The Agencies of Abuse: Intimate Abusers' Experience of Arrest and Prosecution. *Law and Society Review* v42 i1 p111-144
- Hall, J. (2015). Feminist Strategies to End Violence Against Women. In R. Baksh, & W. Harcourt, (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Transnational Feminist Movements* (394-418.) Oxford: Oxford University Press

Home Office (2016a) Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme. One year on – Home Office assessment of national roll out.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/505434/2016-03-08\\_DVDS\\_report\\_\\_final\\_.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/505434/2016-03-08_DVDS_report__final_.pdf) accessed 14.10.18

Home Office (2016b) Multi-agency statutory guidance for the conduct of domestic homicide reviews available at

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/575273/DHR-Statutory-Guidance-161206.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/575273/DHR-Statutory-Guidance-161206.pdf) accessed 15 Oct 2018

Home Office, (2016c), *Domestic Violence and Abuse*, available at

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/575232/HO-Domestic-Homicide-Review-Analysis-161206.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/575232/HO-Domestic-Homicide-Review-Analysis-161206.pdf) accessed 15 October 2018

Home Office (2016d) *Strategy to End Violence Against Women and Girls 2016 – 2020*

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/522166/VAWG\\_Strategy\\_FINAL\\_PUBLICATION\\_MASTER\\_vRB.PDF](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/522166/VAWG_Strategy_FINAL_PUBLICATION_MASTER_vRB.PDF)

Ingala Smith (2018) *Counting Dead Women* <https://kareningalasmith.com/counting-dead-women/>

accessed 2.5.2019

Johnson, H., Eriksson, L., Mazerolle, P. & Wortley, R., (2019). Intimate Femicide: The Role of

Coercive Control. *Feminist Criminology*. Available at <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1547775/>

Accessed 6.5.2019

- Johnson, M. (2011). Gender and types of intimate partner violence: A response to an anti-feminist literature review. *Aggression and Violence*, 16, (4), 289-296.
- Johnson, M. (2008). *A Typology of Domestic Violence: Intimate Terrorism, Violent Resistance, and Situational Couple Violence*. Boston: Northeastern University Press
- Johnson, C. and Sachman, M. (2014) Familicide – Suicide: From myth to hypothesis and towards understanding *Family Court Review. An Interdisciplinary Journal* v52 i1 p100-113
- Lees, S. (1997). *Ruling Passions: Sexual violence, reputation and the law*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Luckenbill, D. F. (1977). Criminal Homicide as a Situational Transaction. *Social Problems*, 25, (2), 176-186.
- McLaren, H.J. (2013) (Un)-blaming mothers whose partners sexually abuse children: in view of heteronormative myths, pressures and authorities. *Child and Family Social Work* v18 n4 439-448
- Monckton Smith, J. (2010). *Relating Rape and Murder: narratives of sex, death and gender*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan
- Monckton Smith, J. (2012). *Murder, Gender and the Media: Narratives of dangerous love*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan
- Monckton Smith, J., Williams, A., & Mullane, F. (2014). *Domestic Abuse, Homicide and Gender: strategies for policy and practice*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan
- Monckton Smith, J., Szymanska, K. & Haile, S., (2017). Exploring the relationship between stalking and homicide. *Suzy Lamplugh Trust*. Retrieved March 30, 2018 from <http://eprints.glos.ac.uk/4553/>

- Mullen, P.E., Mackenzie, R., Ogloff, J.R.P., Pathé, M., McEwan, T., & Purcell, R. (2006). Assessing and Managing the Risks in the Stalking Situation. *Journal American Academy of Psychiatry and Law*, 34, 439–50.
- Mullen, P.E. (2004). The autogenic (self generated) massacre. *Behavioural Science and Law*. 22, (3), 311-23.
- Mullen, P.E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2000). *Stalkers and their Victims*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- NCICP (2003) National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. *Costs of intimate partner violence against women in the United States*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for disease control and prevention
- Pollack, O. (1950) *The Criminality of Women* University of Pennsylvania Press
- Schlesinger, L.B. (2002). Stalking, Homicide, and Catathymic Process: A Case Study. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 46, (1), 64-74.
- Sechrist, S.M. and Weil, J.D. (2017) Assessing the Impact of a Focused Deterrence Strategy to Combat Intimate Partner Domestic Violence *Violence Against Women* v24 i3 first published Feb 2017 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077801216687877>
- Shapiro, D.L. and Noe, A.M. (2015) *Risk Assessment: Origins, Evolution and Implications for Practice*. SpringerBriefs in Behavioural Criminology London: Springer
- Standing Together (2016) Domestic Homicide Review (DHR): Case Analysis, accessed on October 20<sup>th</sup> 2017 at [http://www.standingtogether.org.uk/sites/default/files/docs/STADV\\_DHR\\_Report\\_Final.pdf](http://www.standingtogether.org.uk/sites/default/files/docs/STADV_DHR_Report_Final.pdf),

- Stanton, G. (2016) 10 Stages of Genocide available at <http://genocidewatch.net/genocide-2/8-stages-of-genocide/> accessed 2.5.2019
- Stark, E. (2009), *Coercive Control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- UNODC (2013). Global Study on Homicide. *United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime*. Retrieved March 30, 2018 from [https://www.unodc.org/documents/gsh/pdfs/GLOBAL\\_HOMICIDE\\_Report\\_ExSum.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/gsh/pdfs/GLOBAL_HOMICIDE_Report_ExSum.pdf)
- Websdale, N. (2010). *Familicidal Hearts: the emotional styles of 211 killers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Websdale, N. (1999). *Understanding Domestic Homicide*. Boston: Northeastern University Press
- Websdale, N. & Dedolph, B. (2000). *Lethality Assessment Tools: A Critical Analysis*. Retrieved March 30, 2018 from <https://vawnet.org/material/lethality-assessment-tools-critical-analysis>
- Yllo, M. & Bograd, L. (1988). *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*. London: Sage