

## IN BRIEF

# COERCIVE CONTROL AS A PRECURSOR TO FEMICIDE IN KENYA

## Executive Summary

This technical brief emerges from Kenya's socio-cultural analysis of femicide (UN Women Kenya report, 2026) and examines coercive control as a critical early warning indicator of femicide. Evidence from multiple counties shows that femicide is rarely the result of a single violent incident; rather, it is the lethal culmination of prolonged patterns of domination in which perpetrators restrict women's autonomy through surveillance, isolation, intimidation, and economic deprivation. Survivors and communities consistently reported long periods of coercive behaviour preceding killings, particularly when women disclosed abuse, resisted control, or attempted to leave relationships. National mapping further confirms that many victims had sought help before their deaths, but non-physical abuse was minimised or overlooked by institutions until violence escalated. The brief highlights a significant legal and policy gap: coercive control is not recognised as an offence under Kenyan law, limiting early intervention. Addressing femicide therefore requires recognising coercive control as a serious, actionable risk; strengthening screening, frontline response, and justice-chain coordination; and shifting prevention efforts upstream, before control hardens into lethal violence.

## 1) Introduction

### Coercive control as early femicide risk



Kenya's socio cultural analysis of femicide shows that most lethal attacks are not isolated outbursts but the culmination of a sustained pattern of coercive control domination tactics that restrict a woman's autonomy, mobility, access to help, and ability to exit a relationship safely; in Meru, Makueni, Kisumu and Nairobi, families and community members consistently described long periods of monitoring, intimidation, and threats before a killing, particularly at moments of disclosure or separation. Independent national mapping (Femicide Report 2025) reaches the same conclusion: most victims had previously sought help or reported danger, and killings frequently followed ignored warning signs rather than spontaneous conflict, making coercive control a practical early risk indicator for femicide across Kenyan counties.

## 2) Forms of coercive control - surveillance, isolation, economic deprivation



Across the study counties, survivors and families described surveillance (phone checks, GPS style following, forced sharing of passwords), isolation (forbidding visits to relatives, blocking contact with neighbours, controlling attendance at church/barazas), and economic deprivation (confiscating earnings, denying money for transport or healthcare, sabotaging work) as routine precursors to lethal violence; these tactics reduce a woman's "space for action," trap her in place, and make reporting/logistics for escape difficult or impossible. The Femicide Report 2025 and Africa Data Hub's longitudinal analysis add a digital layer: stalking, doxing, and luring to rentals or short lets have become common control tools in urban corridors (Nairobi–Kiambu–Nakuru), with killings overwhelmingly occurring in private spaces and the perpetrator known to the victim, which is consistent with an entrenched pattern of control rather than a single event.

## 3) Why coercive control escalates to homicide



Coercive control functions as a system of domination that conditions women to comply and punishes resistance; the UN Women study documents that

risk spikes when women assert boundaries, disclose sexual or physical abuse, or attempt separation, because control oriented partners interpret these acts as loss of status or humiliation and escalate to overt violence, including strangulation and fatal attacks. The national femicide mapping further shows that the home ostensibly a safe place is the primary site of homicide precisely because control is exercised there over time, and that many victims had approached chiefs or police shortly before death, indicating that failure to interrupt coercive control early enables escalation to murder.

## 4) Case evidence — Meru, Makueni, Kisumu



In Meru, community accounts highlight daily supervisory behaviours and financial restriction that were known to neighbours but "normalised," until the victim was killed following a dispute about leaving; subsequent review revealed prior reports and missing documentation at health and police levels.

In Makueni, women described being locked in homes, starved, and threatened if they sought external help, while families urged endurance ("vumilia hapo"); several femicides followed aborted exit attempts in which no immediate protection or safe accommodation was provided despite prior complaints.

In Kisumu (Nyando/Obunga), focus groups explained that separation is framed as public embarrassment for men; stalking and repeated intimidation preceded several killings, and witnesses recounted requests for help that did not trigger a rapid, coordinated response.

## 5) The legal gap — coercive control is not recognised in Kenyan law



Although Kenya’s legal framework criminalises assault and provides civil remedies (e.g., protection orders), coercive control as a stand alone offence is not recognised, leaving a large portion of dangerous, non physical abuse outside the reach of criminal law and making early, preventive interventions more difficult for police, prosecutors, and courts. The 2026 Technical Working Group on Gender Based Violence also underscores systemic classification and data gaps, noting the absence of a femicide indicator and the failure to tag risk factors such as prior coercive behaviours, which impairs targeted action. The UN Women study similarly documents widespread first contact minimisation (“no bruises, no case”), confirming that, in practice, non physical domination has little procedural weight until the violence turns overt, by which time risk of homicide is already high.

## 6) Recommendations — criminalisation, screening tools, and frontline training



Kenya should adopt a coercive control offence that captures pattern based psychological, economic, and technological domination, aligning criminal law with real world femicide risk as documented in county narratives; codification would signal zero tolerance for non physical abuse, enable risk based bail conditions (no contact, geofencing), and facilitate

earlier arrests before violence escalates. Parallel to law reform, counties should introduce screening tools at chiefs’ offices, police stations, and Gender Based Violence Recovery Centres so that surveillance, isolation, and economic deprivation trigger first hour protective steps (scene/phone evidence capture, escorted reporting, safe accommodation, ODPP early consultation), instead of being dismissed as “family issues.” Frontline capacity must be upgraded through health and police training on: recognising coercive patterns, documenting digital evidence (texts, call logs, app messages, location trails), issuing time bound no contact orders, and activating relocation/transport stipends to prevent attrition measures repeatedly tied to case survival and homicide prevention in national analyses. Finally, justice chain governance should embed typology aware dashboards that include a “coercive control risk” tag within the broader femicide indicator (alongside intimate partner, property/land, sexual violence linked, and witchcraft typologies) so counties can monitor time to response, protective orders issued, and breaches closing the current visibility gap.

## 7) Conclusion



The Kenyan evidence base is unequivocal: coercive control is the early, actionable warning system for femicide, and it is visible to families, neighbours, chiefs, police, and health providers long before lethal harm; when institutions dismiss non physical abuse or lack tools to respond, control hardens into lethal violence, often at disclosure or separation. Criminalising coercive control, mainstreaming screening and first hour protocols, and training police and health workers to treat control as an emergency signal will transform early warnings into safety moving the justice chain upstream to prevent femicide rather than merely record it.

## References

- **Primary:** *Kenya's socio cultural analysis of femicide (UN Women Kenya report, 2026)* – patterns of coercive control, escalation at separation/disclosure, and justice chain gaps across Meru, Makueni, Kisumu, and Nairobi.
- **Heinrich Böll Stiftung** (Jan 27, 2026). *She Did Not Die by Accident: Femicide Report 2025* – national mapping of ignored warnings, first hour failures, and home/private space lethality.
- **Africa Data Hub** (2016–2025). *Femicide Kenya: Silencing Women* – county clustering; known perpetrator and home location predominance; digital age context for control in urban counties.
- **Technical Working Group on GBV (via The Star, Jan 27, 2026)** – national surge figures, lack of a femicide indicator, and policy gaps that fail to capture risk markers like coercive control.

---

## Acknowledgement

This brief was derived from the report on the Socio-Cultural Analysis of Femicide in Kenya, developed by UN Women Kenya in collaboration with the University of Nairobi. It synthesizes key findings and insights to inform evidence based programming and policy dialogue on ending violence against women and girls. This brief was developed by Mary Wanjiru-UN Women Kenya Ending Violence Against Women and Girls Team Leader; Jack Onyisi Abebe- UN Women East and Southern Africa Knowledge Management and Research Specialist and Emily Mwasame-UN Women East and Southern Africa Knowledge Management Assistant under the overall guidance and leadership of Adama Moussa-UN Women East and Southern Africa Deputy Regional Director; Antonia N’Gabala-Sodonon-UN Women Kenya Country Representative and Dan Bazira-UN Women Kenya Deputy Country Representative.

We gratefully acknowledge the invaluable contributions of Joan Obunga-Legal Expert; Christine Okeno-UN Women Kenya Programme Analyst; Evelyn Okatch and Fatuma Abbas, Programme Associates in the Ending Violence Against Women portfolio. Their technical expertise, strategic insights and unwavering commitment were instrumental in shaping the content, strengthening the analysis and ensuring the relevance and quality of this brief.

UN Women exists to advance women’s rights, gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls. As the lead UN entity on gender equality, we shift laws, institutions, social behaviours and services to close the gender gap and build an equal world for all women and girls. We keep the rights of women and girls at the centre of global progress – always, everywhere. Because gender equality is not just what we do. It is who we are.