

Economic Abuse as an Invisible Form of Domestic Violence: A Multicountry Review

TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, & ABUSE
2020, Vol. 21(2) 261-283
© The Author(s) 2018
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/1524838018764160
journals.sagepub.com/home/tva



Judy L. Postmus¹, Gretchen L. Hoge², Jan Breckenridge³,
Nicola Sharp-Jeffs⁴, and Donna Chung⁵

Abstract

The predominant perception of intimate partner violence (IPV) as constituting physical violence can still dominate, particularly in research and media reports, despite research documenting multiple forms of IPV including sexual violence occurring between intimate partners and various forms of psychological and emotional abuse. One frequently hidden or “invisible” form of abuse perpetrated within intimate partner relationships is economic abuse, also referred to as financial abuse in much of the literature. While the links between gendered economic insecurity and economic abuse are emerging, there remains a lack of consistency about definitions within the United States and globally, as there is no agreed upon index with which to measure economic abuse. As such, the purpose of this article is to review and analyze the global literature focused on either economic or financial abuse to determine how it is defined and what measures are used to capture its prevalence and impact. The 46 peer-reviewed articles that met all inclusion criteria for analysis came from a range of countries across six continents. Our review found that there is growing clarity and consistency of terminologies being used in these articles and found some consistency in the use of validated measures. Since this research is in its “infancy,” we need to have stronger collaborative efforts to use similar measures and terminology. Part of that collaborative effort is to consider how language and cultural differences may play a part in our understanding of economic abuse.

Keywords

anything related to domestic violence, domestic violence, battered women

Introduction

The fact that intimate partner violence (IPV) is a significant social concern affecting a substantial number of women and children is now undeniable, making it a gendered problem. In most international jurisdictions, the importance of understanding the needs of and responding to IPV victims is clearly understood. Establishing the prevalence of all forms of violence against women (VAW) has been a priority since the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women*,¹ adopted in 1979 by the United Nations General Assembly (Articles 12 and 19). Most recently, the 2011 *Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating VAW and domestic violence*, also known as the Istanbul Convention,² further details the importance of research intended to move beyond prevalence in order to better understand the dynamics of VAW in Europe (including IPV; Article 11). As a direct result of the number of international conventions and treaties, research on VAW, including IPV has been prioritized in many jurisdictions ensuring a growing global evidence base.

Despite prioritizing research in this area, the predominant focus of international and national studies to date has been on establishing the prevalence of physical violence and/or threat.

While surely unintended, the seriousness of the effects of IPV is most often assessed by the extent and nature of any physical injury. This perception of IPV as primarily constituting physical violence still dominates, particularly in media reports of IPV, regardless of reports from practitioners and victims substantiating multiple forms of abuse. Such forms include sexual violence and various forms of psychological and emotional abuse. In an effort to better understand the dynamics of these latter two manifestations of IPV, many researchers argue that

¹ Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

² Department of Social Work, Lewis University, Romeoville, IL, USA

³ School of Social Sciences, UNSW, Sydney, Australia

⁴ Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, London Metropolitan University, London, United Kingdom

⁵ School of Occupational Therapy and Social Work, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Corresponding Author:

Judy L. Postmus, Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers University, 390 George Street, Suite 408, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA.

Email: postmus@ssw.rutgers.edu

the context in which violence and abuse occur in intimate partnerships—frequently referred to as contexts of “coercive control” (Stark, 2007), is critical. This is where abusers use a variety of tactics to maintain control over their partners by forcing physical, emotional, and financial dependency and producing a continual fear which prevents women from challenging their actions. Women forced into such dependency are at greater risk, according to the marital dependency theory (Vyas & Watts, 2008) and the interdependence theory (Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003), of being trapped in the relationship. This explains why women report that economic concerns are one of their top reasons why leaving the abuser is so difficult (Sanders & Schnabel, 2006; Strube, 1988). It is precisely the relational and gendered context of IPV that makes these tactics hard to detect because the “means and effects . . . are easily confused with the range of sacrifices women are expected to make in their roles as homemakers, parents and sexual partners” (Stark, 2007, p. 230).

One frequently hidden or “invisible” form of abuse perpetrated within intimate partner relationships is economic or financial abuse. Practitioners and emerging qualitative research have for some time recognized that IPV contributes to “poverty, financial risk and financial insecurity for women, sometimes long after the relationship has ended” (Braaf & Barrett Meyering, 2010, p. 5). From this perspective, economic insecurity is framed as a likely consequence of IPV for women leaving a violent relationship at the time of separation and in its aftermath. Although identified early on by practitioners in the IPV field as a fundamental underpinning of coercive control, only relatively recently has economic abuse been conceptualized as separate from emotional and psychological abuse—albeit with some overlap (Stylianou, Postmus, & McMahon, 2013). Corrie and McGuire (2013) suggest that we are yet to fully establish the prevalence of economic abuse, in part, because victims may have difficulty distinguishing economically abusive patterns from the economic insecurity they experience as women.

Economic insecurity is, without doubt, a gendered issue with factors such as the gendered nature of care, the undervaluing of women’s paid and unpaid work, and workforce discrimination all contributing to women consistently experiencing poorer social and economic outcomes throughout their life course. Given that existing prevalence data provide evidence of gender asymmetry in victimization and perpetration of IPV, it is not a surprise that economic abuse is compounded by the context of women’s economic insecurity more generally. It is also possible that victims do not always understand the ongoing consequences and extent of the damage caused by economic abuse prior to leaving the relationship and so may fail to recognize economic abuse as a form of IPV during the relationship.

While the links between gendered economic insecurity and economic abuse are emergent at best (Corrie, 2016), there remains a lack of consistency about definitions within the United States and globally, as there is no agreed index with which to measure economic abuse, underscoring the purpose of

this article. As with all measures of social concerns, definitions do matter and it is here that the research can lack precision. The choice of different terms defined in slightly different ways, and the interchange of terms at other times has had the unintended effect of diluting the evidence base. The lack of definitional clarity also means it is difficult to measure whether service and policy responses are dealing appropriately with the issue, if at all. As such, the purpose of this article is to determine how the peer-reviewed global literature defines and measures economic or financial abuse to then highlight implications based on an analysis of the literature. The questions framing this study include (1) how do researchers define economic/financial abuse? and (2) how do researchers measure economic/financial abuse?

Existing Definitions of Economic Abuse and Financial Abuse

Economic abuse has been defined as a deliberate pattern of control in which individuals interfere with their partner’s ability to acquire, use, and maintain economic resources (Adams, Sullivan, Bybee, & Greeson, 2008; Postmus, Plummer, McMahon, Murshid, & Kim, 2012). Academics have sought to categorize the different forms that economic abuse can take. For instance, Postmus, Plummer, and Stylianou (2016) suggest that economic abuse involves behaviors that control, exploit, or sabotage an individual’s economic resources including employment.

Economic abuse and financial abuse are frequently used interchangeably in the literature (Sharp-Jeffs, 2015b). Alternatively, abuse may be described as affecting the economic or financial security of victims of IPV or causing economic or financial insecurity. Sharp-Jeffs (2015a) adapted the definition of economic abuse, proposing to use the term “financial abuse” instead of economic abuse. The distinction made here between economic and financial abuse is that financial abuse is part of economic abuse and involves similar behaviors; however, financial abuse focuses specifically on individual money and finances and not economic resources (e.g., transportation, a place to live, employment, and education; Sharp-Jeffs, 2015a). Yount, Krause, and VanderEnde (2016) recently used the term “economic coercion” to describe the same economic abusive behaviors identified by others (Adams et al., 2008; Postmus, Plummer, & Stylianou, 2016) in which an abuser attempts to control the partner’s ability to acquire, use, and maintain resources.

It is important to note that much of the available literature describes a range of controlling behaviors or tactics which may keep victims of IPV financially dependent and socially isolated, often, in place of a definition. Some of the tactics of economic abuse include reduced access to savings and assets (Braaf & Barrett Meyering, 2010), deliberately causing housing insecurity by damaging property or not making rent or mortgage payments (Valentine & Breckenridge, 2016), and malicious interference with workforce and educational participation (Breckenridge, Walden, & Flax, 2014).

Measuring Economic Abuse

The measures used in studies on IPV may include items that ask about forms of economic or financial abuse; however, without identifying such abuse as a focus of the work, they fail to reliably capture the scope, complexity, or magnitude of the abuse. For example, Outlaw (2009) included one question about economic abuse as part of the National Violence Against Women Survey and then concluded that economic abuse was a rare phenomenon, occurring less than physical abuse.

Other studies have included more than one question on economic abuse but again, fail to identify the term as a focus of the work. Instead, the questions are frequently integrated into emotional or psychological abuse scales or subscales. For example, the Abusive Behavior Inventory (ABI; Shepard & Campbell, 1992) has two subscales—Physical and Psychological—in which a few questions on economic abuse are part of the Psychological Abuse subscale. Similarly, the Index of Spouse Abuse Hudson & McIntosh, 1981) had physical and Non-Physical Abuse subscales in which the Non-Physical Abuse subscale included two questions on economic abuse; however, the term was never mentioned in the reporting of the results. The Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI; Tolman, 1989) has five questions on economic abuse as part of the long form; however, the short form only retained one question.

Other researchers included questions on economic abuse without recognizing they had done so. For example, Lloyd (1997) used an expanded version of the Conflict Tactics Scale to include questions around work sabotage efforts, which is a form of economic abuse. Although not naming economic abuse, the qualitative portion of this study provided illustrations of what could be understood as employment sabotage, economic exploitation, and economic control. Similarly, Tolman and Wang (2005) focused on employment sabotage efforts that abusers use against victims in their literature review; unfortunately, they failed to mention or include questions on economic or financial abuse in their measure of abuse.

Finally, Weaver, Sanders, Campbell, and Schnabel (2009) created the Domestic Violence–Related Financial Issues Scale (DV-FI) that included a subscale on economic abuse as part of their evaluation of a financial literacy program. This subscale only included five questions, of which three focused on credit card debt and credit rating and failed to capture a wider view of the phenomenon.

Adams, Sullivan, Bybee, and Greeson (2008) created the first Scale of Economic Abuse (SEA) from several sources such as existing research and from interviews with advocates and IPV survivors. The researchers started with a 120-item scale covering several concepts of economic abuse including preventing women's resource acquisition, preventing women's use of resources, and exploiting women's resources. After further testing, the final scale included 28 questions and two subscales including economic exploitation and economic control.

Postmus et al. (2016) further tested the SEA and reduced the items to 12 questions, naming it the SEA-12. From their

analyses, they found three conceptual categories of economic abuse—economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage. Further testing of the SEA-12 with a new sample of survivors found that the SEA-12 was a reliable and valid measure of economic abuse and that such abuse is distinctly different from physical, emotional, and sexual abuse (Stylianou et al., 2013). Additionally, the testing found that the three constructs were also uniquely different from each other and from other forms of abuse.

While it is clear from a preliminary review of the literature that economic abuse may be reported by victims of IPV, research to date subsumes economic abuse into the categories of emotional or psychological abuse, fails to report the findings as economic abuse, or does not report the results of the limited number of survey questions at all. Additionally, the recent publications of a scale for economic abuse has had limited testing with varied samples of survivors; they were also only tested with samples in the United States. Hence, the measurement of economic abuse in IPV is limited. Additionally, there have been no studies which have attempted to systematically review the ways in which it has been measured internationally.

Method

The purpose of this study was to provide greater clarity on how the peer-reviewed global literature defines and measures economic or financial abuse and then to provide implications based on an analysis of this literature. The questions framing this study include (1) how do researchers define economic/financial abuse? and (2) how do researchers measure economic/financial abuse?

Search Strategy

We conducted a comprehensive review between April 2016 and May 2017 of main databases in the following fields: social work, sociology, psychology, public policy, gender and women's studies, criminal justice, and economics. Databases searched included: Social Work Abstracts (EBSCO), Social Services Abstracts, Family and Society Studies Worldwide, PAIS International, PsychiatryOnline, PsychINFO (including PsychARTICLES), Sociological Abstracts, ProQuest Sociology, PubMed, Business Source Premier, Econlit, Worldwide Political Science Abstracts, Academic Search Premier, GenderWatch, Women's Studies International, and Criminal Justice Abstracts. Search terms included: (1) "financial abuse," (2) "economic abuse," (3) "economic security AND abuse," and (4) a combination of all three ("financial abuse" OR "economic abuse" OR "economic security AND abuse"). Search terms, when entered as a string, used "OR" between individual search terms to minimize overlap in search results while still ensuring that all relevant articles would be captured for each string term. There was no limit on the year in which the article could be published. Due to the large number of results in each search, the search was limited to peer-reviewed, scholarly literature. Articles were limited to those published in the English language.

Inclusion Criteria

The database search resulted in 274 articles that addressed financial or economic abuse in the context of IPV, elder abuse, system-related abuse, abuse and disability, and child abuse. This was narrowed to 80 articles that specifically related to IPV or VAW. Although we recognize that IPV is a gendered problem with most victims identified as female, to be exhaustive in our search for research on economic abuse, we included any studies in peer-reviewed journals regardless of the gender of the perpetrator or the victim.

An analysis of the 80 articles was first done to identify whether economic or financial abuse was mentioned as a main focus ($n = 33$) of the article (i.e., economic abuse was a variable in the analyses and the article included an in-depth discussion of these results) or as a semifocus ($n = 47$) of the article (i.e., economic abuse was a variable but was not the specific focus of the article). Upon further analysis, three articles were removed due to publication in nonacademic sources and one article was removed as it was a research proposal, narrowing the articles for consideration to 76 articles. Reference lists of key authors, identified based on our familiarity with their work, and articles examining the measurement of economic abuse, were then reviewed to determine whether any additional articles should be included. This resulted in the addition of one article for analysis for a total of 77 articles.

Decisions about the inclusion of articles in analysis at this stage involved two steps of evaluation, which resulted in the removal of eight articles, leaving 69 articles. Articles were then further excluded from analysis if they did not clearly define economic/financial abuse and provide additional examples of tactics. For example, articles were excluded from analysis if their focus was on a general IPV measure and included items that would be categorized as economic/financial abuse by experts in this area but did not name them or categorize them as such ($n = 2$). Additionally, articles where the multidimensional construct was called something other than economic/financial abuse (i.e., economic coercion, financial coercive control) were also excluded ($n = 2$). This left 65 articles remaining for consideration. Finally, all eight conceptual articles and 11 qualitative only studies were removed. These articles, while providing interesting information and theories about economic abuse, did not define or test this form of abuse which is the key focus on this study. In the end, this left the analysis to focus on 46 articles examining economic abuse in a quantitative ($n = 42$) or mixed methods ($n = 4$) capacity.

Data Extraction and Analysis

An in-depth analysis of the full length of each article was conducted to gather relevant data. These data included the type of research conducted (i.e., quantitative, mixed method), sample characteristics, the country where the research took place, the study setting, how authors referred to the construct (i.e., economic abuse/financial abuse/something else), how authors

defined economic/financial abuse and the specific tactics included in the introduction and background sections of their manuscripts, the characteristics of tools used to measure economic abuse presented in the methods and results sections of each manuscript, and the manner in which economic abuse was used in the research conducted (i.e., independent/predictor variable, dependent/outcome variable, measurement development). The data were then analyzed through constant comparison methods to extract answers to our questions guiding this study. To complement this inductive analysis approach, we also used a deductive or a priori approach to understanding how economic or financial abuse was defined. This a priori approach was based on the knowledge of the theoretical and measurement development literature on economic or financial abuse in which we used the three constructs of economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage. These inductive and deductive approaches to the analysis allowed us to acknowledge our own biases around constructs related to economic abuse while also allowing for the possibility of additional constructs to derive from the literature.

Results

The 46 peer-reviewed articles that met all inclusion criteria for analysis came from a range of countries across six continents. The majority of articles (17) came from research conducted in the United States. Four articles came from South Africa. Three articles came from research in Canada or Palestine. Two articles came from the UK, Ivory Coast, and the Philippines. One article from each of the following countries was also included: Australia, Germany, Iran, Japan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Nigeria, South Korea, Tanzania, Trinidad, Turkey, and Zimbabwe. One article was derived from a multicountry study conducted in Asia and the Pacific.

Overall, 18 studies examined economic abuse with victims. Thirteen of the studies included samples of female victims who were recruited using various methods from community settings, domestic violence agencies and shelters, health-care settings, or an Individual Development Account savings program for IPV victims. One study focused on gay and bisexual male victims from HIV agencies serving men of color. One study included a random sample of both male and female victims from a nationally representative survey. One study compared the experiences of a sample of female perpetrators of abuse (as victims) in an offenders' program with a sample of female victims in a shelter setting. Two studies compared the experiences (as victims and perpetrators of abuse) of convenience samples of female survivors staying in women's shelters, male and female college students, and male prisoners.

There were 26 studies that recruited participants from the general population of women and/or men. This included 20 studies that examined the construct with a general sample of women. These women were recruited from the community using various methods, from health-care settings, from

microfinance programs, or by using a random sample of women from nonrepresentative samples or from nationally or geographically representative samples. One study examined the construct with a sample of men (as potential perpetrators) that was representative of each of nine site samples across multiple countries. Five studies examined the construct with both men and women using a convenience sample from the community, or using a random sample obtained from a nationally representative survey, from a military management system, or from a college campus.

Overall, two studies examined the concept with service providers. One of these studies included a sample of lawyers and advocates working in the field. The other study surveyed medical students who would potentially treat patients who had experienced IPV. Please refer to Table 1 for a description of the articles.

How Economic/Financial Abuse Is Defined

Table 2 provides information on how economic abuse was defined and measured in the 46 articles. Each citation includes a brief description and whether: (1) economic abuse was clearly defined or not, (2) economic abusive tactics were included or not, and (3) which constructs were captured in the definition/tactics.

Overall, 20 articles included a clear definition of economic/financial abuse and/or listed more than one tactic used by perpetrators to illustrate the construct in the introduction or background section of the manuscript. Upon analysis, these tactics were thematically captured under the three constructs identified in theoretical and measurement development literature including economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage. Of the 20 articles with a clear definition and/or description of abusive tactics, 14 articles covered tactics that could fall under all three constructs of economic abuse. Three articles included tactics that would fall under the categories of economic control and economic exploitation. Two articles included tactics that only covered economic control. One article included tactics that are categorized as economic control and employment sabotage. The remaining 26 articles contained no clear definition of economic abuse or tactics used.

Overall, the construct of economic control received the most attention in definitions, as every article with a clear definition either named the construct or included tactics that illustrate this construct in its definition of economic abuse ($n = 20$). Such economic control tactics included: restricting access to finances, refusing to contribute financially for necessities or other items, restricting access to financial information or involvement with financial decision-making, and controlling the household spending. This was followed by economic exploitation ($n = 17$) and employment sabotage ($n = 15$). Economic exploitation included tactics such as misusing family finances; damaging property; stealing property, money, or identities; going into debt through coercion or in secret; kicking the victim out of the living situation; using wealth as a weapon or as a threat; selling necessary household or personal items; restricting access to health care or insurance; and denying or

Table 1. Description of Articles.

| Country of Origin | |
|--|--------|
| United States | 17 |
| South Africa | 4 |
| Canada and Palestine | 3 Each |
| UK, Ivory Coast, and Philippines | 2 Each |
| Australia, Germany, Iran, Japan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Nigeria, South Korea, Tanzania, Trinidad, Turkey, and Zimbabwe | 1 Each |
| Multicountry (Asia and the Pacific) | 1 |
| Sample | |
| Victims—female | 13 |
| Victims—gay and bisexual male victims | 1 |
| Victims—male and female | 1 |
| Victims and perpetrators—female and male | 3 |
| General sample of women from the community | 20 |
| General sample of men from the community | 1 |
| General sample of women and men from the community | 5 |
| Service providers (lawyers, advocates, or medical students) | 2 |
| Definitions of economic and financial abuse | |
| Included a clear definition | 20 |
| Named or described all three constructs (i.e., economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage) | 14 |
| Named or described two of the three constructs | 4 |
| Named or described one of the three constructs (i.e., economic control) | 2 |
| How economic or financial abuse is measured | |
| Used a validated tool to measure economic abuse (SEA or the SEA-12) | 4 |
| Used a validated tool (SEA-12) alongside a general IPV measurement tool (ABI) | 1 |
| Used general IPV measurement tools that included economic abuse items (i.e., ABI, CCB, DV-FI, CTS, Abuse Assessment Screen Questionnaire, CBS) | 9 |
| Used series of items about economic abuse, ranging from 1 to 5 questions | |
| Used one question | 5 |
| Used two questions | 9 |
| Used three questions | 6 |
| Used four questions | 4 |
| Used five questions | 1 |
| Did not use questions but described characteristics of economic abuse | 3 |
| Presented an unclear picture of how economic abuse was measured | 4 |

Note. $n = 46$. ABI = Abusive Behavior Inventory; CCB = Checklist of Controlling Behaviors; DV-FI = Domestic Violence-Related Financial Issues Scale; CBS = Controlling Behaviors Scale; SEA = Scale of Economic Abuse; SEA-12 = Scale of Economic Abuse-12; CTS = Conflict Tactics Scale.

restricting access to transportation. Employment sabotage tactics included anything related to interfering with or preventing a partner from work.

How Economic/Financial Abuse Is Measured

Researchers used a variety of measures to capture the construct of economic/financial abuse in their studies. A total of 44

Table 2. How Economic Abuse Is Measured and Defined in the Global Peer-Reviewed Literature.

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| Adams, A. E., Beeble, M. L., and Gregory, K. A. (2015) | United States | DV and sexual assault agency 93 Female IPV Victims Convenience sample | Scale of Economic Abuse (Adams et al., 2008) 28-item, validated measure of economic abuse. The 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from <i>never</i> (0) to <i>quite often</i> (4). Two subscales measuring economic exploitation (financial ways abusers take advantage of survivors) and economic control (abusers' efforts to dictate women's access to and use of money). Constructs captured—EC EE ES (ES items captured under EC subscale) | Set of tactics used to obtain power and control in an abusive relationship, involving controlling a woman's ability to acquire, use and maintain economic resources, thus threatening her economic security and potential for self-sufficiency. Tactics included: regulation of access to money and financial information, stealing money, refusing to work, generating debt in their partner's name, blaming woman for spending money on family needs, controlling her earnings, wasting money, direct and indirect interference with employment, and coerced debt 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Adams, A. E., Sullivan, C. M., Bybee, D., and Greeson, M. R. (2008) | United States | DV agencies 103 Female IPV victims Convenience sample | Scale of Economic Abuse, 28-item measure of economic abuse developed and validated in this study. The 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from <i>never</i> (1) to <i>quite often</i> (5), and also including <i>not applicable</i> (8) and <i>prefer not to answer</i> (9). Two subscales measuring economic exploitation and economic control Constructs captured—EC EE ES (ES items captured under EC subscale) | Part of the pattern of behaviors used by batterers to maintain power and control over their partners. This involves behaviors that control a woman's ability to acquire, use, and maintain economic resources, thus threatening her economic security and potential for self-sufficiency 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC |
| Antai, D., Antai, J., and Anthony, D. S. (2014) | Philippines | Households 8,478 Women Nationally representative sample | Four items chosen by authors. Response options included: no, often, sometimes, not at all, and yes. No and not at all were dichotomized to no, and all other answers were dichotomized to yes. Items included: (1) disallowed respondent to engage in legitimate work, (2) controlled respondent's money or forced her to work, (3) destroyed personal property/pet or threatened to harm pet, and (4) whether respondent had ever lost their job/source of income because of their husband. Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Form of DV and family violence involving behaviors that negatively affect a person financially, undermining efforts to become financially independent. Behaviors that control the ability to acquire, use, and maintain economic resources. Tactics included: prevent from obtaining/maintaining employment outside the home, cause her to lose her job or miss work, show up at work place, harass her at work, harass coworkers—with motive to interfere with woman's ability to acquire resources by preventing her from maintaining employment, monitoring how existing resources are used, strictly limiting access to household resources, denying access to money for essentials hiding jointly earned money, denying access to bank accounts, withholding financial information, destroying property, turning off utilities, credit card debt, refusing to make payments on bills 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|--|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Antai, D., Oke, A., Braithwaite, P., and Lopez, G. B. (2014) | Philippines | Households 8,478 Women Stratified, clustered, probability sample | Four items chosen by authors. Response options included: no, often, sometimes, not at all, and yes. No and not at all were dichotomized to no, and all other answers were dichotomized to yes. Items included: (1) disallowed respondent to engage in legitimate work, (2) controlled respondent's money or forced her to work, (3) destroyed personal property/pet or threatened to harm pet, and (4) whether respondent had ever lost their job/source of income because of their husband. Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Control of a woman's ability to acquire, use and maintain economic resources, threatening economic security, potential for self-sufficiency, and economic independence. Coercive behavior making victim economically dependent on partner and increasing risk of continued abuse. Tactics included: take control of resources by preventing employment outside home, cause job absence or loss by showing up at work, prevent use of existing resources by controlling distribution and use, deny access to joint bank accounts or financial information, exploit a woman's resources by stealing money, creating costs, generating debt 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Awwad, J., Ghazeeri, G, Nassar, A. H., Bazi, T., and Fakh, A. (2014) | Lebanon | Health clinic 91 Women Convenience sample | One item chosen by authors: "Does your partner control home expenditure denying you access to money?" Constructs captured—EC | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Falb, K. L., Annan, J., Kpebo, D., Cole, H., Willie, T., Xuan, Z., Raj, A., and Gupta, J. (2015) | Ivory Coast | Rural villages 682 Female IPV victims w/o microfinance experience Community sample | Three items chosen by authors. If participant responded "yes" to any item, they were coded as experiencing that form of violence. Items included: (1) asked the woman if her partner refused to give her money for household necessities even if there was money available, (2) took money against her will, and (3) obliged her to give him all or part of the money she earned. Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Fawole, O. I., van Wyk, J., and Adejimi, A. (2013) | Nigeria | Medical school setting 109 Medical students (women and men) Convenience sample | No information on specific measure or semistructured interview questions asked to capture and then quantify economic abuse. Constructs captured—Unclear | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Fulu, E., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., and Garcia-Moreno, C. (2013) | Multicountry—Asia and Pacific | Households 10,178 Men Cluster sample representative of each of nine sites (multicountry) | Four items chosen by authors. Measured as part of emotional abuse perpetration using an economic abuse subscale. Items included: (1) prohibited a partner from getting a job, going to work, trading, or earning money, (2) taken a partner's earnings against her will, (3) thrown a partner out of the house, and (4) kept money from your earnings for alcohol, tobacco, or other things for yourself when you knew your partner was finding it hard to afford the household expenses. Constructs captured—EC EE ES | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|---|--------------|--|---|---|
| Gaffoor, Z., Wand, H., Street, R. A., Abbai, N., and Ramjee, G. (2016) | South Africa | Public spaces (health clinics, malls, churches, taxi stands, community venues) 1,456 Sexually active, HIV-negative women Convenience sample | One item chosen by authors: "Sometimes in relationships women are abused by their partners. The abuse can be physical, like hitting or slapping, emotional like yelling, name-calling or threatening the children, or economic like taking away or not giving money. We would like to know if any of these things are happening to the women we speak to." Response was categorized into economic, emotional, and/or physical abuse. Constructs captured—EC | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Graham-Kevan, N., and Archer, J. (2008) | UK | DV shelter setting 43 Female IPV victims College setting 113 College students (women and men) Prison | Four items from the Controlling Behavior Scale (CBS; Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003) but did not specify item details. Five-point Likert-type scale ranging from never (0) to always (4) to indicate if and how often any of the behaviors listed were used to influence their partners. Constructs captured—unclear in this article (EC and ES captured in CBS (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003)) | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Graham-Kevan, N., and Archer, J. (2003) | UK | 108 Male prisoners All convenience samples DV shelter setting 43 Female IPV victims College setting 113 College students (women and men) Prison 108 Male prisoners All convenience samples | Five items from the Controlling Behaviors Scale (CBS) developed for this particular study. Respondents indicated whether they had used any of the behaviors listed, and then whether their partner had used any. Five-point Likert-type scale ranging from never (0) to always (4) to indicate the occurrence and frequency of controlling acts. Items included: (1) did you/your partner disapprove of the other working or studying? (2) if yes, did you/your partner try to prevent or make difficult the other working or studying? (3) did you/your partner feel it was necessary to have control of the other's money (e.g., wages, benefit)? (4) if yes, did you/your partner give the other an allowance/require other to ask for money? (5) did you/your partner have knowledge of the family income? Constructs captured—EC ES Three items chosen by authors. Dichotomized to binary summary score, "yes" to any or "no" to all over past year. Items included: (1) taken money against her will, (2) refused money for household necessities, and (3) obliged the woman to give him all or part of the money she earned Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Gupta, J., Falb, K. L., Lehmann, H., Kpebo, D., Xuan, Z., Hossain, M., Zimmerman, C., Watts, C., and Annan, J. (2013) | Ivory Coast | Rural villages 934 Women with partners Purposive sample | Constructs captured—EC ES | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|--------------------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| Haj-Yahia, M. M. (1999) | Palestine | Households 2,410 Married women Randomly selected sample | Two items chosen by authors. Part of a 32-item instrument developed specifically for this survey to measure psychological, physical, sexual, and economic abuse. Classical item test theory was used to create the scales used after data collection. Items included: (1) prevented you from using the family's money as you see fit and (2) tried to control your behavior or force you to do what he wants, while misusing the family's income and other resources to do so Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2000a) | Palestine | Households 1,334 Married women Randomly selected sample | Two items chosen by authors. Part of a 32-item instrument developed specifically for this survey to measure psychological, physical, sexual, and economic abuse. Classical item test theory was used to create the scales used after data collection Items included: (1) prevented you from using the family's money as you see fit and (2) tried to control your behavior or force you to do what he wants, while misusing the family's income and other resources to do so Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2000b) | Palestine | Households 2,410 Married women Randomly selected sample | Constructs captured—EC EE Two items chosen by authors. Part of a 32-item instrument developed specifically for this survey to measure psychological, physical, sexual, and economic abuse. Classical item test theory was used to create the scales used after data collection Items included: (1) prevented you from using the family's money as you see fit and (2) tried to control your behavior or force you to do what he wants, while misusing the family's income and other resources to do so Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Harned, M. S. (2001) | USA | Campus setting 874 Female and male college students Randomly selected sample | Constructs captured—EC EE ABI-12 (Shepard & Campbell, 1992) Unspecified items from validated, 12-item psychological abuse subscale of a general abuse measure. Examples referenced included: (1) restriction of financial resources and (2) has a dating partner prevented you from having money for your own use? Constructs captured—EC | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|---|--------------|---|---|---|
| Huang, C.-C., Postmus, J. L., Vikse, J. H., and Wang, L.-R. (2013) | USA | Hospital setting 2,107 mothers Subsample from stratified, multistage, randomly selected sample | Two items chosen by authors. Measured (never, sometimes, or often) over past 12 months. Coded "yes" if a woman had experienced either of the two abuse items "often" or "sometimes." Coded "no" if a woman reported "never" for both items. Items included: (1) he tried to prevent you from going to work and/or school and (2) he withheld money, made you ask for money, or took your money Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Defined as including "employment sabotage, economic control and economic exploitation." Defined as distinct from normal patterns of financial decision-making in relationships due to nature of control involved. One partner does not allow the other any say in financial decisions, controls her work activities and use of income, ruins credit as means to increase financial dependence 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Huang, C.-C., Vikse, J. H., Lu, S., and Yi, S. (2015) | USA | Hospital setting 2,410 Mothers Subsample from stratified, multistage, randomly selected sample | Two items chosen by authors. Frequency that father had committed these types of behaviors measured (never, sometimes, or often) over past 12 months. Coded "yes" if a woman had experienced either of the two abuse items "often" or "sometimes." Coded "no" if a woman reported "never" for both items. Items included: (1) he tried to prevent you from going to work and/or school and (2) he withheld money, made you ask for money, or took your money Constructs captured—EC EE ES | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Jewkes, R., Penn-Kekana, L., Levin, J., Ratsaka, M., and Schriber, M. (2000) | South Africa | Households 1,306 Women Stratified, multistage, randomly selected sample | Three items chosen by authors; measured as part of emotional abuse in past year. Items included: (1) prevented from working, (2) partner has not provided money to run the home or look after children but has money for other things, and (3) eviction from home. Constructs captured—EC EE ES | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Jewkes, R. K., Levin, J. B., and Penn-Kekana, L. A. (2003) | South Africa | Households 1,164 Women Stratified, multistage, randomly selected sample | Two items chosen by authors. Items included: (1) having not been given money to run the home when her partner had money for other things and (2) having her earnings taken by her partner Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Joyner, K., and Mash, R. J. (2011) | South Africa | Rural health clinics 168 Female IPV victims Convenience sample from purposefully selected sites | Three items chosen by authors. Items included: (1) withholding money, (2) controlling decisions, or (3) taking money Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No mention of tactics 3) No constructs captured |
| Kapiga, S., Harvey, S., Muhammad, A. K., Srocki, H., Mshana, G., Hashim, R., Hansen, C., Lees, S., and Watts, C. (2017) | Tanzania | Microfinance/loan groups 1,049 Women Convenience sample | Three items chosen by authors. Severity determined based on number of "yes" answers. Items included: (1) refuses to give you enough money for household expenses, even when he has money for other things, (2) takes money that you have earned away from you, and (3) makes important financial decisions without consulting you Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No mention of tactics 3) No constructs captured |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|---|-----------|--|---|--|
| Kutin, J., Russell, R., and Reid, M. (2017) | Australia | Community 13,307 Women and 3,743 Men Randomly selected sample | Five items chosen by authors. Lifetime abuse measured with dichotomous yes/no response options. Items included: (1) partner stopped or tried to stop you knowing about or having access to her/his money, (2) partner stopped or tried to stop you from working or earning money or studying, (3) partner deprived you of basic needs (e.g., food, shelter, sleep, assistive aids), (4) Partner damaged, destroyed or stole any of your property, and (5) partner stopped or tried to stop you from using the telephone, Internet or family car. | Form of IPV involving behaviors aimed at manipulating a person's access to finances, assets, and decision-making to foster dependence and control. Economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage identified as three dimensions comprising the overall construct 1) Clearly defined 2) No tactics mentioned 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Lehmann, P., Simmons, C. A., and Pillai, V. K. (2012) | USA | Shelter setting 2,135 Female IPV victims Convenience sample | Constructs captured—EC EE ES Checklist of Controlling Behaviors (CCB) tool used to assess for coercive control in violent relationships developed and validated in this study. Seven-item subscale measuring economic abuse. The 5-point Likert-type response style scale ranging from never (1) to very frequently (5). Items included: (1) did not allow me equal access to family money; (2) told me or acted as if it was his money, his house, his car, and so on, (3) threatened to withhold money from me, (4) made me ask for money for basic necessities; (5) used my fear of not having access to money to control my behavior, (6) made me account for the money I spent, and (7) tried to keep me dependent on him for money | Refers to “withholding money” as routine barrier used to entrap, isolate, and control a survivor. Economic coercion and threats to withhold financial means for food or household expense referenced 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE |
| Littwin, A. (2012) | USA | Personal contacts/DV e-mail lists/ 55 DV lawyers/advocates Snowball sample | Constructs captured—EC EE Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Murray Straus et al., 1996). Two items from validated measure of abuse addressing economic abuse. Items included: (1) vandalize your property or destroy something you loved, causing you to be frightened or fear bodily harm and (2) stand outside your home, school, or workplace Constructs captured—EE ES | Financial control, employment sabotage, control over family finances, restricted access to knowledge about finances. Tactics used as foundation that allows for coerced debt to occur, where victim has decreased ability to prevent transactions to which she does not consent. This includes credit fraud and theft as well as intimidation/threats/violence that keep victim from confronting abuser with issues of credit fraud or other forms of coerced debt 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|--|----------|---|--|--|
| Merrill, G. S., and Wolfe, V. (2000) | USA | DV and HIV agencies serving men of color 52 gay/bisexual male IPV victims Convenience sample | Unclear set of items created by authors. Not all items detailed. Those described are as follows: (1) damaging property which belonged to respondent, (2) harassing respondent at work or school, (3) causing respondent to miss work or school, (4) calling and visiting respondent at work or school excessively, (5) making respondent feel he was entitled to respondents' financial support, (6) refusing to contribute to his portion of expenses, and (7) significantly interrupting work, education and/or career development Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Forcing economic dependence, preventing the victim from accessing financial resources, destroying property, restricting partners from attending school, working, accessing any source of independent income, damaging or stealing property, using superior wealth as a weapon 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Nagassar, R. P., Rawlins, J. M., Sampson, N. R., Zackerli, J., Chankadyal, K., Ramasir, C., and Boodram, R. (2010) | Trinidad | Households 290 Women Stratified, randomly selected sample | No measurement information included 1) Unclear set of items created by authors 2) Not validated 3) Constructs captured—unclear | The withholding or deprivation of funds for essential needs, gambling away the housekeeping money, purposely building debts and selling of necessary household items. 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE |
| Outlaw, M. (2009) | USA | Phone survey 11,291 Women and men with partners Subsample of nationally representative, randomly selected sample | One item chosen by authors. Dichotomous yes/no as to whether respondents' current partner prevents him/her from knowing about or having access to family income, even when s/he asks. Question on survey about prohibiting work outside the home was not included in analysis as author states this could be representative of either economic or social abuse. Constructs captured—EC | Imposed economic dependence of the abused by the abuser, possible outright stealing by abuser. Abuser decides when and if survivor gets money even if she earns it and how much she gets. Inadequate amount of money given, survivor has to ask for more, steal or borrow from others to meet basic needs 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE |
| Poole, C., and Rietschlin, J. (2012) | Canada | Phone survey Unspecified number of female and male IPV victims over age 60 Nationally representative, randomly selected sample | Two items chosen by authors. Items included: (1) partner damages or destroys your possessions or property, and (2) prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you ask. Constructs captured—EC EE ES | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Postmus, J. L., Huang, C. C., Stylianou, A. M. (2012) | USA | Hospital setting 2,305 Mothers involved with fathers of their children 1-year post baseline Subsample from stratified, multistage, randomly selected sample | Two items chosen by author. Items included: (1) He withheld money, made you ask for money or took your money, and (2) He tried to prevent you from going to work and/or school. Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Includes employment sabotage, economic control, and economic exploitation 1) Clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|---|----------|--|--|--|
| Postmus, J. L., Plummer, S., McMahon, S., Murshid, N. S., and Kim, M-S. (2012) | USA | DV agencies 120 female IPV victims Convenience sample | Scale of Economic Abuse-12 (SEA-12; Postmus et al., 2016). Validated revision of the Scale of Economic Abuse (SEA; Adams et al., 2008). Five-point Likert-type scale ranging from <i>never</i> (1) to <i>quite often</i> (5). Twelve items comprising three factors named economic control (5 items), employment sabotage (4 items), and economic exploitation (3 items) Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Defined as efforts of abuser to make partner economically dependent, controlling her ability to become self-sufficient, accomplished by maintaining complete control over money and other economic resources by making all financial decisions, reducing ability to acquire, use, and maintain money, and/or by forcing her to rely on abuser for all of financial needs. Tactics identified include forms of employment sabotage, coerced debt, institutional barriers to reinforce economic control and exploitation 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Postmus, J. L., Plummer, S. B., and Stylianou, A. M. (2016) | USA | DV agencies 120 female IPV victims Convenience sample | Scale of Economic Abuse-12 (SEA-12) developed and validated in this study. Revision of the Scale of Economic Abuse (SEA; Adams et al., 2008). Five-point Likert-type scale ranging from <i>never</i> (1) to <i>quite often</i> (5). Exploratory factor analysis resulted in the 28-item SEA being reduced to 12 items comprising three factors named economic control (5 items), employment sabotage (4 items), and economic exploitation (3 items) Constructs captured—EC EE ES No information on specific measure or semistructured interview questions used. In results, economic abuse is referred to as economic control including: withholding money from victim, refusing to meet household expenses, stealing valuable assets such as personal jewelry, land, and so on. Unclear whether these were predetermined categories or if they were qualitative responses that were quantified Constructs captured—unclear | Strategies including economic exploitation, economic control and employment sabotage that hinder economic self-sufficiency and damage economic self-efficacy. Tactics preventing women's resource acquisition, preventing women's resource use, and exploiting women's resources 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Rabbani, F., Qureshi, F., and Rizvi, N. (2008) | Pakistan | Community-based health and development program 108 female IPV victims Convenience sample | One item chosen by authors. Dichotomous yes/no response options. Measured using the following item: "Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?" Constructs captured—EC | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Romans, S. Forte, T., Cohen, M. M., Du Mont, J., and Hyman, I. (2007) | Canada | Phone survey 17,005 women and men with current or ex-partner Nationally representative, randomly selected sample | Four items chosen by authors. Five-point Likert style scale, ranging from <i>never</i> to <i>always</i> . Items included: (1) not giving money for the expenses to the wife, (2) constant control over her expenses, (3) not telling her about his income, and (4) opposing to her having a job Constructs captured—EC ES | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Sahraian, A., Ghanizadeh, A., Hashemi, S. H., Mohammadi, M. R., and Ahmadvadeh, L. (2015) | Iran | Psychiatric inpatient program 209 women married to psychiatric patients Convenience sample | | |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|---|---------|---|--|---|
| Sanders, C. K. (2014) | USA | Matched savings program for IPV survivors 125 female IPV victims Convenience sample | Unclear: set of items created by authors. Methods state that "history of economic abuse" was gathered from shelter intake. No further details on measurement of construct or questions used Constructs captured—unclear | Variety of tactics that negatively affect women financially and undermine efforts to become financially independent, including behaviors that restrict woman's ability to pursue education or gain or maintain employment. Abuser also restricts, monitors, or completely controls access to financial resources 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC ES |
| Selek, S., Vural, M., and Cakmak, I. (2012) | Turkey | University teaching hospital setting 96 female IPV victims employed as nurses Convenience sample | Modified Abuse Assessment Screen Questionnaire. No specific details provided regarding measurement questions in screening tool related to economic abuse Constructs captured—unclear | Described as "prevention of working, making money, buying, selling or seizure of revenues of someone." 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Simmons, C. A., Lehmann, P., and Collier-Tenison, S. (2008) | USA | Offenders program 77 female IPV perpetrators Convenience sample DV shelter setting 2,135 female IPV victims Convenience sample | Seven items from economic abuse subscale in Checklist of Controlling Behaviors (CCB; Lehmann, 1998). Validated 84-item measure used to assess for coercive control in violent relationships. Five-point Likert style scale ranging from never (1) to very frequently (5). Items included: (1) did not allow me equal access to family money, (2) told me or acted as if it was his money, his house, his car, and so on, (3) threatened to withhold money from me, (4) made me ask for money for basic necessities, (5) used my fear of not having access to money to control my behavior, (6) made me account for the money I spent, and (7) tried to keep me dependent on him for money Constructs captured—EC EE | 1. Not clearly defined 2. No tactics included 3. No constructs captured |
| Stockl, H., and Penhale, B. (2015) | Germany | Community registration lists 10,263 women Nationally representative, randomly selected sample | Three items from validated 33-question tool that also addressed emotional abuse and controlling behavior. Items included: (1) partner controls exactly how much money I spend on what, (2) makes me feel that I am financially dependent on him, and (3) does not let me decide about money or things I want to buy by myself Constructs captured—EC | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|--|-------------|--|--|--|
| Stylianou, A. M., Postmus, J. L., and McMahon, S. (2013) | USA | DV agencies 457 female IPV victims Convenience sample | SEA-12 (Postmus, Plummer, & Stylianou, 2016) measuring economic abuse. Three subscales named Economic Control (5 items—monitoring/restricting woman's ability to freely use resources), Employment Sabotage (4 items—blocking employment or restricting ability to obtain resources via employment), and Economic Exploitation (3 items—depletion of funds and/or creation of debt or ruining of credit) Two economic abuse questions from psychological abuse subscale of validated Abusive Behavior Index (ABI; Shepard & Campbell, 1992). Items included: (1) prevented you from having money for your own use and (2) put you on an allowance Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Using means to control survivor that hinder her economic self-sufficiency and damage her economic self-efficacy. Description includes preventing her from working, harassing her at work, ruining her credit score, demanding that she account for all expenses, making unilateral decisions. These actions result in women becoming economically dependent on partner 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Um, M. Y., Kim, H. J., and Palinkas, L. A. (2016) | South Korea | Households 180 ever-married refugee women Snowball sample | Three items in a validated, Modified Conflict Tactics Scale. Dichotomized yes/no response options. Items included: (1) my partner deprived me of money to buy necessities, (2) my partner disposed of property without my consent, and (3) my partner took full control of income and expenses Constructs captured—EC EE | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Voth Schrag, R. J. (2015) | USA | Hospital setting 2,777 mothers who were also IPV victims Subsample from stratified, multistage, randomly selected sample | Two items chosen by author. Measured dichotomously, with "sometimes" and "often" as "yes." Items included: (1) How often did/does partner try to keep you from going to work or school? and (2) How often did/does partner withhold money, make you ask for money or take your money? Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Tactics used to create barriers to economic security including destroying credit, stealing financial resources, limiting participation in economic decision-making. Additional tactics described include sabotaging employment; making economic threats; limiting, destroying, and controlling woman's access to economic resources; preventing her participation in economic life and decisions of the family; deliberate sabotaging of resources; destroying credit; preventing ability to obtain and maintain employment or credentials, and stealing money or property 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Watts, C., Keogh, E., Ndllovu, M., and Kwaramba, R. (1998) | Zimbabwe | Households 966 women Nationally representative, randomly selected sample | Unclear set of items created by authors. Described on questionnaire as "being prevented from going to work, thrown out of the home, not given available support money." No clear information about specific items used to measure construct Constructs captured—EC EE ES | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Study | Country | Sample (Location, Gender, Type) | How Economic Abuse Is Measured | How Economic Abuse Is Defined |
|--|---------|--|---|--|
| Weaver, T., Sanders, C. K., Campbell, C. L., and Schnabel, M. (2009) | USA | DV shelter setting 113 female IPV victims Convenience sample | Domestic Violence-Related Financial Issues Scale (DV-FI) developed and validated in this study. Economic Abuse subscale included the following items: (1) credit card debt has played a role in my previous experiences of partner violence, (2) my partner prevented me from having access to money, (3) my partner negatively affected my credit rating, (4) my partner negatively affected my credit card debt, (5) my partner prevented me from obtaining necessary skills or education to obtain adequate employment Constructs captured—EC EE ES | Tactics that negatively affect women financially and undermine their efforts to become economically independent. Tactics included: restricting access to money, controlling or limiting ability to pursue education, or gain and maintain employment, exploiting financial resources that is, debt, stealing money 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics included 3) Constructs captured—EC EE ES |
| Yoshihama, M. (1994) | Japan | Mail survey distributed via women's groups, social service providers, attorneys, local and national newspaper ads 796 women Convenience sample | One item chosen by authors under emotional abuse that addresses economic neglect: "Partner failing to provide financially when he was able to do so." Constructs captured—EC | 1) Not clearly defined 2) No tactics included 3) No constructs captured |
| Zamorski, M. A., and Wiens-Kinkaid, M. E. (2013) | Canada | Canadian Armed Forces management system 1,745 Partnered female and male military personnel with a partner Randomly selected sample | Unclear set of items, potentially including (1) Preventing knowledge of access to family income and (2) Damaged or destroyed possessions or property Constructs captured—EC EE | "Preventing access to family income" given as example of economic abuse 1) Clearly defined 2) Tactics mentioned 3) EC |

articles used quantitative measures to examine the construct of economic abuse, while two articles using mixed methods did not use a specific quantitative measure and presented descriptive statistics based on quantified qualitative data. Of the articles that used a specific measure to capture economic abuse, most used measures that covered all three constructs ($n = 17$). This was followed by articles using measures covering both economic control and economic exploitation ($n = 14$), and then by articles using measures that only captured economic control ($n = 6$). Three articles used measures capturing both economic control and employment sabotage. One article used a measure capturing economic exploitation and employment sabotage. Three articles did not provide specific measurement information. Overall, economic control received the most attention across measures used in articles ($n = 40$). This was followed by economic exploitation ($n = 32$) and then employment sabotage ($n = 21$).

Researchers quantified economic abuse in the following ways: used a specific validated tool, included economic abuse items within a broader IPV measurement tool, or identified economic abuse through a number of questions not in any measurement tool. Five articles used validated tools that specifically measured the construct of economic abuse. Two of these articles used the SEA, which captures and explicitly names the constructs of economic control and economic exploitation. Two of these articles used the SEA-12, a revised version of the SEA, which captures and names as such the constructs of economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage.

A number of articles used general IPV measurement tools that also included items that capture the construct of economic abuse. In each case, these items were representative of a combination of economic control, economic exploitation, and/or employment sabotage but were not named as such. One of these articles used the ABI Psychological Abuse subscale-12, in which economic abuse was a subscale of psychological abuse, capturing the construct of economic control. The Checklist of Controlling Behaviors was used in two articles and included an economic abuse subscale capturing economic control and economic exploitation. The DV-FI was used in one article and included a subscale for economic abuse that captured all three constructs. Two articles used different revised versions of the Conflict Tactics Scale, one covering the constructs of economic control and economic exploitation, and the other covering the constructs of economic exploitation and employment sabotage. One article used a modified form of the Abuse Assessment Screen Questionnaire but did not provide detail about the question(s) that addressed economic abuse. Two articles used the Controlling Behaviors Scale including items that captured the constructs of economic control and employment sabotage.

Some articles did not use specific tools to measure economic abuse but instead included a series of items chosen by the researchers to represent the construct. Five articles used only 1 item to measure economic abuse. The item in each of these five articles captured economic control. Nine articles used a

series of 2 items to measure the overall construct. Five of these articles used items that captured economic control and economic exploitation. Four of these articles included items that captured economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage. Six articles used a series of 3 items in their measurement of economic abuse. One article captured only economic control. Four articles included items that addressed economic control and economic exploitation. One article captured economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage in its 3-item measure. Four articles used a series of 4 items to measure economic abuse, with one of these articles focusing on economic control and employment sabotage, and the other three focusing on economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage. One article used a series of 5 items to measure the overall construct. This measure included items that captured economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage.

Three articles did not state the individual items used in their measure of economic abuse, but one article described characteristics of the measure that captured economic control and economic exploitation in the findings. The other two articles captured the constructs of economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage. Four articles presented an unclear picture of how economic abuse was measured. Two of these articles stated that they used quantitative tools to measure economic abuse but provided no specific information on the items or tools used. The other two articles presenting an unclear picture used mixed methods in data collection and analysis and provided descriptive statistics on quantified qualitative data; however, they did not provide details on any specific quantitative measure used in data collection.

Discussion

This global review of the literature provides answers to our research questions as to how researchers define and measure economic or financial abuse when examining IPV. The review resulted in a large number of peer-reviewed articles coming from countries representing almost all of the continents (excluding Antarctica). However, the number of articles identified ($n = 46$) is considerably small in comparison to the number of articles that would likely be identified in a global review focused on physical or sexual violence.

Our review suggests there is growing clarity and consistency of terminologies being used in these articles, as well as evidence that economic abuse can be conceptualized as a separate category from emotional abuse. However, further clarity is needed as to whether economic abuse and financial abuse are the same phenomenon and are therefore interchangeable or if they are different but related concepts in the context of IPV. Most of the articles focused on the same aspects of economic abuse including economic exploitation, economic control, and employment sabotage. Yet it is reasonable to question whether there are other aspects of economic or financial abuse that are yet to be included in measures of these forms of abuse. Indeed, further research is needed that is guided by the marital

dependence theory (Vyas & Watts, 2008) and the interdependence theory (Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003) which suggest that a survivor's increased financial dependence on an partner increases her risk for experiencing abuse. Thus, to better understand how and to what extent survivors' increased access to economic resources might lead to increased independence from abusive relationships, we might also need to learn about the modes of financial entrapment that are used to restrict economic resources beyond those included as part of any measurement used. The limited number of specific questions addressing economic or financial abuse included in large-scale surveys may well influence our understanding of perpetrator strategies simply because we ask respondents to identify a limited range of abusive behaviors.

Additionally, our analysis identified studies that primarily, but not exclusively, focused on females as victims of economic abuse. A few studies included heterosexual, gay, and bisexual male victims from different settings including college campuses, prisons, general communities, HIV agencies, and domestic violence agencies. More research is needed to determine whether economic abuse, like other forms of IPV, is a gendered phenomenon as well as to determine the prevalence of economic abuse with a wide range of samples that include both genders and different sexual orientations as victims and perpetrators.

Our review also identified some consistency in the use of validated measures including the SEA with 28 items or the shortened SEA-12 version with 12 items (see Appendix A for these two measures). Although used more frequently in studies in the United States, questions remain as to the use of these scales in other countries or in other languages. It is also of interest as to whether other distinct questions measuring economic or financial abuse would be more culturally relevant in Hong Kong, for example, than those found to measure the construct in the United States. It is clear that gender does matter when considering cultural differences in the definition and manifestation of economic abuse. For example, in a Chinese population study of sociodemographic factors in domestic violence, Cao, Yang, Wang, and Zhang (2014) stressed the importance of cultural context, pointing to the sharp division of gender roles and responsibility for financial matters being the province of male family members based on Confucian philosophy. Hence, this cultural context fundamentally contributes to gender inequality and particular behavioral forms of IPV. Further testing is needed to determine the impact of cultural and linguistic nuances, particularly in the administration of surveys where there is no opportunity to clarify or reframe a question. For example, the SEA-12 is currently being administered in Hong Kong, Taiwan, Australia, and New Zealand to test its cultural utility.

Additionally, conceptual clarity is needed when considering use of the terms financial and economic abuse with other specific population groups such as older people. We purposefully removed articles about economic exploitation or abuse among the elderly in nonintimate relationships since such abuse is not entirely the same as IPV. Conceptually, it is important to

distinguish between IPV with older couples and elder abuse where the perpetrator is not the survivor's partner. This is pertinent as some research has suggested that the "patterning" of abuse may change over the length of the relationship, with physical abuse decreasing and emotional, financial, and sexual abuse increasing with age over time (Bows, 2015). Such abuse by an intimate partner would be a fundamentally different phenomenon to abuse occurring in older age from a family member or caregiver. Further exploration is needed to better understand the intersection between economic abuse that is perpetrated within an intimate relationship and age, as well as potential differences when perpetrated by extended family members and caregivers.

This review, while thorough in its efforts to unearth as many articles as possible, was narrowly focused on the measurement of economic and financial abuse. This review may also not have found all articles due to differences in terminology. Additionally, this review only captured English language articles; there may be research on economic or financial abuse published in other languages (e.g., Spanish or Mandarin). We only included peer-reviewed articles with full or partial quantitative focus; additional work is needed to examine the gray literature, conceptual articles, and qualitative articles. Australia is an example of a country where the work on economic abuse and economic security is primarily funded by government and subsequently appears in the gray literature as opposed to peer-reviewed publications.

Finally, it would be useful to establish at what point and in which contexts the gendered division of the management of financial resources and economic opportunities in intimate relationships actually becomes financial control and abuse. There is literature (mostly in the financial realm) about the difference between financial management (i.e., paying bills and managing households) and financial control (i.e., making decisions around how money is spent). However, less is known about this difference in the context of IPV, or in varied cultural contexts where gender role expectations may directly influence what is understood as economic or financial abuse, or not.

Implications

This review of the peer-reviewed literature provides a framework that IPV researchers should consider when studying, naming, and measuring economic or financial abuse. Since this research is in its "infancy," there are some key strategies for developing knowledge and evidence in the future. The emerging framework presented includes three main categories of tactics; in furthering research in this area, it is worth considering whether there are tactics of economic abuse that we have yet to identify. For example, the development of digital technologies has increased the types of surveillance tactics that perpetrators now employ as part of their coercive control; there may be economic abuse tactics that are yet to be identified as such. To strengthen the research, we need to have stronger collaborative efforts to use similar measures and terminology. Part of that collaborative effort is to consider how language and

Table 3. Implications.

| | |
|--------------|--|
| For research | <p>Further clarity and refinement is needed to determine whether economic abuse and financial abuse are the same phenomenon and therefore are interchangeable or if they are different but related concepts in the context of IPV</p> <p>Further testing of measurements are needed to determine if all aspects of economic or financial abuse are included in current measures</p> <p>Further testing of the SEA or the SEA-12 is needed to determine if relevant for use in other countries and cultural contexts</p> <p>Further clarity is needed to determine the impact that gender and gender roles around financial management play in our understanding of economic abuse</p> <p>Greater clarity is needed when considering use of the terms financial and economic abuse with other specific population groups such as older people</p> <p>Need stronger collaborative efforts to use similar measures and terminology</p> <p>Need prevalence data</p> <p>Need to determine the patterns of impact of economic abuse in the short term and long term for victims</p> <p>Need to better understand how perpetrators use economic or financial abuse as part of their overall strategy to control partners during the relationship and after separation</p> |
| For practice | <p>Greater focus on economic abuse and its continuing consequences for victims</p> <p>Greater awareness of economic abuse is needed as victims may not always identify their experiences of financial control and abuse</p> <p>Interventions are needed to address economic abuse and improve economic security</p> <p>Practitioners and advocates in specialist IPV and mainstream human services should have knowledge and skills to assess and respond to economic abuse</p> <p>Financial institutions and other relevant organizations be encouraged to continue to develop policies and practices that take account of women's circumstances of economic abuse when they are seeking credit or paying for debts incurred</p> <p>Jurisdictions should include economic or financial abuse in the legal definitions of IPV</p> |

cultural differences may play a part in our understanding of economic or financial abuse. There is also a need to collect prevalence data and to study the impact of economic abuse in the short term AND long term for victims. Research is also needed to better understand how perpetrators use economic or financial abuse as part of their overall strategy to control partners (Table 3)

Additionally, there is a need to focus on economic or financial abuse in practice settings. Such focus should include ensuring that practitioners have the relevant knowledge and skills for assessing and responding to economic abuse, developing and testing interventions that address economic or financial abuse, and improving survivors' economic security.

There is evidence suggesting that women may not always identify their experiences of financial control and abuse or distinguish these from their experience of gendered financial management. Hence, it is crucial that advocates are clear of these distinctions and work with women to make transparent the perpetrator's use of strategies and tactics of economic and financial abuse. Several studies exist that evaluate economic empowerment programs or financial literacy programs (Postmus, Hetling, & Hoge, 2015; Sanders, Weaver, & Schnabel, 2007); however, these studies are limited to the United States and are limited in their scope of program materials. Further research is needed to determine whether improving ones financial knowledge decreases the impact of experiencing economic or financial abuse as it does on improving survivors' access to resources, economic self-efficacy, or economic self-sufficiency.

Finally, economic abuse can cause severe material deprivation for women and can prevent them from becoming economically secure and independent (Corrie, 2016). Economic abuse most often results in a lack of financial resources making it difficult to leave a violent relationship and providing the impetus for some women to feel they have no choice but to return to that relationship (McLaren, 2013). The theories of marital dependency and interdependence (Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003; Vyas & Watts, 2008) could provide greater understanding into how economic abuse is used by abusers to trap their partners in the relationship. As with all manifestations of IPV, economic abuse affects women from all socioeconomic groups and geographic locations. However, there is no doubt that intersections of vulnerability include disability, older people, indigeneity, and certain cultural, racial, or ethnic backgrounds.

Appendix A

The Scale of Economic Abuse (SEA) and the SEA-12

Scale of Economic Abuse (SEA).

Adams, A. E., Sullivan, C. M., Bybee, D., & Greeson, M. R. (2008). Development of the scale of economic abuse. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 563–588.

I'm going to go through a list of things some individuals do to hurt their partner or ex-partner financially. Could you tell me, to the best of your recollection, how frequently your partner or ex-partner has done any of the following things in the last 12 months. Your answer can range from 1 to 5. 1 = *never*, 2 = *hardly ever*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *Often*, 5 = *Quite often*.

Scale of Economic Abuse-12 (SEA-12).

Postmus, J. L., Plummer, S. B., & Stylianou, A. M. (2016). Measuring economic abuse in the lives of survivors: Revising the scale of economic abuse. *Violence Against Women, 22*, 692–703.

I'm going to go through a list of things some individuals do to hurt their partner or ex-partner financially. Could you tell

Economic Exploitation (11 items)

1. Convince you to lend him money but not pay it back.
2. Take money from your purse, wallet, or bank account without your permission and/or knowledge.
3. Pay bills late or not pay bills that were in your name or in both of your names.
4. Spend the money you needed for rent or other bills.
5. Force you to give him money or let him use your checkbook, ATM card, or credit card.
6. Steal your property.
7. Refuse to get a job so you had to support your family alone.
8. Build up debt under your name by doing things like use your credit card or run up the phone bill.
9. Have you asked your family or friends for money but not let you pay them back.
10. Gamble with your money or your shared money.
11. Pawn your property or your shared property.

Economic control (17 items)

12. Demand to know how money was spent.
13. Decide how you could spend money rather than letting you spend it how you saw fit.
14. Do things to keep you from having money of your own.
15. Make important financial decisions without talking with you about it first.
16. Keep you from having the money you needed to buy food, clothes, or other necessities.
17. Hide money so that you could not find it.
18. Keep financial information from you.
19. Make you ask him for money.
20. Demand that you give him receipts and/or change when you spent money.
21. Do things to keep you from going to your job
22. Demand that you quit your job.
23. Threaten you to make you leave work.
24. Take your paycheck, financial aid check, tax refund check, disability payment, or other support payments from you.
25. Threaten you or beat you up for paying the bills or buying things that were needed.
26. Steal the car keys or take the car so you couldn't go look for a job or go to a job interview.
27. Keep you from having access to your bank accounts.
28. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work.

Economic Exploitation (3 items)

1. Pay bills late or not pay bills that were in your name or in both of your names.
2. Spend the money you needed for rent or other bills.
3. Build up debt under your name by doing things like use your credit card or run up the phone bill.

Economic control (5 items)

4. Demand to know how money was spent.
5. Make important financial decisions without talking with you about it first.
6. Keep financial information from you.
7. Demand that you give him receipts and/or change when you spent money.
8. Make you ask him for money.

Employment sabotage (4 items)

9. Do things to keep you from going to your job
10. Demand that you quit your job.
11. Threaten you to make you leave work.
12. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The work for this manuscript was funded by the Rutgers University, Rutgers Global.

Notes

1. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women does not explicitly mention violence against women (VAW) but general recommendations 12 and 19 that clarify the convention includes VAW and makes detailed recommendations to state parties.
2. The convention on preventing and combating VAW and domestic violence (later known as the Istanbul Convention) was adopted by the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers on April 7, 2011. Following its 10th ratification by Andorra on April 22, 2014, it entered into force on August 1, 2014. Retrieved September 11, 2016, from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168046031c>

References

- Adams, A. E., Beeble, M. L., & Gregory, K. A. (2015). Evidence of the construct validity of the Scale of Economic Abuse. *Violence and Victims, 30*, 363–376.
- Adams, A. E., Sullivan, C. M., Bybee, D., & Greeson, M. R. (2008). Development of the scale of economic abuse. *Violence Against Women, 14*, 563–588. doi:10.1177/1077801208315529
- Antai, D., Antai, J., & Anthony, D. S. (2014). The relationship between socio-economic inequalities, intimate partner violence and economic abuse: A national study of women in the Philippines. *Global Public Health, 9*, 808–826.
- Antai, D., Oke, A., Braithwaite, P., & Lopez, G. B. (2014). The effect of economic, physical, and psychological abuse on mental health: A population-based study of women in the Philippines.

me, to the best of your recollection, how frequently your partner or ex-partner has done any of the following things in the last 12 months. Your answer can range from 1 to 5. 1 = *never*, 2 = *hardly ever*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *often*, 5 = *quite often*.

Authors' Note

Nicola Sharp-Jeffs is now affiliated to Surviving Economic Abuse in London, UK.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

- International Journal of Family Medicine*, 2014 (Article ID 852317), 1–11. doi:10.1155.2014.852317
- Awwad, J., Ghazeeri, G., Nassar, A. H., Bazi, T., & Fakih, A. (2014). Intimate partner violence in a Lebanese population attending gynecologic care: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29, 2592–2609.
- Bows, H. (2015). *A delicate balance: Domestic violence - The police reporting decisions of women aged over 40*. Durham, NC: University of Durham.
- Braaf, R., & Barrett Meyering, I. (2010). *Seeking security: Promoting women's economic wellbeing following domestic violence (pp. 1–131)*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales, Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, Australia Dept. of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.
- Breckenridge, J., Walden, I., & Flax, G. (2014). *Staying home leaving violence evaluation: Final report* (pp. 1–149). Sydney, Australia: Gendered Violence Research Network, UNSW.
- Cao, Y., Yang, S., Wang, G., & Zhang, Y. (2014). Sociodemographic characteristics of domestic violence in China: A population case-control study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29, 683–706. doi:10.1177/0886260513505218
- Corrie, T. (2016). *Economic security for survivors of domestic and family violence: Understanding and measuring the impact*. Abbotsford, Victoria: Good Shepherd Australia New Zealand.
- Corrie, T., & McGuire, M. (2013). *Economic abuse: Searching for solutions*. Abbotsford, Victoria: Good Shepherd Youth & Family Services and Kildonan UnitingCare.
- Falb, K. L., Annan, J., Kpebo, D., Cole, H., Willie, T., Xuan, Z., . . . Gupta, J. (2015). Differential impacts of an intimate partner violence prevention program based on child marriage status in rural Cote d'Ivoire. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 57, 553–558.
- Fawole, O. I., van Wyk, J., & Adejimi, A. (2013). Training on prevention of violence against women in the medical curriculum at the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. *African Journal of Health Professions Education*, 5, 75–79.
- Fulu, E., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2013). Prevalence of and factors associated with male perpetration of intimate partner violence: Findings from the UN Multi-country Cross-sectional Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific. *Lancet Global Health*, 1, 187–207.
- Gaffoor, Z., Wand, H., Street, R. A., Abbai, N., & Ramjee, G. (2016). Predictors of perceived male partner concurrency among women at risk for HIV and STI acquisition in Durban, South Africa. *AIDS Research and Therapy*, 13, 1–11.
- Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2003). Physical aggression and control in heterosexual relationships: The effect of sampling. *Violence and Victims*, 18, 181–196.
- Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2008). Does controlling behaviour predict physical aggression and violence to partners? *Journal of Family Violence*, 23, 538–548.
- Gupta, J., Falb, K. L., Lehmann, H., Kpebo, D., Xuan, Z., Hossain, M., . . . Annan, J. (2013). Gender norms and economic empowerment intervention to reduce intimate partner violence against women in rural Cote d'Ivoire: A randomized controlled pilot study. *BMC International Health Human Rights*, 13, 1–12.
- Haj-Yahia, M. M. (1999). Wife abuse and its psychological consequences as revealed by the first Palestinian national survey on violence against women. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 13, 642–662.
- Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2000a). Implications of wife abuse and battering for self-esteem, depression, and anxiety as revealed by the second Palestinian national survey on violence against women. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 435–463.
- Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2000b). The incidence of wife abuse and battering and some sociodemographic correlates as revealed by two national surveys in Palestinian society. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 347–374.
- Harned, M. S. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 269–285.
- Huang, C. C., Postmus, J. L., Vikse, J. H., & Wang, L. R. (2013). Economic abuse, physical violence, and union formation. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35, 780–786. doi:10.1016/j.child-youth.2013.01.020
- Huang, C. C., Vikse, J. H., Lu, S., & Yi, S. (2015). Children's exposure to intimate partner violence and early delinquency. *Journal of Family Violence*, 30, 953–965.
- Hudson, W. W., & McIntosh, S. R. (1981). The assessment of spouse abuse: Two quantifiable dimensions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 43, 873–885.
- Jewkes, R. K., Levin, J. B., & Penn-Kekana, L. A. (2003). Gender inequalities, intimate partner violence and HIV preventive practices: findings of a South African cross-sectional study. *Social Science & Medicine*, 56, 125–134.
- Jewkes, R. K., Penn-Kekana, L., Levin, J., Ratsaka, M., & Schriber, M. (2000). Prevalence of emotional, physical and sexual abuse of women in three South African provinces. *South African Medical Journal*, 91, 421–428.
- Joyner, K., & Mash, R. J. (2011). The value of intervening for intimate partner violence in South African primary care: Project evaluation. *BMJ Open*, 1, e000254.
- Kapiga, S., Harvey, S., Muhammad, A. K., Stockl, H., Mshana, G., Hashim, R., . . . Watts, C. (2017). Prevalence of intimate partner violence and abuse and associated factors among women enrolled into a cluster randomised trial in northwestern Tanzania. *BMC Public Health*, 17, 1–11.
- Kutin, J., Russell, R., & Reid, M. (2017). Economic abuse between intimate partners in Australia: Prevalence, health status, disability and financial stress. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 41, 269–274.
- Lehmann, P., Simmons, C. A., & Pillai, V. K. (2012). The validation of the Checklist of Controlling Behaviors (CCB): Assessing coercive control in abusive relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 18, 913–933.
- Littwin, A. (2012). Coerced debt: The role of consumer credit in domestic violence. *California Law Review*, 100, 951–1026.
- Lloyd, S. (1997). The effects of domestic violence on women's employment. *Law & Policy*, 19, 139–167.
- McLaren, H. (2013). Domestic violence, housing and employment: Workers' perspectives on employment assistance in supported accommodation. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 415–433.

- Merrill, G. S., & Wolfe, V. (2000). Battered gay men: An exploration of abuse, help seeking, and why they stay. *Journal of Homosexuality, 39*, 1–30.
- Nagassar, R. P., Rawlins, J. M., Sampson, N. R., Zackerli, J., Chankadyal, K., Ramasir, C., & Boodram, R. (2010). The prevalence of domestic violence within different socio-economic classes in Central Trinidad. *West Indian Medical Journal, 59*, 20–25.
- Outlaw, M. (2009). No one type of intimate partner abuse: Exploring physical and non-physical abuse among intimate partners. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 263–272.
- Poole, C., & Rietschlin, J. (2012). Intimate partner victimization among adults aged 60 and older: An analysis of the 1999 and 2004 General Social Survey. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect, 24*, 120–137.
- Postmus, J. L., Hetling, A., & Hoge, G. (2015). Evaluating a financial education curriculum as an intervention to improve financial behaviors and financial well-being of survivors of domestic violence: Results from a longitudinal randomized controlled study. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 49*, 250–266. doi:10.1111/joca.12057
- Postmus, J. L., Huang, C.-C., & Stylianou, A. M. (2012). The impact of economic abuse on maternal mental health and parenting. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*, 1922–1928.
- Postmus, J. L., Plummer, S. B., McMahon, S., Murshid, N., & Kim, M. (2012). Understanding economic abuse in the lives of survivors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*, 411–430.
- Postmus, J. L., Plummer, S. B., & Stylianou, A. M. (2016). Measuring economic abuse in the lives of survivors: Revising the Scale of Economic Abuse. *Violence Against Women, 22*, 692–703. doi:10.1177/1077801215610012
- Rabbani, F., Qureshi, F., & Rizvi, N. (2008). Perspectives on domestic violence: Case study from Karachi, Pakistan. *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal, 14*, 415–426.
- Romans, S., Forte, T., Cohen, M. M., Du Mont, J., & Hyman, I. (2007). Who is most at risk for intimate partner violence? A Canadian population-based study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*, 1495–1514.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2003). Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 351–375.
- Sahraian, A., Ghanizadeh, A., Hashemi, S. H., Mohammadi, M. R., & Ahmadzadeh, L. (2015). Prevalence and predictors of domestic violence towards wives by their psychiatric hospitalized husbands. *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry, 10*, 233–238.
- Sanders, C. K. (2014). Savings for survivors: An individual development account program for survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Social Service Research, 40*, 297–312.
- Sanders, C. K., & Schnabel, M. (2006). Organizing for economic empowerment of battered women: Women's savings accounts. *Journal of Community Practice, 14*, 47–68.
- Sanders, C. K., Weaver, T. L., & Schnabel, M. (2007). Economic education for battered women: An evaluation of outcomes. *Affilia, 22*, 240–254.
- Selek, S., Vural, M., & Cakmak, I. (2012). Abuse nurses take no legal steps: A domestic violence study carried out in Eastern Turkey. *Psychiatria Danubina, 24*, 386–391.
- Sharp-Jeffs, N. (2015a). *Money matters: Research into the extent and nature of financial abuse within intimate relationships in the UK*. London, England: The Co-operative Bank/Refuge.
- Sharp-Jeffs, N. (2015b). *A review of research and policy on financial abuse within intimate partner relationships*. London, England: Child and Woman Abuse Studies Unit, London Metropolitan University.
- Shepard, M., & Campbell, J. A. (1992). The Abusive Behavior Inventory: A measure of psychological and physical abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7*, 291–305.
- Simmons, C. A., Lehmann, P., & Collier-Tenison, S. (2008). Men's use of controlling behaviors: A comparison of reports by women in a domestic violence shelter and women in a domestic violence offender program. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*, 387–394.
- Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stockl, H., & Penhale, B. (2015). Intimate partner violence and its association with physical and mental health symptoms among older women in Germany. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*, 3089–3111.
- Strube, M. J. (1988). The decision to leave an abusive relationship: Empirical evidence and theoretical issues. *Psychological Bulletin, 104*, 236–250.
- Stylianou, A. M., Postmus, J. L., & McMahon, S. (2013). Measuring abusive behaviors: Is economic abuse a unique form of abuse? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*, 3186–3204.
- Tolman, R. M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims, 4*, 159–177.
- Tolman, R. M., & Wang, H. C. (2005). Domestic violence and women's employment: Fixed effects models of three waves of Women's Employment Study data. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 36*, 147–158. doi:10.1007/s10464-005-6239-0
- Um, M. Y., Kim, H. J., & Palinkas, L. A. (2016). Correlates of domestic violence victimization among North Korean refugee women in South Korea. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*, 2037–2058. doi:10.1177/0886260515622297
- Valentine, K., & Breckenridge, J. (2016). Responses to family and domestic violence: Supporting women? *Griffith Law Review, 1*–15. doi:10.1080/10383441.2016.1204684
- Voth Schrag, R. J. (2015). Economic abuse and later material hardship: Is depression a mediator. *Affilia, 30*, 341–351.
- Vyas, S., & Watts, C. (2008). How does economic empowerment affect women's risk of intimate partner violence in low and middle income countries? A systematic review of published evidence. *Journal of International Development, 21*, 25.
- Watts, C., Keogh, E., Ndlovu, M., & Kwaramba, R. (1998). Withholding of sex and forced sex: dimensions of violence against Zimbabwean women. *Reproductive Health Matters, 6*, 57–65.
- Weaver, T. L., Sanders, C. K., Campbell, C. L., & Schnabel, M. (2009). Development and preliminary psychometric evaluation of the Domestic Violence-Related Financial Issues Scale (DV-FI). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 569–585.
- Yoshihama, M. (1994). Physical, sexual, and emotional abuse by male intimates: Experiences of women in Japan. *Violence and Victims, 9*, 63–77.

- Yount, K. M., Krause, K. H., & VanderEnde, K. E. (2016). Economic coercion and partner violence against wives in Vietnam: A unified framework? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*, 3307–3331. doi:10.1177/0886260515584350
- Zamorski, M. A., & Wiens-Kinkaid, M. E. (2013). Cross-sectional prevalence survey of intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization in Canadian military personnel. *BMC Public Health, 13*, 1–31.

Author Biographies

Judy L. Postmus, PhD, ACSW, is a professor at the School of Social Work, Rutgers University. Her research is on physical, sexual, and economic victimization experiences of women with her most recent attention given to developing a violence against women research consortium, funded by the National Institute of Justice (2016-MU-CX-K011). She is also the director of the Center on Violence Against Women & Children. She has given many local, national, and international presentations on the impact of policies and interventions for survivors of violence. Her work is strongly influenced from her 20 years as a practitioner and administrator.

Gretchen L. Hoge, PhD, MSW, is an assistant professor of social work at Lewis University in Romeoville, IL and a faculty affiliate at the Center on Violence Against Women & Children at Rutgers University. Her research explores the experiences of immigrant survivors of intimate partner violence in varied cultural contexts, as well as the evaluation of policies and programs addressing gender-based violence and the development of healthy relationships. She has experience working in the areas of community outreach and education, policy

practice, and direct practice with survivors of intimate partner violence and their children.

Jan Breckenridge, PhD, is the deputy head of school (research) in the School of Social Sciences at UNSW Sydney, Australia. She was instrumental in the establishment of the gendered violence research network (GVRN) at UNSW, is the co-convenor of the GVRN. She has a commitment to action and other participatory strategies of research engagement and has undertaken extensive work and research in the areas of trauma, domestic and sexual violence and child abuse, and gender justice. Her research provides a focus for her commitment to developing evidence-informed practice in these areas.

Nicola Sharp-Jeffs, PhD, is the founder and director of surviving economic abuse, a nonprofit organization in the UK whose mission is to raise awareness of economic abuse and build the capacity of those who come into contact with victims and survivors to respond. She has been working in the violence against women and girls sector since 2006. In 2016, she was made a Winston Churchill fellow and travelled to the U.S. and Australia to explore innovative responses to economic abuse.

Donna Chung, PhD, is a professor of social work and social policy at Curtin University in Perth, Australia. She has been involved in social work education and social research for over 20 years undertaking various teaching, research and management roles within higher education. Her research interests are primarily the areas of male violence against women, homelessness, gender and sexuality and social policy. She has worked on various research projects in these areas and provides advice and consultancy to governments on policies and programs in these areas.