

Annex 1: Prevalence of economic abuse globally

This annex provides the full evidence that was found regarding the prevalence of economic abuse by each region and country. For countries where there were multiple or more detailed findings, these will be presented under their own heading, but for countries where there was less evidence, these will be grouped into a table under the region heading.

Africa	2	Iraq	40	Spain	64
Egypt	5	Jordan	41	Sweden	66
Ghana	6	Lebanon	43	Ukraine	66
Kenya	7	Nepal	44	United Kingdom	67
Malawi	8	Pakistan	44		
Nigeria	10	Palestine	47	North America and the Caribbean	82
South Africa	12	Philippines	48	Canada	82
Tanzania	18	Saudi Arabia	49	Mexico	90
Uganda	19	South Korea	49	Trinidad and Tobago	90
Zimbabwe	20	Sri Lanka	50	United States	91
		Turkey	51		
Asia (including the Middle East)	21	Vietnam	56	Oceania	110
Bangladesh	24			Australia	110
Cambodia	29	Europe	57	New Zealand	122
China	29	Croatia	60	Papua New Guinea	123
Cyprus	31	Finland	61		
India	32	Italy	61	Central and South America	124
Indonesia	37	Lithuania	63	Columbia	125
Israel	38	Netherlands	63	Ecuador	126
Iran	39	Poland	64		

Africa

Table 1: Prevalence of economic abuse in Algeria, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gambia, Liberia, Morocco, Namibia, Rwanda, Senegal and Sudan

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Asian and African countries ¹	Arab women (53% in Asian countries, 47% in African countries)	490	Financial abuse by an intimate partner before and during Covid-19	14.5% reported lifetime financial abuse 10.6% reported financial abuse prior to Covid-19, and 12.9% reported it during Covid-19
Algeria ²	Working women	28	Do you have control over your salary?	36% reported they did not have control over their salary
Botswana ³	Women and men	639 women 590 men	Economic intimate partner violence	28.6% of women reported experiencing economic abuse 18.2% of men reported perpetrating economic abuse
Côte d'Ivoire ⁴	Women aged 18 and over with no previous microfinance experience, including child brides and non-child brides	682	If a partner refused to give her money for household necessities even if there was money available, took money against her will, or obliged her to give him all or part of the money she earned	Past year overall prevalence of 32.6% Child brides reported a past year prevalence of 28.7% Non-child brides reported a past year prevalence of 34.1% Women taking part in only a group savings intervention reported a past year prevalence of 28.9% Women taking part in the intervention plus a gender dialogue group reported a past year prevalence of 35.5%
Ethiopia ⁵	Pregnant women attending a health clinic	612	Abuse by an intimate partner during the current pregnancy 1. Taken your earnings or savings from you against your will 2. Refused to give you money for household, even when he has money for other things	Overall prevalence rate of 27% during the current pregnancy By measure 1. 10.6% 2. 24.8%

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Gambia ⁶	Pregnant women seeking antenatal care in rural Gambia	373	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Denies you money or other material things to hurt you 2. Refuses to let you work or do any form of business 	<p>Overall prevalence of 10.7%</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 7% 2. 5.4%
Liberia ⁷	Women attending a local market	229	Not being able to control the money in the family (due to partner's behaviour)	81%
Morocco ⁸	Men and women aged 18–59	1200 men 1200 women	<p>Economic violence by a partner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevented (his wife/her) from working for wages or profit 2. Took (his wife's/her) earnings against her will 3. Kept money from earnings for personal use when the respondent knew (his wife/she) was finding it hard to pay for her personal expenses or household needs 4. Threw (his wife/her) out of the house <p>Women were asked if they had experienced these behaviours, men were asked if they had perpetrated them</p>	<p>Women</p> <p>19.2% reported any economic violence in their lifetime, 6% reported it in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 11.7% / Last 12 months: 3.6% 2. Lifetime: 7.2% / Last 12 months: 1.7% 3. Lifetime: 7.3% / Last 12 months: 1.8% 4. Lifetime: 8.8% / Last 12 months: 1.4% <p>Men</p> <p>18.6% reported perpetrating any economic violence in their lifetime, 4% reported perpetrating it in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 7.3% / Last 12 months: 2.6% 2. Lifetime: 4.1% / Last 12 months: 1.2% 3. Lifetime: 3.2% / Last 12 months: 1.2% 4. Lifetime: 12.2% / Last 12 months: 1.5%
Namibia ⁹	Pregnant women attending a primary care clinic	386	<p>Financial abuse by an intimate partner</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has he ever failed to provide money to run the house or look after the children but had money for other things? 2. Has he ever taken your earnings? 3. Has he ever tried to prevent you from going to work, sell or make money in any other way? 4. Has he ever forced you to do some work that you didn't like? 	<p>Overall prevalence by time period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ever: 6% • In the last 12 months: 5.2% • Whilst pregnant: 5.2% <p>By measure and time period</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ever: 6%, Last 12 months: 4.9% Whilst pregnant: 5.2% 2. Ever: 0.8% Last 12 months: 0.5% Whilst pregnant: 0.5% 3. Ever: 0.5% Last 12 months: 0.5% Whilst pregnant: 0.3% 4. Ever: 0.3% Last 12 months: 0% Whilst pregnant: 0%
Rwanda ¹⁰	Women and men from 11 districts	110 women	Economic abuse experienced by women: zero control over household's income	A percentage is not reported, but the mean was 3.69, with a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 4

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Senegal ¹¹	Women in Dakar aged between 17 and 60, who were or had been in a couple in the previous 12 months and reported any form of spousal violence	144	Economic abuse in the last 12 months	33.3%
Sudan ¹²	Pregnant women attending antenatal care in Garri	236	Economic domestic violence	21.2%
Tunisia ¹³	Married women attending family planning centre	197	Economic violence in marriage	<p>Lifetime prevalence rate of 41.1%</p> <p>By demographic information</p> <p>Economic abuse was associated with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being married for three or more years • Having three or more children • Education at primary school level • Husband being educated at primary school level • Husband experiencing alcoholism

Egypt

Table 2: Prevalence of economic abuse in Egypt

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women during Covid-19 ¹⁴	2068	Twenty questions were asked overall, with the following relevant items: 1. Did not permit to handle money 2. Did not permit to choose/buy things 3. He kept away from home for days or weeks without informing you/giving you money	By measure before and after Covid-19 1. Before: 33% / After: 39% 2. Before: 33.4% / After: 42.8% 3. Before: 12.2% / After: 30.3%
Married working women attending health insurance clinics in Alexandria ¹⁵	400	Financial abuse	30%
Women in Alexandria ¹⁶	Not stated	Economic abuse	Among women who experienced economic abuse, 27% reported their husband forcing them to beg for money, 25% were forced to borrow money and 14% said their husband refused to spend money on them
Women over the age of 15 ¹⁷	Not stated	Economic domestic violence by a male partner	40.8%
Married women aged 15 to 19 using the 2005 and 2008 Egypt Demographic and Health Survey ¹⁸	Not stated	Economic abuse	43%
Men and women aged 18–59 ¹⁹	1380 men 1402 women	Economic violence by a partner: 1. Prevented (his wife/her) from working for wages or profit 2. Took (his wife's/her) earnings against her will 3. Kept money from earnings for personal use when the respondent knew (his wife/she) was finding it hard to pay for her personal expenses or household needs 4. Threw (his wife/her) out of the house Women were asked if they had experienced these behaviours, men were asked if they had perpetrated them	Women 26.5% reported any economic violence in their lifetime, 8.1% reported it in the last 12 months 1. Lifetime: 10.9% / Last 12 months: 2.4% 2. Lifetime: 2.4% / Last 12 months: 0.6% 3. Lifetime: 13% / Last 12 months: 5.5% 4. Lifetime: 14.1% / Last 12 months: 3.1% Men 21.1% reported perpetrating any economic violence in their lifetime, 6.6% reported perpetrating it in the last 12 months 1. Lifetime: 3.2% / Last 12 months: 1.2% 2. Lifetime: 0.3% / Last 12 months: 0.2% 3. Lifetime: 6% / Last 12 months: 2.8% 4. Lifetime: 13.9% / Last 12 months: 2.9%

Ghana

Table 3: Prevalence of economic abuse in Ghana

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women aged 18 and above within Awutu Senya east district ²⁰	120	Economic abuse by a partner 1. Restrictions around work 2. Not providing for economic needs	By measure 1. 4.2% 2. 2.5%
Women aged 18–49 in the Central Region ²¹	2000	Economic intimate partner violence	Lifetime prevalence of 10.1% Past year prevalence of 7.4%
General population as part of the Ghana Family Life and Health Survey 2015 ²²	4995	1. Denied pocket money 2. Cash taken out 3. Belongings controlled 4. Property damaged 5. Prohibited from working 6. Forced to work 7. Denied food Note: this survey asked about family members or domestic relations and the findings do not distinguish between family or intimate partners as the perpetrator	Past year prevalence rate for women: 12.8% Past year prevalence rate for men: 7.7% Results with further demographic information are available in the main report but are not included here due to the issues around perpetrators mentioned in the previous column
Ever-married women aged 18–65 ²³	2289	Had their (last) husband or partner: 1. ever refused to give them enough housekeeping money even though he had enough money to spend on other things 2. taken cash or withdrawn money from their bank account or other savings without permission, 3. controlled their belongings or their spending decisions, 4. destroyed or damaged property they had material interest in, 5. prohibited them from working or forced them to quit working, 6. forced them to work against their will, 7. prevented them from having a paid job, 8. refused to give or denied them food or other basic needs.	Prevalence rate of 52.1%
Ever-married women aged 18 and above ²⁴	2289	1. Employment sabotage 2. Economic exploitation 3. Economic deprivation	By measure 1. 8.5% 2. 24.2% 3. 42%
Married women ²⁵	50	Economically disempowering acts of violence	10%

Kenya

Table 4: Prevalence of economic abuse in Kenya

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Reports of intimate partner violence by HIV-negative partners in a PrEP project in Kenya and Uganda ²⁶	53	Economic abuse	22%
Women enrolled in an HIV project ²⁷	2836	Financial abuse	8%
Women victim-survivors of domestic abuse ²⁸	50	Financially controlled and deprived	91.1%
Women in Kabisaga Sub-location, Nandi County ²⁹	83	Economic abuse by a partner 1. Restrictions as a cause for unemployment 2. Having to surrender income 3. Having spending monitored 4. Partner taking items on credit in your name 5. Partner accumulating debt in drinking debts you end up paying 6. Selling family assets 7. Not being included on family property deeds 8. Partner keeping property ownership secret 9. Prevented from furthering education 10. Solely covering costs of children 11. Having to account for all money spent 12. Never being given any money for the household 13. Not being consulted in making financial decisions	1. 65.2% 2. 59.5% 3. 18.9% 4. 47.4% 5. 22.8% 6. 21.7% 7. 92.8% 8. 6% 9. 57.8% 10. 67.5% 11. 29% 12. 16.9% 13. 73.5%

Malawi

Table 5: Prevalence of economic abuse in Malawi

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
General population ³⁰	3546 women 2246 men	Economic abuse by a partner, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taken money from purse without consent 2. Refused to pay child support/ maintenance 3. Prevented from knowing about/ accessing family income 4. Forced to hand partner money 5. Prevented from earning an income 6. Not paid for work undertaken as promised 7. Forced to work without pay 8. Prevented from accessing income-earning resources 9. Withdrawn money from account without consent 10. Forced to ask for money 11. Forced to be sole breadwinner 	Prevalence rate of 28% for women By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 8.1% 2. 7.6% 3. 7.5% 4. 6.9% 5. 6.5% 6. 5.4% 7. 3.7% 8. 3.6% 9. 3.4% 10. 2.8% 11. 2.7% By demographic information Age: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <10 years: 1% • 10–20 years: 20% • 21–30 years: 46% • 31–40 years: 22% • 41–50 years: 8% • >50 years: 3% Marital status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married: 86.4% • Single 7.3% • Divorced/separated /widowed: 6.2% Number of children in household: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No children: 16% • 1–2 children: 31% • 3–5 children: 29% • 6–10 children: 17% • More than 10: 7% Employment status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-employed: 45% • Remittance from partner/friend/family: 31% • Unemployed: 14% • Employed: 8% • Casual labour: 2% • Pension/grant: 0%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<p>Average monthly personal income:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No income: 31% • Below 500: 13% • 501-999: 17% • 1000-1999: 13% • 2000-3999: 10% • 4000-5999: 6% • 6000-11999: 5% • 12000 and above: 4% <p>Relationship to perpetrator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current spouse: 68.6% • Former spouse: 6.8% • Current boyfriend: 7.5% • Former boyfriend: 1% <p>Age of perpetrator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <20: 3% • 21-30: 36% • 31-40: 31% • 41-50: 12% • >50: 10% <p>Was perpetrator working at time of the abuse?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 51.3% • No: 34.1% • Most of the time: 14.6%

Nigeria

Table 6: Prevalence of economic abuse in Nigeria

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Adult women in urban settlement in Benin City during Covid-19 ³¹	616	Economic violence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevented from getting a job 2. Forced to give up salary 3. Possessions forcefully taken away 4. Denied opportunities or resources 	Overall past year prevalence rate of 5.8% from any perpetrator, and 16.3% for those reporting any form of abuse from any perpetrator (including family members) 83% of perpetrators of economic abuse were a boyfriend (44.4%) or husband (38.9%) By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 13.9% 2. 63.9% 3. 25% 4. 13.9%
Women ³²	606	Economic intimate partner violence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He does not contribute to financing the home 2. He does not pay house rent 3. He does not allow me to work 	Overall prevalence of 51.2% By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 34.8% 2. 13.4% 3. 12.5% By demographic information Employment type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artisan: 60.5% • Secretariats: 51.3% • Professionals: 34.6% • Housewives: 64.2% Educational status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formal education: 60.5% • Secondary: 59.5% • University: 37.1%
Women farmers in Lafia who have experienced at least one form of gender-based violence ³³	180	Economic violence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevention from working (farming activities) 2. Refusal to pay children school fees 3. Denial of feeding allowance <p>Note: this research referred to gender-based violence rather than intimate partner violence but this appears to refer to abuse by partners</p>	By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 79.4% 2. 51.1% 3. 48.3%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Female health workers in South East Nigeria ³⁴	392	Financial abuse within intimate relationship: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Withholding allowance 2. Withholding access to health 3. Withholding money for transportation 4. Withholding money for food 	<p>Overall prevalence rate of 21.9%</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 60.4% 2. 16.8% 3. 13.9% 4. 8.9% <p>By demographic information</p> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <30: 20.7% • 30–40: 24.7% • >40: 39.2% <p>Marital status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married: 25% • Single: 27.6% <p>Educational status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary: 57.1% • Secondary: 41.8% • Tertiary: 20.9% <p>Employment rank:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management: 41.2% • Senior staff: 23.3% • Junior staff: 27.2% <p>Religion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catholic: 21.9% • Protestant: 31.4% <p>Number of children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 25% • 1–4: 15.5% • 5–8: 31% <p>Male children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 20.9% • No: 30.9%
Pregnant women accessing health services ³⁵	702	Economic intimate partner violence	Overall prevalence of 23.9%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women accessing health services ³⁶	210	Economic threats/deprivation of financial resources by husband	Overall prevalence rate of 29.05% By demographic information Location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban: 8.75% Rural: 39.73% Education status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No education: 25.4% Primary: 47.37% Secondary: 32.08% Tertiary: 11.38%
Secondary school students ³⁷	900	Financial abuse experienced in the family	By frequency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely: 18.19% Occasionally: 34.3% Often: 20.9% Very often: 25.9%
Married adults ³⁸	300	Economic/financial abuse in domestic violence	No percentage is given, but a mean of 9.37 is provided, and it was the least common form of abuse in the research
Married men ³⁹	820	Economic violence included withholding access to money, deliberately giving insufficient money or totally abandoning financial responsibilities	Overall prevalence of 23.2% of men perpetrating economic abuse Past year prevalence of 11.3% of men perpetrating economic abuse

South Africa

Table 7: Prevalence of economic abuse in South Africa

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women ⁴⁰	Not stated	Economic abuse in domestic violence	48%
Women in three South African cities ⁴¹	Not stated	Economic abuse	58%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Victim-survivors attending a domestic abuse service who had reported economic abuse ⁴²	1045	<p>Economic abuse:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Little/no money 2. Supports mistress 3. Takes/demands money: 4. Doesn't pay maintenance 5. Starving 6. Takes and sell things 7. Destroy property 8. Throw out possessions/evict 9. Other 	<p>By measure (across victim-survivors reporting any economic abuse)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 15% 2. 0.8% 3. 7.6% 4. 4.2% 5. 2.1% 6. 11.2% 7. 33% 8. 23% 9. 2.9% <p>By demographic information (of victim-survivors of economic abuse)</p> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7-19: 1.2% • 20-39: 69.7% • 40-59: 27.8% • 60+: 1.2% <p>Marital status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single: 36.4% • Married: 54.2% • Living together: 5.4% • Divorced: 1.5% • Separated: 2% • Widowed: 0.6% <p>Partner status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current partner: 80.3% • Ex-partner: 19.7% <p>Employment status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part-time: 3.4% • Full-time: 44.4% • Self-employed: 2.2% • Unemployed: 50% <p>Abusers' employment status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part-time: 3.9% • Full-time: 54.6% • Self-employed: 3.7% • Unemployed: 37.7%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<p>Length of abuse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <1 year: 16.2% • 1 year: 15.3% • 2 years: 14.4% • 3 years: 11.3% • 4 years: 6.8% • 5 years: 8.9% • 6–10 years: 15.8% • 11–15 years: 5.3% • 16+ years: 6% <p>Number of children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 44.3% • One: 20.6% • Two: 19.4% • Three: 9.3% • Four: 4% • Five: 1.6% • Six: 0.4% • Seven: 0.1% • Eight: 0.3%
Women attending antenatal clinics in Soweto between November 2001–April 2002 ⁴³	1395	<p>Financial abuse: Has a current or previous partner ever:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failed to provide money to run the house or look after the children but had money for other things? 2. Taken your earnings or pay packet from you? 3. Tried to prevent you from going to work, selling, or making money in any other way? 	<p>Prevalence of any lifetime financial abuse: 12.9% more than once, 13.7% once</p> <p>Prevalence of any financial abuse in the last 12 months: 11.1% more than once, 10.7% once</p> <p>In the past 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Once: 6.2% / More than once: 6% 2. Once: 0.7% / More than once: 0.6% 3. Once: 4.9% / More than once: 4.8% <p>Lifetime</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Once: 7.5% / More than once: 7.4% 2. Once: 1.5% / More than once: 1.1% 3. Once: 6% / More than once: 5.5%
Women in an HIV prevention trial ⁴⁴	1456	Ever experienced economic abuse	<p>10% reported ever experiencing economic abuse</p> <p>Prevalence by partner status</p> <p>Sexual partner has another partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 37.9% • No: 16.6% • I don't know: 45.5%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women aged 18–30 in a mental health intervention ⁴⁵	680	<p>Economic intimate partner violence from a current or former partner in the past 12 months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stop you from getting a job, going to work, trading or earning money? 2. Take your earnings against your will? 3. Throwing you out of the house 4. Spending money on alcohol, tobacco or other things for himself when he knew you did not have enough for essential household expenses? 	<p>43.7% reported two or more experiences of economic abuse in the past year, and 76.3% reported two or more experiences of emotional and/or economic abuse in the past year</p> <p>By mental health and frequency of abuse</p> <p>Depression:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Once: 9.9% / Few: 7.5% / Many: 4.9% 2. Once: 6.3% / Few: 2.7% / Many: 0.9% 3. Once: 8.4% / Few: 4.6% / Many: 5.4% 4. Once: 7.5% / Few: 13.1% / Many: 17.8% <p>Suicidal ideation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Once: 9.9% / Few: 7.5% / Many: 4.9% 2. Once: 6.3% / Few: 2.7% / Many: 0.9% 3. Once: 8.4% / Few: 4.6% / Many: 5.4% 4. Once: 7.5% / Few: 12.1% / Many: 17.8%
Women in prison ⁴⁶	348	Economic abuse in their last or previous relationships	<p>Lifetime prevalence of 62%</p> <p>Prevalence rate of 37% in any past relationship, 48% in all past relationship</p> <p>64% of women who had committed theft had experienced economic abuse in their last relationship (versus 45% who had committed theft but not experienced economic abuse)</p>
Women ⁴⁷	1306	Financial abuse in the past year	<p>By discussion of HIV and condom use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners have discussed HIV: 8.4% • Partners have not discussed HIV: 10.3% • Woman asked for condom use: 12.4% • Woman did not ask for condom use: 8.2%
Women in a microfinance intervention ⁴⁸	860	<p>Economic intimate partner violence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How often did your partner stop you from getting a job, going to work, trading or earning money? 2. How often did your partner take your earnings against your will? 3. How often did your partner throw you out of the house? 4. How often did your partner spend money on alcohol, tobacco or other things for himself when he knew you did not have enough for essential household expenses? 	<p>9% reported past year economic abuse</p> <p>By age group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21–34: 14.5% • 35–54: 9.3% • 55–82: 5.9%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Undergraduate nursing students, of whom 74.1% were females and 25.9% were males ⁴⁹	243	Financial abuse intimate partner violence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taken money from purse without consent 2. Prevented from knowing about family income 3. Prevented from earning an income 4. Not paid for work as promised 5. Forced to work without pay 6. Prevented from accessing income-earning resources 7. Forced to ask for money 	Lifetime prevalence rate of 45% and a 12 month prevalence rate of 39% By measure where responses were occasionally/sometimes/often <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 34% 2. 32% 3. 24% 4. 26% 5. 27% 6. 23% 7. 32%
Court records from Paarl and Belville in 1999 and 2000 ⁵⁰	1044	Economic abuse Between 68.5% and 94.6% of recorded perpetrators were current or former male intimate partners	30% of cases reported at Paarl involved economic abuse 36.4% (in 1999) and 28.2% (in 2000) of cases at Belville involved economic abuse
Women who were married or in union household couples ⁵¹	4948	Respondents were asked whether partners had regularly not provided money for food, rent or bills while having money for other things	Overall prevalence of 18.9%
Women who had experienced intimate partner abuse ⁵²	1386	Financial abuse: husband did not regularly provide money needed for food, rent or bills	16.9%
Women aged over 18 who were enrolled in a loan center ⁵³	860	Economic abuse: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How often did your partner stop you from getting a job, going to work, trading or earning money? 2. How often did your partner take your earnings against your will? 3. How often did your partner throw you out of the house? 4. How often did your partner spend money on alcohol, tobacco or other things for himself when he knew you did not have enough for essential household expenses? 	Overall lifetime prevalence of 14.3%, and of 9% in the past 12 months For women married or living as married, there was a lifetime prevalence of 16.1% and past 12 month prevalence of 13.2%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Protection order applications ⁵⁴	1722 in intimate relationships, including 1509 female applicants and 213 male applicants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic abuse 2. Damage to property 	<p>27% of female applicants and 12% of male applicants reported economic abuse, and 17% of female applicants and 32% of male applicants reported damage to property</p> <p>By relationship status, gender and measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic abuse <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married: Female: 29% / Male: 8% • Divorced/separated: Female: 31% / Male: 12% • Formerly dating: Female: 13% / Male: 16% • Cohabiting: Female: 36% / Male: 5% 2. Damage to property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married: Female: 16% / Male: 26% • Divorced/separated: Female: 15% / Male: 32% • Formerly dating: Female: 16% / Male: 32% • Co-habiting: Female: 18% / Male: 46%
Low-income female survivors of domestic abuse ⁵⁵	20	<p>Economic abuse:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partners failed to provide financially for their families 2. Partners would deliberately withhold money for necessary household items and use it alcohol or money 	<p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 50% 2. 25%
Applications for DVA protection orders ⁵⁶	600	Economic abuse	A quarter to a third of all applications mentioned economic abuse

Tanzania

Table 8: Prevalence of economic abuse in Tanzania

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women enrolled in a microfinance trial ⁵⁷	1049	Economic abuse by current or most recent partner: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 3. Makes important financial decisions without consulting you 	Prevalence rate of 46.9% in lifetime, and 34% in the past 12 months
Women and men in couples ⁵⁸	450	Economic violence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 her house 4. Kept money from a partner's earnings for alcohol, tobacco or other things knowing that partner was finding it hard to afford household expenses <p>Women were asked if they had experienced economic violence, and men were asked if they had perpetrated it</p>	By reporting of economic abuse and timeframe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both man and woman reporting economic abuse: Last 3 months: 10% / Last 12 months: 12% / Ever: 18% / Pregnancy: 1% • Man reporting perpetrating economic abuse, woman reporting not experiencing economic abuse: Last 3 months: 15% / Last 12 months: 13% / Ever: 13% / Pregnancy: 2% • Man reporting no perpetration of economic abuse, woman reporting experiencing economic abuse: Last 3 months: 24% / Last 12 months: 26% / Ever: 27% / Pregnancy: 13%
Women attending clinics for children under the age of 5 ⁵⁹	500	Economic violence from a partner: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taken your earnings or savings from you against your will? 2. Refused to give you money for household expenses, even when he has money for other things? 	15% reported economic violence during the pregnancy and 2.6% experienced economic violence only after the pregnancy

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Couples from Karatu District ⁶⁰	450 couples	<p>Economic violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 her house 4. Kept money from a partner's earnings for alcohol, tobacco, or other things knowing that partner was finding it hard to afford household expenses <p>Men were asked about perpetrating economic abuse, and women were asked about experiencing economic abuse</p>	<p>Women reporting economic abuse by time period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past 3 months: 34% • Past 12 months: 37.6% • Ever: 45.3% <p>Men reporting perpetrating economic abuse by time period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past 3 months: 25.6% • Past 12 months: 24.7% • Ever: 31.3% <p>Older men were less likely to report economic violence. Men with gender inequitable attitudes, who experienced childhood trauma and who used alcohol or drugs were significantly more likely to report economic violence against their partners in the last 3 months</p>
Men and women ⁶¹	1008 men 1008 women	<p>Economic intimate partner violence</p> <p>Measures are not stated but the research is part of the IMAGES project, which used the questions also used in the study above this one</p>	<p>42.5% of women experienced economic violence in their lifetime, and 68.1% in the last year</p> <p>14.9% of men had perpetrated economic violence in the lifetime, and 50% had in the last year</p>

Uganda

Table 9: Prevalence of economic abuse in Uganda

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Reports of intimate partner violence by HIV-negative partners in a PrEP project in Kenya and Uganda ⁶²	53	Economic abuse	22%
Family members receiving family counselling ⁶³	217	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Perpetrator using all joint resources 2. Perpetrator not contributing towards joint bills 	<p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 60% 2. 40%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Men and women aged 15–49 ⁶⁴	1008 men 1008 women	<p>Economic intimate partner violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibiting a partner from getting a job, going to work, trading, or earning money 2. Taking partner's earnings against her will. 3. Throwing a partner out of the house 4. Keeping money from earnings for alcohol, tobacco or other things for self when knew partner was finding it hard to afford the household expenses <p>Women were asked if they had experienced these, men were asked if they had perpetrated them</p>	<p>Women</p> <p>50.1% of women reported lifetime economic violence, and 73.8% reported it in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 37.4% / Last 12 months: 67.7% 2. Lifetime: 23.2% / Last 12 months: 67.5% 3. Lifetime: 19.5% / Last 12 months: 56.5% 4. Lifetime: 17.7% / Last 12 months: 71.7% <p>Men</p> <p>41.8% reported perpetrating economic violence in their lifetime, and 75.1% in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 16.6% / Last 12 months: 53.7% 2. Lifetime: 11.4% / Last 12 months: 72.1% 3. Lifetime: 13.9% / Last 12 months: 52.7% 4. Lifetime: 22.1% / Last 12 months: 82.1%

Zimbabwe

Table 10: Prevalence of economic abuse in Zimbabwe

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Domestic abuse crime records in Gokwe ⁶⁵	27	Economic abuse	24%
Women victim-survivors of intimate partner violence attending a gender-based violence service ⁶⁶	20	Economic violence	45%
Pregnant women aged 15 to 49 attending hospital ⁶⁷	120	Economic abuse	24.2%
Women over 18 in one province in Zimbabwe ⁶⁸	996	<p>Economic abuse from all perpetrators, including being prevented from going to work, thrown out of the home, and not given available support money</p> <p>Whilst the survey includes all perpetrators, the research notes most perpetrators were a current or former partner</p>	41%

Asia (including the Middle East)

Table 11: Prevalence of economic abuse in Asia

Region	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Asian and African countries ⁶⁹	Arab women (53% in Asian countries, 47% in African countries)	490	Financial abuse by an intimate partner before and during Covid-19	14.5% reported lifetime financial abuse 10.6% reported financial abuse prior to Covid-19, and 12.9% reported it during Covid-19
Middle East region ⁷⁰	Systematic review of intimate partner violence studies	55 studies with 138692 people	Economic abuse	The overall prevalence of economic abuse was 19%
Azerbaijan ⁷¹	Men and women aged 18–59	631 men 271 women	<p>Economic intimate partner violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibiting a partner from getting a job, going to work, trading, or earning money 2. Taking partner's earnings against her will. 3. Throwing a partner out of the house 4. Keeping money from earnings for alcohol, tobacco or other things for self when knew partner was finding it hard to afford the household expenses <p>Women were asked if they had experienced, men were asked if they had perpetrated</p>	<p>Women</p> <p>33% of women reported lifetime economic violence, and 20.5% reported it in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 26.7% / Last 12 months: 20.3% 2. Lifetime: 5.4% / Last 12 months: 16.7% 3. Lifetime: 5.9% / Last 12 months: 15.4% 4. Lifetime: 5.5% / Last 12 months: 33.3% <p>Men</p> <p>29.3% of men reported lifetime perpetration of economic violence and 35.2% reported it in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 22.6% / Last 12 months: 27.6% 2. Lifetime: 2.9% / Last 12 months: 43.8% 3. Lifetime: 7.1% / Last 12 months: 12.5% 4. Lifetime: 7% / Last 12 months: 56.4%
Bahrain ⁷²	Women attending primary care	602	<p>Financial abuse:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Denied food/water 2. Denied basic needs 3. Controlled access to salary/ income 4. Denied access to education 5. Denied access to employment 	<p>64.3% of perpetrators were husbands</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 23.3% 2. 43.3% 3. 81.7% 4. 11.9% 5. 21.3% <p>By age</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18–24: 16.7% • 25–34: 21.7% • 35–49: 51.7% • ≥50: 10%

Region	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Kyrgyzstan ⁷³	Substance-involved women	55	Economic abuse by an intimate partner	<p>85.45% experienced at least one lifetime incident of economic abuse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 72.72% experienced economic exploitation 81.81% experienced economic control 63.63% experienced employment sabotage <p>By demographic information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethnicity: Russian: 57.45% / Kyrgyz: 0% Other: 62.5% Married/common law marriage: 38.3% Secondary or lower education: 68.09% Unemployed in last 12 months: 100% Children: 80.85% / No children: 37.5% Place to sleep every night for past 90 days: Yes: 93.62% / No: 100% Illicit drug use in last 90 days: Yes: 42.55% / No: 75% Injection drug use: Yes: 18.18% / No: 0% Hazardous drinking: Yes: 85.11% / No: 100%
Laos ⁷⁴	Men	350	Economic abuse perpetrated against a wife	<p>50.4% had perpetrated economic abuse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 35.4% prohibited their wife from working 18% demanded total access to their wives' bank account or earnings 9% had taken their wives' money or belongings without permission
Mongolia ⁷⁵	Randomly selected households in Ulaanbaatar	4967 (3338 were women)	Financial intimate partner violence	<p>7% experienced financial violence</p> <p>By demographic information</p> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15-24: 5% 25-34: 8.3% 35-44: 2.4% 45-54: 5.9% 55-64: 20.1% >65: 37.9% <p>Women's education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary or lower: 5% Secondary: 5.3% College/university: 12.6%

Region	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
				<p>Partner's education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary or lower: 4.9% • Secondary: 5.7% • College/university: 9.4% <p>Marital status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married: 6.5% • Living together: 5.3% • Divorced/widow: 14.8% • Not married: 5.4% <p>Women's employment status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 3.6% • No: 9.3% <p>Partner's employment status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 6.3% • No: 7.1% <p>Housing status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Own: 6.3% • With family: 10.9% • Rented: 4.1% <p>Household monthly income (in thousand tugrugs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <119: 9.3% • 120–239: 5.9% • >240: 2.9% <p>Partner's alcohol use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 7.3% • No: 5.9%
Timor-Leste ⁷⁶	Women victim-survivors	18	Economic abuse	10 of the 18 victim-survivors experienced economic abuse
Yemen ⁷⁷	Women	Not stated	Economic domestic violence by a male partner	35%

Bangladesh

Table 12: Prevalence of economic abuse in Bangladesh

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women ⁷⁸	Not stated	Economic abuse in marriage	50%
Married women in rural Bangladesh ⁷⁹	4411	Restriction of food	5%
Ever-partnered men ⁸⁰	830 rural men and 742 urban men	<p>Economic abuse was measured using:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibited partner from working 2. Took partners' earnings 3. Forced partner out of the house 4. Withheld earnings from partner <p>Men were asked if they had perpetrated these</p>	<p>17.7% of rural men and 15.6% of urban men perpetrated economic abuse in their lifetime, and 6% rural men and 3.5% urban men in their current relationship</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural: 9.4% / Urban: 10.4% 2. Rural: 2.2% / Urban: 2.8% 3. Rural: 6.6% / Urban: 6.6% 4. Rural: 3.3% / Urban: 4.3%
Data from the Violence Against Women Survey 2011 ⁸¹	Not stated	Economic violence by an intimate partner	<p>About half reported lifetime economic violence</p> <p>One third reported economic abuse in the past 12 months</p>
Married women aged 15–49 ⁸²	929	<p>Economic coercion intimate partner violence, measured using the 36-item Economic Coercion Scale which assessed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EC1: Coercion in accessing work, schooling or training 2. EC2: Coercion in use/maintenance of economic resources 	<p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 41.9% 2. 50% <p>Both EC1 & EC2: 30%</p> <p>EC1 with physical/ sexual/ psychological IPV: 38.5%</p> <p>EC2 with physical/ sexual/ psychological IPV: 47.4%</p> <p>EC1 and EC2 with physical/ sexual/ psychological IPV: 28.7%</p>

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Female garment workers experiences of intimate partner violence ⁶³	800	<p>Economic intimate partner violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibited from getting a job, going to work, trading, earning money or participating in income generation activities 2. Took her earning, jewellery or anything valuable against her will 3. Refused to provide money for household expenses even when he has money for other things 4. Thrown out of house 5. Did not work despite his capacity to earn 6. Insisted her to surrender her earnings partially or fully either to him or to an in-law 7. Did not allow her to spend your own earnings without his permission 	<p>Overall prevalence of 35%</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 14.5% 2. 4.3% 3. 7% 4. 3.8% 5. 13.8% 6. 6.6% 7. 11.1% <p>By demographic information in last 12 months</p> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15–19: 39.47% • 20–24: 35.8% • 25–29: 33.58% • ≥30: 35.46% <p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 41.45% • 1–5 years: 35.29% • ≥6 years: 32.31% <p>Age at marriage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <15: 38.37% • 15–19: 32.56% • 19+: 37.61% <p>Number of children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 34.85% • One: 35.28% • Two plus: 35.06% <p>NGO membership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 33.38% • No: 42.86% <p>Ability to mobilise resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy/fairly easy: 36.17% • Somewhat difficult: 30.39% • Very difficult: 36.61% <p>Acceptance of IPV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher: 41.67% • Medium: 29.6% • Lower: 30.69% <p>Education relative to husband:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Husband has more: 31.78% • Same amount: 35.88% • Wife has more: 39.36%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<p>Income tertile:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest: 35.73% • Medium: 39.71% • Highest: 30% <p>Savings in Bangladeshi Takas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 30.16% • 1-20000: 35.8% • 20001-50000: 36.6% • >50000: 42.95% <p>Contribution to household income:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Husband pays more/full: 33.14% • About the same: 24.29% • Wife pays more of full: 44.44% <p>Ownership of jewellery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 39.56% • No: 29.43% <p>Controlling by husband:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least: 21.05% • Moderately: 36.58% • Highly: 62.2% <p>Husband abused alcohol/drugs in last 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No: 34.36% • Yes: 70.59% <p>Husband involved in extra marital sex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 60.71% • No: 33.90% <p>Food insecurity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 75% • No: 34.1%
Men and women aged between 17 and 50 ⁸⁴	136	Economic domestic violence	<p>5.8% experienced economic abuse before Covid-19</p> <p>15.8% experienced economic abuse after the first Covid-19 lockdown</p>
Reported cases of dowry abuse ⁸⁵		Dowry violence	<p>2015: 6595 cases</p> <p>2016: 5278 cases</p> <p>2017: 4125 cases</p>

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women aged 15–49 in rural Matlab ⁸⁶	930	<p>Economic Coercion Scale, which includes 40 items on limiting access to economic activity, economic control, creating barriers to economic achievements by a husband or partner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disallowed you to go to your work, school, or training, or do any home-based income earning activity? 2. Told you that you could work outside the home only if you kept up with the housework? 3. Told you that you could earn income only if you worked from home? 4. Been wary that you might meet other men when you leave the house for work, school, or training? 5. Told you that you could never keep a job? 6. Influenced you to give up or to refuse to take a job for money because he did not want you to take that job? 7. Threatened to hurt you or your children, or threatened to throw you out or abandon you if you worked? 8. Threatened to withhold money or gifts from you or your children if you worked? 9. Told you that women shouldn't work outside the home? 10. Told you that women who work outside the home are bad mothers? 11. Told you that you should not work because his parents said your working was wrong? 12. Refused to allow you to continue any education or training after marriage? 13. Not allowed you equal access to the family money? 14. Hidden money so that you could not find it? 15. Kept you from opening or accessing your savings or bank account? 16. Kept information on household finances and assets from you? 17. Made you fear the consequences if you asked him for money? 18. Demanded to know how your own money was spent? 19. Made you ask him for money for special purchases, such as cosmetics, sari/dresses, or special food for guests? 20. Refused to give you money to buy food, clothes, or other necessities, even when he had the money? 	<p>62.6% experienced any lifetime economic coercion</p> <p>40.32% had experienced inhibited access to work or training</p> <p>48.71% had experienced control over money or assets</p> <p>29.35% experienced economic sabotage</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 17.74 / Past 12 months: 26.67% 2. Lifetime: 5.91% / Past 12 months: 50.91% 3. Lifetime: 9.57% / Past 12 months: 52.81% 4. Lifetime: 8.49% / Past 12 months: 43.04% 5. Lifetime: 4.19% / Past 12 months: 69.23% 6. Lifetime: 4.62% / Past 12 months: 41.86% 7. Lifetime: 2.15% / Past 12 months: 50% 8. Lifetime: 2.8% / Past 12 months: 73.08% 9. Lifetime: 25.7% / Past 12 months: 59% 10. Lifetime: 12.5% / Past 12 months: 61.21% 11. Lifetime: 8.71% / Past 12 months: 43.21% 12. Lifetime: 6.45% / Past 12 months: 16.67% 13. Lifetime: 21.08% / Past 12 months: 79.08% 14. Lifetime: 12.37% / Past 12 months: 77.39% 15. Lifetime: 3.23% / Past 12 months: 36.67% 16. Lifetime: 5.91% / Past 12 months: 58.18% 17. Lifetime: 12.58% / Past 12 months: 77.78% 18. Lifetime: 20.97% / Past 12 months: 83.59% 19. Lifetime: 11.18% / Past 12 months: 74.04% 20. Lifetime: 10% / Past 12 months: 78.49% 21. Lifetime: 6.24% / Past 12 months: 56.9% 22. Lifetime: 6.89% / Past 12 months: 59.38% 23. Lifetime: 18.39% / Past 12 months: 87.13% 24. Lifetime: 15.16% / Past 12 months: 76.6% 25. Lifetime: 13.33% / Past 12 months: 64.52% 26. Lifetime: 6.24% / Past 12 months: 51.72% 27. Lifetime: 3.55% / Past 12 months: 63.64% 28. Lifetime: 14.19% / Past 12 months: 70.45% 29. Lifetime: 8.17% / Past 12 months: 39.47% 30. Lifetime: 5.27% / Past 12 months: 44.9% 31. Lifetime: 6.02% / Past 12 months: 39.29% 32. Lifetime: 10.22% / Past 12 months: 31.58%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
		<p>21. Blown through/spoiled money despite household needs?</p> <p>22. Made you feel obliged to give him money?</p> <p>23. Decided how you should spend money rather than letting you spend it how you saw fit?</p> <p>24. Made you afraid of the consequences if you spent money without his permission?</p> <p>25. Made important financial decisions without talking with you about them first?</p> <p>26. Threatened you or beaten you up for buying things that were needed?</p> <p>27. Taken your money from you without your permission or knowledge?</p> <p>28. Told you or acted as if it was "his money, his house, etc."?</p> <p>29. Beaten you or threatened to beat you if your family did not give money which he wanted from them?</p> <p>30. Beaten you up if you challenged his financial decisions?</p> <p>31. Forbidden you from becoming a microcredit member, group savings member, or opening a bank account?</p> <p>32. Demanded that you quit your job, schooling, or training?</p> <p>33. Picked fights when you needed to leave for work, study, or training?</p> <p>34. Pressured you into earning money when you did not want to?</p> <p>35. Destroyed or taken something that belonged to you?</p> <p>36. Refused to work without any proper reason, which meant you had to support your family by other means?</p> <p>37. Had you ask your family or someone else for money but not let you pay them back?</p> <p>38. Convinced you to lend him money but not pay it back?</p> <p>39. Pawned or sold your own or your shared belongings or property without your knowledge or consent?</p> <p>40. Not given you money so that you had to take out loans to cover household expenses?</p>	<p>33. Lifetime: 2.8% / Past 12 months: 57.69%</p> <p>34. Lifetime: 1.94% / Past 12 months: 83.33%</p> <p>35. Lifetime: 4.19% / Past 12 months: 60.47%</p> <p>36. Lifetime: 4.62% / Past 12 months: 60.47%</p> <p>37. Lifetime: 7.1% / Past 12 months: 37.88%</p> <p>38. Lifetime: 15.27% / Past 12 months: 71.83%</p> <p>39. Lifetime: 2.69% / Past 12 months: 32%</p> <p>40. Lifetime: 5.81% / Past 12 months: 72.22%</p>

Cambodia

Table 13: Prevalence of economic abuse in Cambodia

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Ever-partnered men and women in Cambodia ⁸⁷	1474 men and 417 women	<p>Economic abuse was measured using:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibited partner from working 2. Took partners' earnings 3. Forced partner out of the house 4. Withheld earnings from partner <p>Women were asked if they had experienced these measures, men were asked if they had perpetrated them</p>	<p>49% of women reported any act of economic abuse in their lifetime, and 16.6% reported it in their current relationship</p> <p>53.2% of men reported perpetrating any act of economic abuse in their lifetime and 25.2% in their current relationship</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 37.4% / Men: 25.6% 2. Women: 12.4% / Men: 16.9% 3. Women: 8.6% / Men: 7.8% 4. Women: 8.6% / Men: 30.6%
Women aged 18–49 ⁸⁸	477	Lifetime economic intimate partner violence	Prevalence rate of 46.8%

China

Table 14: Prevalence of economic abuse in China

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Male sex workers, including money boys and other male sex workers ⁸⁹	404	<p>Abuse from a male partner, relevant items included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Threatened to stop helping you with money or with housing 2. Damaged or destroyed your property 	<p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Overall: 11% / Money boy: 13.8% / Other male sex workers: 8.2% 4. Overall: 13.7% / Money boy: 16.9% / Other male sex workers: 10.6%
Ever-partnered men and women in China ⁹⁰	970 men and 1082 women	<p>Economic abuse was measured using:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibited partner from working 2. Took partners' earnings 3. Forced partner out of the house 4. Withheld earnings from partner <p>Women were asked if they had experienced these measures, men were asked if they had perpetrated them</p>	<p>25% of women reported any act of economic abuse in their lifetime, and 6.9% reported it in their current relationship</p> <p>22.7% of men reported perpetrating any act of economic abuse in their lifetime and 10.5% in their current relationship</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 14.4% / Men: 10.6% 2. Women: 9.5% / Men: 3.8% 3. Women: 4.3% / Men: 7.2% 4. Women: 4.7% / Men: 7.7%
Women aged 18–49 ⁹¹	309	Economic intimate partner violence	23.1%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Participants from Hong Kong ⁹²	505	Economic abuse	36.5%
General population in Hong Kong ^{93 94}	504, including 222 males and 282 females	<p>Economic abuse was measured using the 12-item Scale of Economic Abuse on a scale of Never (1) to Quite Often (5):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 request you as guarantor and to borrow money 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. Make you ask him for money 8. Demand that you give him receipts and/or change when you spent money 9. Do things to keep you from having money of your own 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 	<p>Overall mean of 15.71 for unmarried people, and 13.92 for married people</p> <p>Economic control had a mean of 7.06 among unmarried people and 6.01 among married people</p> <p>Economic exploitation had a mean of 5.33 among unmarried people and 4.79 among married people</p> <p>Mean by item</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1.16 2. 1.18 3. 1.08 4. 1.39 5. 1.28 6. 1.32 7. 1.16 8. 1.11 9. 1.14 10. 1.10 11. 1.06 12. 1.03
Women in Hong Kong, using the First Community Survey of Family Violence ⁹⁵	1132	Threaten to stop providing financial support	2.6%
Pregnant women ⁹⁶	900	Economic abuse within intimate partner violence	2% experienced economic abuse

Cyprus

Table 37: Prevalence of economic abuse in Cyprus

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Pregnant women attending the Department of Obstetrics at a hospital ⁹⁷	219	Economic violence by an intimate partner	<p>33.3% experienced economic abuse during pregnancy and 37% experienced it before pregnancy</p> <p>By demographic information and before or during pregnancy</p> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <25: Before: 46.7% / During: 36.7% • 26–30: Before: 30.4% / During: 29.3% • >31: Before: 37.3% / During: 35.8% <p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary: Before: 57.7% / During: 42.3% • High school: Before: 42.2% / During: 37.5% • Higher: Before: 39% / During: 29.5% <p>Partner's education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary: Before: 68.2% / During: 50% • High school: Before: 44.6% / During: 57.1% • Higher: Before: 29.1% / During: 29.1% <p>Employment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employed: Before: 32.5% / During: 30.5% • Unemployed: Before: 41.2% / During: 36% <p>Residence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban: Before: 35.8% / During: 32.1% • Rural: Before: 40.7% / During: 37% <p>Income balance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative: Before 52.3% / During: 45.5% • Neutral: Before: 33.6% / During: 30.7% • Positive: Before: 31.6% / During: 28.9% <p>Marriage type:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Normal: Before: 33.7% / During: 31.2% • Arranged: Before 76.5% / During: 58.8%

India

Table 15: Prevalence of economic abuse in India

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Abandoned wives in India ⁹⁸	57	Financial abuse, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dowry demanded/given to in-laws 2. Dowry related violence/harassment 3. Appropriation of wages 4. Abuse related to domestic labour 	By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 100% 2. 68% 3. 14% 4. 98%
Community members ⁹⁹	80	Dowry violence	16.75% of respondents knew someone who had experienced dowry violence
Women in West Bengal ¹⁰⁰	1201	Defined as occurring when a husband: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not allow his wife to spend her own money • forces her to spend all her own income and savings • does not allow her to take up a job or forces her to leave her job, • exerts control 	38.6% of women experienced economic control, with 43.2% of rural women and 33.3% of urban women By demographic information Religion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hindu: 41.12% • Muslim: 25.13% Respondent's employment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not working: 33.81% • Working: 50% Husband's employment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unemployed: 39.05% • Skilled and/or manual labour: 29.25% • Higher level: 44.32% Respondent's earning in relation to husband's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less: 50.57% • Same: 56.52% • More: 32.86% Earning type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In kind: 33.33% • Cash and in kind: 86.96% • Cash: 48.5% Marriage type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arranged: 38.61% • Love: 45.8% • Other: 24.19% Dowry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dowry not taken: 32.53% • Partly paid: 66.88% • Fully paid: 23.32% Contribution to family expenditure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 48.44% • Part: 59.53% • Full: 25%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women aged 18–49 attending an outpatient department in Pune ¹⁰¹	369	Economic violence by an intimate partner, including denial of funds, refusal to contribute financially, and denial of food and basic needs	32.8%
Ever-married aged 18–49 women in informal settlements in Mumbai ¹⁰²	4906	<p>Economic abuse measured using:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Denied the right to property 2. Not trusted with money 3. Belongings taken by force 4. Money hidden from respondent 5. Told lies about job or finances 6. Convinced to loan money and not repaid 7. Valuables sold without consent 8. Kept from having enough money 9. Harassed for not bringing natal family money or property 10. Prevented from seeking employment 11. Money taken or bank account used coercively 12. Forced to bring money from natal family 13. Forced to hand over income 14. Gambling without her consent 15. Loan taken without her consent 	<p>Lifetime prevalence rate of 23% for any of the items</p> <p>By item:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10% 2. 8% 3. 7% 4. 6% 5. 5% 6. 5% 7. 5% 8. 5% 9. 4% 10. 3% 11. 2% 12. 2% 13. 2% 14. 2% 15. 1% <p>By demographic information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marital status: Married: 21% / Widowed, separated or divorced: 58% • Age: 18–25: 22% / 26–30: 22% / 31–36: 22% / 37–49: 24% • Education: None: 23% / Primary: 23% / Middle: 24% / High: 24% / Senior: 19% / Above: 18% • Religion: Muslim: 23% / Hindu: 22% / Other: 28% • Caste: General: 22% / Other backward caste: 20% / Scheduled tribe or caste: 28% • Socioeconomic quintile: 1 (poorest): 26% / 2: 22% / 3: 23% / 4: 22% / 5 (least poor): 18% • In remunerated work: No: 20% / Yes: 31% • Husband in remunerated work: No: 48% / Yes: 22% • Uses alcohol or drugs: No: 21% / Yes: 34% • Husband uses alcohol or drugs: No: 17% / Yes: 29% • Emotional abuse in last 12 months: No: 14% / Yes: 61% • Physical abuse in last 12 months: No: 17% / Yes: 59% • Sexual abuse in last 12 months: No: 20% / Yes: 79%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate or severe depression: No: 79% / yes: 21% Moderate or severe anxiety: No: 85% / Yes: 15% Suicidal thoughts or actions in last 12 months: No: 84% / Yes: 16%
Rural women in Haryana ¹⁰³	200	Economic domestic abuse by a husband: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Husband taking away money forcefully Forcing to go out of house Selling/disposing stridhan or any other valuable without information Non-payment of other bills such as electricity, medical fee, education fee etc 	29 women (14.5%) reported any economic violence By measure of 29 women who experienced economic abuse <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently: 7 / Seldom: 17 / Rarely: 5 Frequently: 3 / Seldom: 19 / Rarely: 7 Frequently: 6 / Seldom: 15 / Rarely: 8 Frequently: 8 / Seldom: 14 / Rarely: 7
Ever-married women in Haryana ¹⁰⁴	631 rural women 249 urban women	Spousal economic violence	Overall, 10% experienced economic abuse in their lifetime. 10.3% of rural women and 9.2% experienced economic violence in their lifetime Overall, 7.6% experienced economic abuse in the last 12 months. 7.6% of rural women and 7.6% of urban women experienced it in the last 12 months
Muslim women from rural areas of North India ¹⁰⁵	387	Economic abuse was measured using the Revised Scale of Economic Abuse: Economic exploitation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Convince you to lend him money but not pay it back Take money from your purse, wallet, or bank account without your permission and/or knowledge Pay bills late or not pay bills that were in your name or both of your names Spend the money you needed for rent or other bills Force you to give him money or let him use your checkbook, ATM card, or credit card Steal your property Build up debt under your name by doing things like use your credit card or run up the phone bill Have you asked your family or friends for money but not let you pay them back Demand to know how money was spent Decide how you could spend money rather than letting you spend it how you saw fit 	32.53% experienced any form of economic abuse By measure Any form of economic exploitation: 30.44% <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 37.52% 27.8% 29.1% 25.84% 22.38% 21.86% 24.13% 29.10% 34.21% 33.64% 30.96% 34.32% 28.53% 39.07% 33.75% 31.96% 28.32% 36.38%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Do things to keep you from having money of your own 12. Keep you from having the money you needed to buy food, clothes or other necessities 13. Hide money so you could not find it 14. Keep financial information from you 15. Make you ask him for money 16. Demand that you give him receipts and/or change when you spent money 17. Take your paycheck, financial aid check, tax refund check, disability payment and other support payments from you 18. Threaten you or beat you up for paying the bills or buying things that were needed <p>Employment sabotage</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refuse you to get a job 2. Do things to keep you from going to your job 3. Demand that you quit your job 4. Steal the car keys or take the car so you couldn't go look for a job or go to a job interview/Transportation problems 5. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work 6. Threaten you to make you leave work <p>Economic control</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demand to know how money was spent 2. Decide how you could spend money rather than letting you spend it how you saw fit 3. Do things to keep you from having money of your own 4. Make important financial decisions without talking with you about it first 5. Keep you from having the money you needed to buy food, clothes, or other necessities 	<p>Any form of employment sabotage: 38.88%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 41.96% 2. 40.41% 3. 45.17% 4. 44.55% 5. 28.68% 6. 38.50% <p>Any form of economic control: 31.02%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 24.5% 2. 24.24% 3. 27.08% 4. 45.32% 5. 34.88%
Women receiving microfinance ¹⁰⁶	951	<p>Domestic violence, relevant items included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deprivation from financial resources 2. Unknown disposal of assets. 	<p>By item</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 42% 2. 31%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women aged 18–60 engaged in family court and who were being supported by domestic violence organisations ¹⁰⁷	150	Financial abuse	14%
Married women aged 15–49 ¹⁰⁸	455 97% of perpetrators in urban areas and 75% in rural included husbands	Economic violence, including: 1. Keeping economical resources away 2. Snatching away all resources 3. No basic need fulfilled 4. Asking money from natal family 5. Run home in less money 6. Dowry	Lifetime prevalence of 47.6% for urban women and 30.6% for rural women Current prevalence of 39.8% for urban women and 23.4% for rural women By item 1. Urban: 86.9% / Rural: 82.8% 2. Urban: 59.8% / Rural: 62.5% 3. Urban: 36.9% / Rural: 45.3% 4. Urban: 35.2% / Rural: 28.1% 5. Urban: 77.9% / Rural: 57.8% 6. Urban: 23% / Rural: 14.1%
Women victim-survivors aged 18–55 of domestic abuse who had filed cases under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act ¹⁰⁹	240 All had been abused by their husbands, and half had also been abused by in-laws	Economic abuse Dowry abuse	43.33% of rural women and 39.79% of urban women experienced economic abuse 19.75% of rural women and 21.44% of urban women experienced dowry abuse 42.5% said their husband did not contribute to household expenses, 50.8% were denied food, clothes and medicines, 23.3% had been thrown out of their marital home and 43.3% had their income taken
Women ¹¹⁰	200	Financial abuse by a partner	17%
Ever-married men and women age of 18: hospital staff, spouses of patients and spouses of psychotic patients ¹¹¹	100 of each group	Economic domestic violence: 1. Demanding dowry 2. Taking away belongings 3. Not allowing to have control over one's income 4. Not providing sufficient finances 5. Not involving in financial decision	Overall prevalence of 11.3% By measure 1. 84% 2. 73.7% 3. 56% 4. 71.3% 5. 41.8%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
First and second generation British Pakistani Muslims and British Gujarati Hindus, and Gujarati Hindus in India, and Pakistani Muslims in Pakistan ¹¹²	84	Economic abuse	39% reported experiencing economic abuse

Indonesia

Table 16: Prevalence of economic abuse in Indonesia

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors of domestic abuse ¹¹³	63	Neglect violence, stated to involve denial of funds, refusal to contribute financially, denial of food or basic necessities, and controlling access to health care, employment, etc	41.88%
Ever-partnered men in Indonesia ¹¹⁴	769 rural men 820 urban men 858 men in the province of Papua	Economic abuse was measured using: 1. Prohibited partner from working 2. Took partners' earnings 3. Forced partner out of the house 4. Withheld earnings from partner Men were asked if they had perpetrated them	33.3% of rural men, 32.6% of urban men and 49.8% of men in Papua reported ever perpetrating economic abuse 13.1% of rural men, 15.5% of urban men, and 26.2% of men in Papua reported perpetrating economic abuse in their current relationship By measure 1. Rural: 17.6% / Urban: 19.1% / Papua: 17.2% 2. Rural: 4.5% / Urban: 2.9% / Papua: 13.1% 3. Rural: 2.1% / Urban: 4.9% / Papua: 13.7% 4. Rural: 14.8% / Urban: 13% / Papua: 33.2%
Divorce cases due to domestic abuse in Sinaj district 2017–2019 ¹¹⁵	316 cases total	Economic violence	By timeframe • 2017: 89 • 2018: 99 • 2019: 113 Economic violence was the most prevalent form of abuse

Israel

Table 17: Prevalence of economic abuse in Israel

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married Arab women ¹¹⁶	Not stated	Being prohibited to manage the household economy	63%
Married women ¹¹⁷	Not stated		<p>5% reported they are not free to independently manage their own or a joint bank account</p> <p>21% reported their partner examines their expenses</p> <p>9% required their partner's approval before making a purchase</p> <p>14% had no information about their partner's income or property</p>
Applications for social services in hospitals and the community ¹¹⁸	Not stated		4% of applicants mentioned economic abuse or withholding of economic rights

Iran

Table 18: Prevalence of economic abuse in Iran

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors referred to a legal service ¹¹⁹	300	Economic domestic violence, measured using: 1. Prevent economic independence 2. Spending money on/for friends 3. Being a miserly husband 4. Control spending obsessively 5. Husband takes their income by force	Overall prevalence of 87.3% 1. 52% 2. 45.3% 3. 30% 4. 37.3% 5. 11.3%
Married women aged 15–55 ¹²⁰	368	Economic, including: 1. Barring from employment 2. Lack of financing 3. Hard decision on spending 4. The income of the spouse	Overall prevalence of 41% 1. 16.7% 2. 17.7% 3. 47.7% 4. 19.6%
Pregnant women experiencing domestic violence in Sahneh ¹²¹	92	Financial violence	Overall prevalence of 38.05%
Married women in Kerman ¹²²	400	Economic violence by a partner	34.7%
Women aged 15–65 ¹²³	380	Economic intimate partner violence	Prevalence of 16.9%
Women ¹²⁴	240	Economic intimate partner violence	Prevalence of 45%
Wives of married male psychiatric in-patients ¹²⁵	209	Economic abuse, including: 1. Not giving money for the expenses to the wife 2. Constant control over her expenses 3. Not telling her about his income 4. Opposing to her having a job	By measure 1. 62.1% 2. 66% 3. 49.6% 4. 61.7%
Married women attending health centres in Sanandaj ¹²⁶	700	Economic violence, including: 1. Financial control 2. Preventing financial independence 3. Assets belonging to women 4. Not providing requirements despite financial power	Overall prevalence of 53.4%. By measure 1. 33% 2. 8.9% 3. 38.4% 4. 6.1%
Women ¹²⁷	200	Financial abuse by a partner	9%

Iraq

Table 19: Prevalence of economic abuse in Iraq

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women attending primary health care centres ¹²⁸	200	Economic intimate partner violence, measured by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has your husband ever taken your earnings/savings or your valuables/other property from you against your will? 2. Have you ever given up or refused a job for money because your husband did not want you to work? 3. Does your husband ever refuse to give you money for household expenses, even when he has the money for other things? Or asking for account expenditure? 	Overall prevalence of 30% By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 11.5% 2. 18% 3. 15.5%
Women victim-survivors in Hawler city ¹²⁹	120	Economic abuse was measured using seven items, on a scale of Never (0) to Always (4)	Economic abuse had a mean of 16.47, the third highest out of the four forms of abuse measured
Married women in Avro City ¹³⁰	105	Financial abuse between partners, measured using 20 items on a scale of Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)	Financial abuse had a mean of 3.69

Jordan

Table 20: Prevalence of economic abuse in Jordan

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Working married women aged 20 and older in Amman ^{131 132}	500	<p>Economic abuse, measured using the 28 item Scale of Economic Abuse on a scale of Never (0) to Always (4):</p> <p>Economic control</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Steals the car keys or takes them, so you cannot look for a job or attend a job interview 2. Does things to keep you from going to work 3. Beats you if you say you need to go to work 4. Threatens you to make you leave your job 5. Demands that you quit your job 6. Does things to keep you from having money of your own 7. Takes your paycheque, financial aid cheque, tax refund cheque, disability payment, or other support payments from you 8. Decides how you can spend money rather than letting you spend it how you see fit 9. Demands to know how money was spent 10. Demands that you give him receipts and/or change when you spend money 11. Keeps you from having the money you need to buy food, clothes, or other necessities 12. Hides money so that you cannot find it 13. Keeps you from having access to your bank accounts 14. Keeps financial information from you 15. Makes important financial decisions without talking with you about it first 16. Makes you ask him for money 17. Threatens you or beats you for paying the bills or buying things that were needed 	<p>Overall prevalence of 38% (44.8% among rural women, 55.2% among urban women)</p> <p>By measure</p> <p>Any form of economic control: Urban: 55.5% / Rural: 44.5%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban: 52.4% / Rural: 47.6% 2. Urban: 57.5% / Rural: 42.5% 3. Urban: 58.5% / Rural: 41.5% 4. Urban 59.8% / Rural: 40.2% 5. Urban 57.7% / Rural: 42.3% 6. Urban 57.4% / Rural: 42.6% 7. Urban 55.9% / Rural: 44.1% 8. Urban 57.8% / Rural: 42.2% 9. Urban 52.7% / Rural: 47.3% 10. Urban 56.1% / Rural: 43.9% 11. Urban 51.7% / Rural: 48.3% 12. Urban 54.7% / Rural: 45.3% 13. Urban 54.7% / Rural: 45.3% 14. Urban 55.8% / Rural: 44.2% 15. Urban 54.1% / Rural: 45.9% 16. Urban 55.6% / Rural: 44.4% 17. Urban 50.4% / Rural: 49.6% <p>Any form of economic exploitation: Urban: 54.6% / Rural: 45.4%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban 52.3% / Rural: 47.5% 2. Urban 53.7% / Rural: 46.3% 3. Urban 51.5% / Rural: 48.5% 4. Urban 54.4% / Rural: 45.6% 5. Urban 58.2% / Rural: 41.8% 6. Urban 55.1% / Rural: 44.9% 7. Urban 52% / Rural: 48% 8. Urban 53.3% / Rural: 46.7% 9. Urban 54.6% / Rural: 45.4% 10. Urban 55.2% / Rural: 44.8% 11. Urban 60.3% / Rural: 39.7%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
		<p>Economic exploitation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Takes money from your purse, wallet, or bank account without your permission and/or knowledge 2. Forces you to give him money or let him use your cheque book, ATM card, or credit card 3. Steals your property 4. Pays bills late or does not pay bills that were in your name or both of your names 5. Builds up debt under your name by doing things like using your credit card or running up the phone bill 6. Refuses to get a job, so you have to support your family alone 7. Gambles with your money or your shared money 8. Has you ask your family or friends for money but does not let you pay them back 9. Convinces you to lend him money but does not pay it back 10. Pawns your property or your shared property 11. Spends the money you need for rent or other bills 	
Women aged 15 and over ¹³³	471	Economic abuse was measured using two items	35.1%
Women ¹³⁴	915	<p>Economic abuse:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forced you to give up your financial rights 2. Withheld money from you 3. Did not participate in household expenditure 4 4. Took money from you 5. Did not allow you to use money for your own expenditure 	<p>By measure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 6.5% 2. 7% 3. 4.8% 4. 9.6% 5. 8.9%

Lebanon

Table 21: Prevalence of economic abuse in Lebanon

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Ever-married women presenting for gynecological care in Beirut ¹³⁵	91	Economic abuse was measured by asking: 'Does your partner control home expenditure denying you access to money?'	33%
Women attending primary health care centres in Lebanon ¹³⁶	1415	Economic abuse was measured as denial of financial support	Personal prevalence was 12% 13% reported a family member had experienced economic abuse
Men and women aged 18 to 59 ¹³⁷	1050 men 1136 women	<p>Economic violence by a partner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevented (his wife/her) from working for wages or profit 2. Took (his wife's/her) earnings against her will 3. Kept money from earnings for personal use when the respondent knew (his wife/she) was finding it hard to pay for her personal expenses or household needs 4. Threw (his wife/her) out of the house <p>Women were asked if they had experienced these behaviours, men were asked if they had perpetrated them</p>	<p>Women</p> <p>10.8% reported any economic violence in their lifetime, 3.7% reported it in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 8.1% / Last 12 months: 2.5% 2. Lifetime: 2.1% / Last 12 months: 0.6% 3. Lifetime: 1.9% / Last 12 months: 1.2% 4. Lifetime: 4.6% / Last 12 months: 1.3% <p>Men</p> <p>9.9% reported perpetrating any economic violence in their lifetime, 5.0% reported perpetrating it in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 6.1% / Last 12 months: 2.1% 2. Lifetime: 1.9% / Last 12 months: 0.5% 3. Lifetime: 3.3% / Last 12 months: 0.9% 4. Lifetime: 5.2% / Last 12 months: 2.8%

Nepal

Table 22: Prevalence of economic abuse in Nepal

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Pregnant women attending an antenatal ward in Syangja District ¹³⁸	202 100% said the perpetrator included their husband	Economic gender-based violence	87%
Victim-survivors with an injury from a partner, relative or household member presenting at a General Practice and Emergency Medicine department ¹³⁹	432 71.9% were female	Economic violence	11.4%
Infertile women aged 15–49 attending an IVF clinic ¹⁴⁰	144	Economic violence	6.2%

Pakistan

Table 23: Prevalence of economic abuse in Pakistan

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married men from three low socio-economic districts ¹⁴¹	840	Economic abuse by a husband towards a wife, including: 1. Accessing their wife's income or assets without permission 2. Using their wife's income 3. Not allowing their wife to work outside the home	83.71% reported perpetrating economic abuse By item 1. 13.79% 2. 32.85% 3. 67.15%
Women in Lahore ¹⁴²	200, 100 in shelters and 100 in the community	Husband takes salary	11% of women in shelters and 31% of women in the community reported experiencing this

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women aged 15–49 in Sargodha ¹⁴³	100	Economic abuse	67% reported their husband always tries to keep them dependent in money matters 64% reported their husband controls access to health facilities
Married women in urban Lahore ¹⁴⁴	151	Financial abuse was measured by asking if a woman had been made to surrender her property in favor of husband or thrown out of the house	0.7% had been made to surrender their property 13.3% had been thrown out of the house
Women from Balochistan ¹⁴⁵	300	Economic violence by husband: 1. Non-involvement in financial decisions 2. Job permission 3. Provision of basic necessities	By item 1. 33 (11%) 2. 34 (11.3%) 3. 45 (15%)
Women victim-survivors ¹⁴⁶	108 88% reported their husband as a perpetrator	Economic control	39% experience some form of economic control
Case studies of intimate partner violence ¹⁴⁷	40	Economic abuse by an intimate partner	82.5%
Working women	Not stated	Economic abuse by a spouse	40.6%
Women who were first and second generation British Pakistani Muslim and British Gujarati Hindus, and Gujarati Hindus in India, and Pakistani Muslims in Pakistan ¹⁴⁸	84	Economic abuse	39% reported experiencing economic abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married men and women ¹⁴⁹	640 men 300 women	<p>Economic violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibited her from getting a job, going to work, trading or earning money 2. Withheld money she needed for household expenses <p>Women were asked if they had experienced the above, men were asked if they had perpetrated it</p>	<p>Women</p> <p>30% of women experienced economic violence in their lifetime, 20% experienced it in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 21% / Last 12 months: 12% 2. Lifetime: 14% / Last 12 months: 11% <p>Men</p> <p>18% reported perpetrating economic violence in their lifetime, 13% in the last 12 months</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 8% / Last 12 months: 4% 2. Lifetime: 11% / Last 12 months: 9% <p>By demographic information</p> <p>Residence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban: Women: 35% / Men: 21% • Rural: Women: 28% / Men: 16% <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18–25: Women: 31% / Men: 13% • 26–33: Women: 32% / Men: 17% • 34–41: Women: 26% / Men: 16% • 42–49: Women: 35% / Men: 22% <p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: Women: 29% / Men: 17% • Primary: Women: 30% / Men: 15% • Middle: Women: 45% / Men: 18% • Secondary: Women: 35% / Men: 19% • Higher: Women: 20% / Men: 20% <p>Standard of living index:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low: Women: 27% / Men: 14% • Medium: Women: 39% / Men: 19% • High: Women: 27% / Men: 20% <p>Number of children:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: Not available • 1–2: Women: 29% / Men: 19% • 3–5: Women: 30% / Men: 19% • 6+: Women: 32% / Men: 16% <p>Women's employment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employed: Women: 34% / Men: 11% • Unemployed: Women: 29% / Men: 19%

Palestine

Table 24: Prevalence of economic abuse in Palestine

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, using the First Palestinian National Survey on Violence Against Women ¹⁵⁰	2410	Economic abuse by a husband during the previous 12 months, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevented you from using the family's money as you see fit? 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? 	Overall prevalence rate of 45% in the last 12 months By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 41% 2. 24%
Women from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, using the Second Palestinian National Survey on Violence Against Women ¹⁵¹	1334	Economic abuse by a husband during the previous 12 months, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevented you from using the family's money as you see fit? 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? 	Overall prevalence rate of 44% in the last 12 months By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 40% 2. 19%
Survey on violence by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics ¹⁵²	Not stated	Economic abuse	55%
Men and women aged 15–59 ¹⁵³	1200 men 1199 women	Economic violence by a partner: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevented (his wife/her) from working for wages or profit 2. Took (his wife's/her) earnings against her will 3. Kept money from earnings for personal use when the respondent knew (his wife/she) was finding it hard to pay for her personal expenses or household needs 4. Threw (his wife/her) out of the house <p>Women were asked if they had experienced these behaviours, men were asked if they had perpetrated them</p>	Women 18.2% reported any economic violence in their lifetime, 9.6% reported it in the last 12 months <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 8.1% / Last 12 months: 4.5% 2. Lifetime: 5.9% / Last 12 months: 3.1% 3. Lifetime: 1.19% / Last 12 months: 5.7% 4. Lifetime: 5.1% / Last 12 months: 2.5% Men 12.3% reported perpetrating any economic violence in their lifetime, 5.4% reported perpetrating it in the last 12 months <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 5.7% / Last 12 months: 2.1% 2. Lifetime: 1% / Last 12 months: 0.6% 3. Lifetime: 5.1% / Last 12 months: 1.7% 4. Lifetime: 2.6% / Last 12 months: 1.5%

Philippines

Table 25: Prevalence of economic abuse in Philippines

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women aged 15–49 ¹⁵⁴	8478	<p>Economic abuse was measured using:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not allowed to engage in legitimate work 2. Spouse controlled money or force her to work 3. Destroyed personal property/pet or threaten to harm pet 4. Ever lost job/source of income because of husband 	<p>By demographic information and measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall: 3.8% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age: 15–19: 9% / 20–24: 17% / 25–29: 23% / 30–34: 21% / 35–39: 14% / 40–44: 9% / 45–49: 7% • Education level: None: 2% / Primary: 27% / Secondary or higher: 71% • Working status: Unemployed: 55% / Employed: 45% • Residence: Urban: 42% / Rural: 58% • Marital status: Never/formerly married: 8% / Currently married: 92% • Justify wife beating: Yes: 27% / No: 73% 2. Overall: 1.5% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age: 15–19: 8% / 20–24: 9% / 25–29: 14% / 30–34: 20% / 35–39: 25% / 40–44: 14% / 45–49: 10% • Education level: None: 7% / Primary: 34% / Secondary or higher: 59% • Working status: Unemployed: 43% / Employed: 57% • Residence: Urban: 45% / Rural: 55% • Marital status: Never/formerly married: 3% / Currently married: 97% • Justify wife beating: Yes: 30% / No: 70% 3. Overall: 3.1% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age: 15–19: 6% / 20–24: 13% / 25–29: 17% / 30–34: 18% / 35–39: 19% / 40–44: 12% / 45–49: 15% • Education level: None: 2% / Primary: 32% / Secondary or higher: 66% • Working status: Unemployed: 39% / Employed: 61% • Residence: Urban: 41% / Rural: 59% • Marital status: Never/formerly married: 6% / Currently married: 94% • Justify wife beating: Yes: 25% / No: 75% 4. Overall: 6.9% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age: 15–19: 7% / 20–24: 11% / 25–29: 21% / 30–34: 16% / 35–39: 21% / 40–44: 12% / 45–49: 12% • Education level: None: 1% / Primary: 28% / Secondary or higher: 71% • Working status: Unemployed: 44% / Employed: 56% • Residence: Urban: 44% / Rural: 56% • Marital status: Never/formerly married: 5% / Currently married: 96% • Justify wife beating: Yes: 27% / No: 73%

Saudi Arabia

Table 26: Prevalence of economic abuse in Saudi Arabia

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married females aged 19–65 attending outpatient clinics ¹⁵⁵	400	Economic intimate partner violence, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forced to spend your money for house needs 2. Forced to borrow money from others 3. Beg him for money 4. Refusal of husband to spend money on house needs during the time he has money for it 	Lifetime prevalence was 25.3% By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 23.2% 2. 17.3% 3. 41.2% 4. 38.1%
Married women attending primary health care centre ¹⁵⁶	720	Economic violence	5.3% reported economic violence
Women ¹⁵⁷	287	Economic abuse	Economic abuse (and social and verbal abuse) was found to be more prevalent than physical and sexual abuse

South Korea

Table 27: Prevalence of economic abuse in South Korea

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Adults aged 19 and over with a partner ¹⁵⁸	1272 men 2689 women	Economic intimate partner violence	2.4% of women reported experiencing economic abuse in the past 12 months 1.5% of men reported perpetrating economic abuse in the past 12 months
Women who reported experiencing abuse from their husband in the past year ¹⁵⁹	309	Economic abuse	20%
Ever-married North Korean refugee women ¹⁶⁰	180	Economic abuse was measured by asking if a partner had ever: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deprived me of money to buy necessities 2. Disposed of property without my consent 3. Took full control of income and expenses 	37.1%

Sri Lanka

Table 28: Prevalence of economic abuse in Sri Lanka

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Ever-partnered men and women in Sri Lanka ¹⁶¹	1176 men and 559 women	<p>Economic abuse was measured using:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibited partner from working 2. Took partners' earnings 3. Forced partner out of the house 4. Withheld earnings from partner <p>Women were asked if they had experienced these measures, men were asked if they had perpetrated them</p>	<p>27.6% of women reported any act of economic abuse in their lifetime, and 6.2% reported it in their current relationship</p> <p>18% of men reported perpetrating any act of economic abuse in their lifetime and 6.4% in their current relationship</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 16.7% / Men: 9.1% 2. Women: 13% / Men: 5.9% 3. Women: 2.5% / Men: 5.1% 4. Women: 6.3% / Men: 8%
Women attending two gender-based violence care centers ¹⁶²	488 94% of perpetrators were intimate partners	Economic violence	<p>66.6% reported economic violence</p> <p>By demographic information of 325 women experiencing economic abuse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married: Yes: 233 • Reported a stable relationship: Yes: 135 • Pregnant (n=180): Yes: 144 • Employed (n=169): Yes: 107
Women aged 18–49 ¹⁶³	653	Economic intimate partner violence	26.6%
Ever-partnered women ¹⁶⁴	2100	<p>Economic abuse by an intimate partner, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prohibits from getting a job or generating income 2. Taken away what she earned or saved 3. Refused to give money 	<p>18.1% reported lifetime economic abuse from a partner and 7.7% reported it in the last 12 months</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lifetime: 11.4% / Past 12 months: 4.9% 2. Lifetime: 3.2% / Past 12 months: 0.9% 3. Lifetime: 7% / Past 12 months: 2.9% <p>By demographic information</p> <p>Location:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban: Lifetime: 20.6% / Last 12 months: 10.7% 2. Rural: Lifetime: 17.4% / Last 12 months: 6.8% 3. Estate: Lifetime: 20% / Last 12 months: 11.5% <p>Age:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 15–24: Lifetime: 19.4% / Last 12 months: 14.1% 2. 25–34: Lifetime: 21.1% / Last 12 months: 13.8% 3. 35–44: Lifetime: 35–44 / Last 12 months: 10.4% 4. 45–54: Lifetime: 17.8% / Last 12 months: 7% 5. 55–64: Lifetime: 15.4% / Last 12 months: 3.1% 6. 65+: Lifetime: 18.7% / Prevalence 2.6%

Turkey

Table 29: Prevalence of economic abuse in Turkey

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women accessing healthcare in Ankara Provincial centre ¹⁶⁵	1178	Economic domestic violence was measured using: 1. Taking her money 2. Making the budget by himself, determining how to spend money by himself 3. Deciding financial results without asking	Overall prevalence of 60.4% By measure 1. 13.6% 2. 53.5% 3. 47.8%
Women attending a training hospital ¹⁶⁶	228 infertile women 204 fertile women	Abuse was measured using the 50 item Scale for Marital Violence Against Women, which includes economic violence	The mean for economic violence among infertile women was 14.37 The mean for economic violence among fertile women was 12.93
Married women attending Family Health Centers in Konya ¹⁶⁷	518	Economic violence: 1. Preventing women from working 2. Neglecting women's basic needs (food, bills, etc.) 3. Grabbing or stealing women's money 4. Forcing women to work	Overall prevalence of 13.5% By item 1. 60% 2. 32.1% 3. 25.7% 4. 12.1%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women aged 15 and over who had been in a relationship, using data from the Research on Domestic Violence against Women in Turkey dataset ¹⁶⁸	11514 in 2008 6711 in 2014	Economic violence by an intimate partner: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has your spouse or any of the people you have been with prevented you from working or forced you to leave a job against your will? 2. Have they ever refused to give you money for you to fulfil the needs of the household even though they have enough money for some other expenses? 3. Have they ever tried to take your own money (in a situation where you have an income) against your own will? 	27.2% of women had experienced economic abuse in their lifetime By demographic information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Region: West: 29% / South: 8.8% / Central: 22.6% / North: 13% / East: 26.9% • Residence: Rural: 27.7% / Urban: 72.3% • Age: 15–24: 14.1% / 25–34: 32% / 35–44: 26.7% / 45–54: 19.9% / 55+: 7.3% • Education level: Illiterate: 16.3% / Elementary: 49% / Secondary: 9.8% / High school: 15.7% / University: 9.2% • Employment: Unemployed: 78.8% / Employed: 21.2% • Relationship status: Single: 8.9% / In a relationship: 4% / Married: 87.2% • Health status: Excellent/good: 43.3% / Reasonable: 41.9% / Bad/very bad: 14.8% • Children: None: 13.4% / One: 15.9% / Two or more: 70.7% • Partner's education: Illiterate: 3.7% / Elementary: 45.1% / Secondary: 16.6% / High: 23.8% / University: 10.7% • Partner's employment: Yes: 82.4% / No: 17.6% • Partner's alcohol use: Yes: 26.3% / No: 73.7% • Partner's gambling: Yes: 4.7% / No: 95.3% • Partner's drug use: Yes: 0.9% / No: 99.1% • Partner's cheating status: Yes: 8.9% / No: 91.1% • Verbal abuse: Yes: 43.6% / No: 56.4% • Physical: Yes: 37.1% / No: 56.4% • Sexual violence: Yes: 14.3% / No: 85.7%
General practitioners ¹⁶⁹	Not stated	Economic violence	1.7%
Women working at a university ¹⁷⁰	Not stated	Economic violence	13.6%
Women in Manisa city ¹⁷¹	Not stated	Economic violence	24.4%
People aged over 65 in Canakkale ¹⁷²	Not stated	Economic violence	12.2%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women in Istanbul and the Aegean Region ¹⁷³	1100, 482 in Istanbul and 618 in the Aegean Region	Economic abuse was measured using the Domestic Violence Against Women Determination Scale, which includes economic abuse	10.4% in Istanbul and 11.7% in the Aegean Region The most frequently reported forms of economic abuse were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spouses controlling all assets and bank accounts: 47.8% • Lack of permission for working: 42.1% • Spouses managing all money related activities: 37.6%
Pregnant women attending obstetrics and gynecology departments in Sanliurfa ¹⁷⁴	317	Financial abuse	6.6% experienced financial abuse during pregnancy
Women over 18 who had been married at least once in the Central Kutahya District ¹⁷⁵	1481 89.2% experienced abuse by a spouse	Economic violence	18.5%
Infertile women referred to an IVF centre ¹⁷⁶	423	Economic violence	30.4% experienced domestic abuse, of which 19% experienced economic violence
Married women aged 15–49 in Mardin city centre ¹⁷⁷	1064	Economic violence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not meeting financial needs / Threatening not to give any money 2. Seizing pay data card by force 3. Not giving enough money to meet the needs 4. Not giving money without being asked 	Overall prevalence of 37.7% By item <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 13.8% 2. 0.9% 3. 25% 4. 37.9%
Married women over 15 in Kesan ¹⁷⁸	586	Economic violence <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dispossession of her money forcibly 2. Prevention of her to work 3. Not purchasing the fundamental needs of the home 	By item <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 4.9% 2. 4.8% 3. 6.5%
Women aged 15–59 ¹⁷⁹	24,048	Financial control by an intimate partner <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taking her income despite her disapproval 2. Refusing to give money for household spending 	Overall prevalence of 6% By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 3% 2. 5%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women who were workers at or mothers of children referred to outpatient pediatric health units ¹⁸⁰	336	Economic intimate partner violence, measured by asking: 'Has your husband ever applied economic violence to you until you married? If so, how many times? If you have not, please answer '0' to this question (Economic violence includes the behaviors, such as preventing or forcing you to leave work, not giving enough money for your, home's and children's needs, and getting your own money by force, if any)'	12.5% experienced at least one incident of economic violence by their husband
Women attending social life centres in a city ¹⁸¹	150	Economic violence by partners: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preventing them from working 2. Withholding money for household expenses 3. Making them quit work 4. Taking away income 	21.3% experienced economic violence in the previous year, and 22.7% experienced it in their lifetime By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Last year: 10.7% / Lifetime: 12.7% 2. In last year: 8.7% / Lifetime: 12.7% 3. In last year: 8.7% / Lifetime: 8.7% 4. In last year: 5.3% / Lifetime: 5.3%
Women experiencing sexual dysfunction receiving support (Group 1); women without sexual dysfunction (Group 2); women experiencing sexual dysfunction but not receiving support (Group 3) ¹⁸²	Group 1: 80 Group 2: 80 Group 3: 40	Economic violence	Group 1: 25% Group 2: 8.7% Group 3: 35%
Married women aged 15–49 in Gönen ¹⁸³	260	Economic violence by a partner	31.5% reported economic violence by a partner
Women diagnosed with depressive disorder (patient group) and women who had not been (control group) ¹⁸⁴	100 in patient group 30 in control group	Economic violence by a partner	Patient group: 51% Control group: 10% 65.6% of those who experienced economic abuse also experienced physical abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Victim-survivors of intimate partner violence directed to a forensic medical department by judicial authorities ¹⁸⁵	34, with 32 being women and 2 being men	Economic intimate partner violence	58.8%
Married women between 15-59 in Edirne ¹⁸⁶	306 in total 188 experienced abuse	Economic partner violence	61.4% experienced domestic abuse, and of these, 19.3% experienced economic abuse
Women using the 2014 National Research on Domestic Violence Against Women ¹⁸⁷	Not stated	Economic domestic violence	30%
Women aged 15-59 ¹⁸⁸	7642	Economic abuse by a husband	27%
Ever-married women over 15 in Manisa ¹⁸⁹	873	Economic domestic violence	25.1% reported lifetime economic violence 11.2% reported economic violence in the past 12 months
Female nurses aged between 22-48 with an intimate partner ¹⁹⁰	110	Economic abuse	46%
Women who have been married once or lived with a partner in Manisa ¹⁹¹	1760	Economic violence measured using the Scale of Domestic Violence	7.4%
Women ¹⁹²	1010	Economic violence	8.2%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Various studies exploring intimate partner violence against women ¹⁹³	Not stated	Economic intimate partner violence	<p>A range of prevalence rates were found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 39% • 3.1% • 24.4% • 30.3% • 11.4% • 78.3% • 52.5% • 50.8% • 52.1% • 4.3%

Vietnam

Table 30: Prevalence of economic abuse in Vietnam

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Married women aged 18–50 in Mỹ Hào district ¹⁹⁴	533	<p>Economic coercion by current husband:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ever refused to give her money for household expenses 2. Ever gave up or refused to take a job for money because her husband did not want her to take that job 3. Has to give all or part of her earnings to her husband 	<p>28% reported lifetime economic coercion</p> <p>54% reported exposure to economic coercion as well as a form of psychological, physical or sexual IPV and 11% reported only economic coercion</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 8% 2. 21% 3. 3%
Ever-married women ¹⁹⁵	Not stated	Economic abuse	Lifetime prevalence rate of 9%
Clients at a counselling centre ¹⁹⁶	1884	Economic violence	11%

Europe

Table 35: Prevalence of economic abuse across Europe, and in Austria, Belgium, Portugal

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Europe-wide ¹⁹⁷ ¹⁹⁸	Women in 28 EU member states	42000	Economic/financial intimate partner violence from a current and/or former partner	Prevalence rate of 12% 5% experienced economic abuse in the current relationship and 13% in their previous relationships
Austria, Belgium, Finland, Lithuania, Portugal ¹⁹⁹	Women over 60 living in the community	2880	Financial abuse by a current partner or spouse	34.2%
EU countries ²⁰⁰	Female victim-survivors in shelters in Europe	46 countries	Economic violence	Economic violence was reported as one of the four most common forms of violence
Austria ²⁰¹	Women over 60 living in the community	31	Financial abuse by a current partner or spouse	19.4%
Belgium ²⁰²	Women over 60 living in the community	25	Financial abuse by a current partner or spouse	19.2%
Belarus ²⁰³	Callers to the National Hotline for Survivors of Domestic Violence Clients at women-only shelters	1417 callers 5 women's shelters	Economic violence	Economic violence was noted as one of the three most common types of violence for both callers and clients in shelters
Bulgaria ²⁰⁴	Women-only shelters	8	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients
Czechia ²⁰⁵	Women-only shelters	3	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Denmark ²⁰⁶	Women-only shelters	48	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients
Estonia ²⁰⁷	Women-only shelters	15	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients
France	Calls to the 3919-Violences Femmes Info helpline	96799 in 2019 ²⁰⁸ 164957 In 2020 ²⁰⁹	Economic violence	<p>23.8% reported economic abuse in 2019:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 53% economic blackmail • 26% no control over finances • 28% had financial resources and means of payment taken <p>19.12% reported economic abuse in 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% economic blackmail • 26% no control over finances • 29% had financial resources and means of payment taken
Germany ²¹⁰	Women aged 16 to 86	10264	<p>Economic abuse by a current partner:</p> <p>‘Partner controls exactly how much money I spent on what, makes me feel that I am financially dependent on him and does not let me decide about money things I want to buy by myself’</p>	<p>By age group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16–49: 12% • 50–65: 14% • 66–86: 13%
Hungary ²¹¹	Calls to the national helpline for adult and child survivors of domestic violence	1008	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by callers
Ireland ²¹²	Calls to the Women’s Aid national domestic violence helpline	15835	Financial abuse	7% of calls were reported to be relating to financial abuse, and it was one of the three most commonly reported forms of abuse
Lichtenstein ²¹³	Calls to the national women’s helpline	Not stated	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by callers

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Luxembourg ²¹⁴	Women-only shelters	10	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients
Moldova ²¹⁵	Shelters for women survivors of violence	8	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients
Montenegro ²¹⁶	Callers to the National SOS Helpline for Victims of Domestic Violence	429	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by callers
	Women's shelters	3		Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients
North Macedonia ²¹⁷	Calls to three national women's helplines	2045	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by callers
Portugal ²¹⁸	Women over 60 living in the community	108	Financial abuse by a current partner or spouse	38.7%
Russia ²¹⁹	Domestic violence victims calling a helpline	Not stated	Economic abuse	It is stated that every third victim mentioned economic abuse
Serbia	Calls to the SOS Hotline for Women and Children Victims of Violence ²²⁰	770 calls	Economic violence	6% of women reported economic violence
	Women-only shelters ²²¹	12		Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Slovakia ²²²	Calls to the National Helpline for Women Experiencing Violence	328	Economic violence	Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by callers
	Women-only shelters	9		Economic violence was one of the three most common forms of abuse reported by clients
Switzerland ²²³	Social services case files in a rural area	34	Economic abuse	50%

Croatia

Table 36: Prevalence of economic abuse in Croatia

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women from two counties attending family medicine offices ²²⁴	1314	Lifetime Economic violence was measured using 19 questions (no further information)	<p>Overall prevalence of 18.9%</p> <p>Of those who reported economic violence 96% reported economic control, 59.8% reported economic exploitation and 36.1% reported employment sabotage</p> <p>By demographic information</p> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18–30: 15.4% • 31–42: 30.3% • 44–56: 30.6% • 57+: 27.7% <p>Marital status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single: 29.6% • Partnered: 15% <p>Education level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower: 20.9% • Higher: 14.2% <p>Socioeconomic status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under average: 31.7% • Average: 15.8% • Above average: 14.1%

Finland

Table 38: Prevalence of economic abuse in Finland

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women over 60 living in the community ²²⁵	45	Financial abuse by a current partner or spouse	37.8%
Domestic violence in social and medical services ²²⁶	Not stated	Economic abuse	20%

Italy

Table 39: Prevalence of economic abuse in Italy

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women's shelters ²²⁷	232	Economic violence	Economic violence was found to be one of the three most common types of violence reported by clients
Women who presented to an anti-violence center who were interviewed 3–5 years after first attending ²²⁸	124	Financial violence by a partner	31.6% reported financial violence at Time 1 29.4% reported financial violence at Time 2
Women between 16 and 70 ²²⁹	Not stated	Economic and psychological abuse	26.4% reported psychological or economic abuse from a current partner 46.1% reported psychological or economic abuse from a former partner

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence	
Women who have experienced gender violence whilst living with a partner, and women who did not report gender violence whilst living with a partner ²³⁰	120 each of both groups of women	<p>Women were asked if their ex-partner did the following:</p> <p>During the relationship</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fall behind in the payment or did he not pay the bills that were in your name or in the name of both, or did he not deposit his financial contribution to the account of common expenses? 2. Spend the money you both needed for the rent or other expenses when you lived together 3. Accumulate debts in your name, doing things like using your credit card, or increasing the telephone bill, electricity, gas 4. Demand to know how you spent the money? 5. Make important financial decisions without asking you first? 6. Withhold financial information from you? 7. Force you to ask him for money? 8. demand you to give him the receipts or change when you spent money 9. prevent you from going to work or attending job interviews? 10. Ask you to quit your job 11. Threaten you to make you quit your job? 12. Hit or threaten you if you said you needed or wanted to work? <p>Post separation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Ask you about how you spend the money? 14. Try to access the accounts you have in common behind your back? 15. Do things to prevent you from going to work, or a job interview 16. Ask you to quit your job? 17. Threaten you to quit your job? 18. Interfere with your work performance through phone calls, messages, or visits to your workplace 19. Delay or not pay what was agreed in the separation agreement? 20. Not bear the part of the extraordinary expenses that corresponds to him? 	<p>Prevalence by those who did report gender violence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 63.3% 2. 58.3% 3. 43% 4. 96.2% 5. 89.9% 6. 96% 7. 82% 8. 49.5% 9. 60.8% 10. 73.4 11. 46.9% 12. 58.2% 13. 45.6% 14. 13.9% 15. 44.4% 16. 17.8% 17. 17.8% 18. 45.5% 19. 69.9% 20. 73.4% 	<p>Prevalence by those who did not report gender violence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 49.5% 2. 44.6% 3. 28.9% 4. 66.2% 5. 42.9 6. 70.2% 7. 42.9% 8. 22.3% 9. 19.9% 10. 32.3% 11. 18.9% 12. 12.4% 13. 14.1% 14. 6.7% 15. 10.8% 16. 6.7% 17. 5.7% 18. 14% 19. 47.9% 20. 57%

Lithuania

Table 40: Prevalence of economic abuse in Lithuania

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women over 60 living in the community ²³¹	50	Financial abuse by a current partner or spouse	36%
Women ²³²	1012	Economic violence from an intimate partner	29.9% had experienced economic violence in their lifetime. Of these: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24.6% had experienced it in the past years • 34% had experience it over a year ago
Women victim-survivors of intimate partner violence who had left the relationship ²³³	61	Economic abuse was measured by asking respondents if they had experienced economic violence in their relationship.	39% reported they had experienced economic violence When presented with scenarios of economic control, all the respondents had experienced at least one scenario

Netherlands

Table 41: Prevalence of economic abuse in the Netherlands

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women's shelters ²³⁴	Unknown	Financial violence	Financial violence was reported as one of the three most common types of violence by clients
Women victim-survivors of intimate partner violence ²³⁵	210	Economic abuse	42.9%

Poland

Table 42: Prevalence of economic abuse in Poland

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Case files of court cases for intimate partner violence against women over 60 ²³⁶	70	Financial abuse	55.7%
Specialised Support Centres for Victims of Violence ²³⁷	35	Economic violence	Economic violence was reported as one of the three most common types of violence by clients
Domestic violence against men and women ²³⁸	Not stated	Economic violence	9% experienced economic violence from another household member, including 12% of women and 6% of men

Spain

Table 43: Prevalence of economic abuse in Spain

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Calls to the national women's helpline ²³⁹	188272	Economic abuse	25% of calls related to economic abuse
Women ²⁴⁰	9568	Economic abuse by an intimate partner	7% without disabilities reported economic violence 13.1% of women with disabilities reported economic violence
Women aged 16 and above ²⁴¹	10171	Economic abuse by an intimate partner	10.8% reported economic abuse in their lifetime 2.5% reported economic abuse in the 12 months prior to the interview, and 8.3% reported it before this

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence	
Women who have experienced gender violence whilst living with a partner, and women who did not report gender violence whilst living with a partner ²⁴²	120 each of both groups of women	<p>Women were asked if their ex-partner did the following:</p> <p>During the relationship</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fall behind in the payment or did he not pay the bills that were in your name or in the name of both, or did he not deposit his financial contribution to the account of common expenses? 2. Spend the money you both needed for the rent or other expenses when you lived together 3. Accumulate debts in your name, doing things like using your credit card, or increasing the telephone bill, electricity, gas 4. Demand to know how you spent the money? 5. Make important financial decisions without asking you first? 6. Withhold financial information from you? 7. Force you to ask him for money? 8. demand you to give him the receipts or change when you spent money 9. prevent you from going to work or attending job interviews? 10. Ask you to quit your job 11. Threaten you to make you quit your job? 12. Hit or threaten you if you said you needed or wanted to work? <p>Post separation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Ask you about how you spend the money? 14. Try to access the accounts you have in common behind your back? 15. Do things to prevent you from going to work, or a job interview 16. Ask you to quit your job? 17. Threaten you to quit your job? 18. Interfere with your work performance through phone calls, messages, or visits to your workplace 19. Delay or not pay what was agreed in the separation agreement? 20. Not bear the part of the extraordinary expenses that corresponds to him 	<p>Prevalence by those who did report gender violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 61.8% 2. 88.3% 3. 80% 4. 100% 5. 85% 6. 100% 7. 91% 8. 91.2% 9. 55.9% 10. 67.6% 11. 73.5% 12. 38.2% 13. 58.9% 14. 44.2% 15. 53% 16. 23.5% 17. 26.4% 18. 38.2% 19. 70.6% 20. 67.6% 	<p>Prevalence by those who did not report gender violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 44.9% 2. 45.8% 3. 27.5% 4. 30% 5. 40.9% 6. 62% 7. 40% 8. 21.6% 9. 17.6% 10. 30.8% 11. 18.2% 12. 9.9% 13. 21.6% 14. 12.5% 15. 12.5% 16. 7.4% 17. 1.7% 18. 15.8% 19. 40.8% 20. 45%

Sweden

Table 44: Prevalence of economic abuse in Sweden

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women over 60 living in the community ²⁴³	50	Financial abuse by a current partner or spouse	50%
Female victim-survivors in contact with women's shelters ²⁴⁴	79 of 130 women's shelters	Economic abuse	<p>54% of all women in contact with a women's shelters have experienced economic abuse</p> <p>87% had had money denied</p> <p>79.2% experienced forced debt</p> <p>59.7% reported common money was hidden</p>

Ukraine

Table 45: Prevalence of economic abuse in Ukraine

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Callers to the National Hotline on Prevention of Domestic Violence	22542	Economic violence	Economic abuse was listed among the three most common forms of violence for helpline callers
Women-only shelters ²⁴⁵	14	Economic violence	Economic abuse was listed among the three most common forms of violence experienced by clients in the shelters
Women victim-survivors ²⁴⁶	Not stated	Economic violence by a partner	68% reported economic violence and 35% reported three or more forms of economic abuse simultaneously

United Kingdom

Table 46: Prevalence of economic abuse in the United Kingdom

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Clients on Refuge's (a national domestic abuse charity) casework system, 97.5% were women and 84.1% of abusers were male partners or ex-partners ²⁴⁷	3519	Financial abuse: 1. Perpetrator controlling household finances 2. Prevented from working 3. Prevented from accessing education 4. Forced to obtain credit in own name	34.2% reported any financial abuse By measure 1. 25.4% 2. 7.9% 3. 3.4% 4. 0.1%
Women who had experienced abuse, 66% of whom had experienced intimate partner abuse ²⁴⁸	29	Financial abuse by an intimate partner	38%
Victim-survivors accessing a financial advice helpline for survivors, 98% of whom were women ²⁴⁹	517	Financial abuse	69% of those for whom the nature of the abuse was known
Refuge clients ²⁵⁰	6500 per day	Economic abuse	45% have disclosed economic abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
General adult population ²⁵¹	Two surveys with samples of 4009 and 4008	<p>Economic abuse from a current or former partner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My partner has caused damage to my personal property 2. My partner 'uses money as a means of manipulation' in our relationship 3. I have limited or no control over my own income 4. I have to ask my partner's permission before making a purchase 5. My partner makes significant financial decisions, without discussing it with me (eg buying a new home, purchasing a new car) 6. My partner only allows me to spend money on basics/essentials 7. My partner uses my bank card without permission 8. My partner controls my personal bank account 9. My partner will not let me have a bank account 10. My partner has taken steps to stop me from going to work 11. My partner has put debt in my name under duress 12. My partner has fraudulently put debts in my name 13. My partner denies me access to our joint bank account 14. My partner denies me access to our joint savings account 15. My partner does not allow me to have personal savings 16. My partner receives text alerts when I have spent a certain amount 17. My partner applied for an overdraft in my name and I was afraid to say no 18. My partner has taken money out of my account with an online banking app without permission 19. My partner has taken out a 'payday loan' in my name and I was afraid to say no 20. I have worked for my partner's or a family business without pay 	<p>16% (17% of women, 16% of men) of adults identified as having experienced economic abuse</p> <p>39% (38% of women, 40% of men) had experienced behaviors of economic abuse</p> <p>89% of women who experienced economic abuse also experienced other forms of abuse, reporting higher rates of emotional, physical and sexual abuse than men</p> <p>27% of LGBT+ respondents versus 16% of heterosexual respondents reported experiencing economic abuse. Lesbian (36%) and bisexual (37%) respondents reported a higher prevalence than gay men (8%)</p> <p>Black, Asian and minority ethnic respondents reported economic abuse at a roughly equal level to white respondents (16% and 17%), but 46% reported any of the indicators used, compared to 38% of white respondents. 14% of Asian respondents reported economic abuse, but 50% had experienced economic abuse behaviours. White, non-British respondents were more likely than white British respondents to experience economic abuse (25% versus 16%, 48% versus 38% when reporting behaviours)</p> <p>Adults aged 30–39 were the most likely to have experienced economic abuse (27% identified and 52% reported behaviours). 28% of those 70 and over had experienced economic abuse behaviours</p> <p>Economic abuse was slightly more prevalence in households with an income of £30–40000 per year (22% identified, 45% on behaviours experienced) compared to households with an income of over £50000 (16% identified, 28% on behaviours) and under £10000 (15% identified, 31% on experiences). Prevalence was similar across personal income levels</p> <p>45% of respondents with children had experienced behaviours indicative of economic abuse, compared to 28% without children</p>

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			By measure (all respondents) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15% 14% 14% 13% 13% 12% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 9% 9% 9% 9%
<p>Female victim-survivors accessing an online forum provided by Women's Aid</p> <p>Domestic abuse services²⁵²</p>	<p>72</p> <p>134</p>	Economic abuse	<p>25% said their partner did not let them have money for essentials</p> <p>29% reported their partner had forced them to borrow money from friends or family members</p> <p>31.9% said their access to money during the relationship was controlled by their partner</p> <p>23.6% reported their partner refusing to pay his share or taking money from them</p> <p>52.9% of those with children said their partner had withheld child maintenance payments</p> <p>18.1% reported their partner preventing them from having paid employment</p> <p>33% said their partner was abusive towards them whilst at work or college</p> <p>80.6% of domestic abuse services reported supporting women to access their own income/finances which had been controlled by perpetrators</p>
Women in Northern Ireland, using the Northern Ireland Crime Survey ²⁵³	Not stated	Economic intimate partner violence	5%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Victim-survivors of intimate partner violence ²⁵⁴	63	Economic violence by an intimate partner: 1. Excessive economic control 2. Prevented from making financial decisions 3. Prevented from working outside the home 4. Put into debt by the perpetrator	75% reported any economic violence 1. 63% 2. 46% 3. 38% 4. 32%
South Asian women victim-survivors in Asian women refuges in London ²⁵⁵	18	Economic abuse by a husband	4 of the 18
Female victim-survivors in a refuge University students Inmates at male prisons ²⁵⁶	43 113 108	Economic abuse by a partner using the Controlling Behaviours Scale, measure on a scale Never (0) to Always (4): 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 (eg, wage, 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? Respondents were asked to indicate if they had used any of the behaviours, or if their partner had used them	Means by population <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In refuge: Self: 2.79 / Partner: 10.16 Students: Self: 1.26 / Partner: 1.76 Non-violent prisoners: Self: 1.15 / Partner: 2.49 Criminally violent prisoners: Self: 1.96 / Partner: 3.13 By relationship typology and self use of methods mean²⁵⁷ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common couple violence: Men: 2.5 / Women: 2.9 Intimate terrorism: Men: 10.1 / Women: 4.7 Violent resistance: Women: 3.4
Practitioners working with victim-survivors of non-physical abuse in domestic violence and abuse and sexual violence services ²⁵⁸	271	Economic abuse (for example, restricts access to finances, jeopardises means of being financially independent) Financial abuse (for example, stealing or defrauding someone of goods and/or property, running up debt in their name)	53.9% had supported victim-survivors with economic abuse 43.4% had supported victim-survivors with financial abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors ²⁵⁹	126	<p>Financial abuse by a partner:</p> <p>Financial control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep financial information from you 2. Make important decisions about money without you 3. Demand to know how you spent money 4. Make you ask him/her for money 5. Control your access to money 6. Make you get money from friends and family 7. Blackmail you into giving him/her money 8. Take your wages 9. Demand you give him/her receipts or change <p>Welfare benefit specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Take your benefits and leave you without money 2. Take your disability benefits or other funds for disability 3. Make you put Child Benefit in their name 4. Claim Carer's Allowance when not looking after you <p>Economic exploitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pay bills late or not pay bills 2. Use you as a source of money eg take your benefits / income 3. Spend the money you needed for rent or other bills 4. Destroy your belongings 5. Build up debt in your name 6. Bills are in his/her name but he/she doesn't pay them 7. Use your credit or debit card without asking 8. Steal from your purse or bank account 9. Take out a loan in your name 10. Destroy or steal your credit/debit card 	<p>97% experienced financial control, 89% experienced employment sabotage, 87% experienced economic exploitation</p> <p>61% were in debt because of financial abuse, and 37% had a bad credit rating as a result of the abuse</p> <p>By measures of financial control</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 76.2% 2. 68% 3. 64.8% 4. 54.1% 5. 53.3% 6. 36.1% 7. 31.1% 8. 30.3% 9. 29.5% <p>Of the 56 participants receiving welfare benefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 42.9% 2. 8.9% 3. 8.9% 4. 5.4% <p>By measures of economic exploitation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 61.5% 2. 57.8% 3. 56% 4. 51.4% 5. 50.5% 6. 38.5% 7. 30.3% 8. 29.4% 9. 22.9% 10. 17.4%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
		<p>Employment sabotage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stop you meeting up with friends or family* 2. Monitor your work activities/check up on you at work eg frequent phone calls, text messages, asking colleagues about you 3. Stop you going out* 4. Taking you to work/meeting you from work, stopping you going to social activities with work colleagues 5. Do things to keep you from going to your job 6. Stop you from taking up study or training 7. Demand you leave your job 8. Threaten you to make you leave work 9. Make you work for him/her without any pay 10. Stop you from being self-employed 11. Require you not to work 12. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work <p>Questions marked with * are noted that they could be seen as aspects of psychological abuse</p>	<p>By measures of employment sabotage</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 77.8% 2. 66.7% 3. 58.7% 4. 47.6% 5. 46% 6. 28.6% 7. 27% 8. 19% 9. 19% 10. 15.9% 11. 7.9% 12. 4.8%
Victim-survivors of domestic abuse who had separated from the perpetrator ²⁶⁰	161	Financial abuse post-separation	23% reported financial abuse post-separation
Women whose partner or ex-partners were involved with a domestic violence perpetrator program, with interviews at baseline and 12 months later ²⁶¹	100	<p>12 indicators to assess a victim-survivor's space for action were used, including: tries to use money/finances to control me</p> <p>18 indicators to assess safety and freedom from violence and abuse for women and children were used, including: deliberately interfered with or damaged your property</p>	<p>50% reported their partner tried to use money or finances to control them at baseline, 47% reported it 12 months later. This was the smallest reduction among the measures used</p> <p>64% reported at baseline that their partner deliberately interfered with or damaged property, and 9% reported it 12 months later</p>
Women victim-survivors who had been supported by a domestic abuse service ²⁶²	100 at Wave 1	Financial abuse as part of domestic violence	A quarter reported experiencing financial abuse at Wave One

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Young women in England and Wales receiving support from the YWCA ²⁶³	63	Financial abuse	One-third had experienced financial abuse
Galop's (a LGBT+ charity) casework data in Greater London ²⁶⁴ 81% reported the perpetrator was a current or former partner	626	Financial abuse	<p>12% disclosed financial abuse</p> <p>By demographic information</p> <p>Sexual orientation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gay: 13% • Lesbian: 16% • Bisexual: 2% <p>Trans identity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trans women: 30% • Trans men: 3% <p>Trans and cisgender:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cisgender: 12% • Transgender: 16% <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13–24: 7% • 25–34: 9% • 35–49: 17% • 50+: 19% <p>Ethnicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White background: 15% • Black and minority ethnic: 11%
Domestic abuse service for women assessed as medium to low risk, primarily from a Black and Minority Ethnic background in an area of London ²⁶⁵	223 victim-survivors	Financial abuse	19% reported financial abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Prosecutions of controlling and coercive behaviour in England and Wales, 90% of which involved abuse against a current or former partner ²⁶⁶	107 prosecutions	<p>Economic abuse was not explored by itself but relevant measures were included in:</p> <p>Intimidation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Destroy property <p>Isolation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Destroy or confiscate phone 2. Confiscate identity documents <p>Regulation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Control finances/ economic resources 2. Control clothes, make up 3. Make victim sleep on floor 4. Control diet 	<p>Number of cases which included measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10 2. 20 3. 2 4. 26 5. 17 6. 4 7. 4
Migrant women who experienced gender-based violence and insecure immigration status ²⁶⁷	50	Financial abuse by an intimate partner	62% experienced financial abuse
Snapshot of services for victim-survivors over one week in Northern Ireland ²⁶⁸	15 services representing 113 women victim-survivors	Financial abuse	51% experienced financial abuse
Pakistani Muslim women victim-survivors in Scotland ²⁶⁹	11	Economic abuse	All interviewees reported economic abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Single parents ²⁷⁰	1676	<p>Economic abuse by a former partner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Former partner undermining your ability to maintain economic resources (36%) 2. Former partner limiting how you use money and economic resources (31%) 3. Former partner controlling how you acquire money and resources (25%) 4. Former partner exhibiting other behaviours that negatively affected your financial situation (23%) 	<p>48% reported some form of economic abuse, 97% of whom were women.</p> <p>Single parents who had separated from their partner were more likely to experience economic abuse than those who had always been single parents (60% versus 39%)</p> <p>24% of who had experienced economic abuse received child maintenance payments in full regularly, compared to 38% of non-victim-survivors of economic abuse</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 36% 2. 31% 3. 25% 4. 23%
Adults with diverse gender or sexuality in Australia or the UK who experienced domestic abuse and animal cruelty in an intimate relationship ²⁷¹	503, of which 244 were in the UK	<p>Financial abuse was defined as: 'May include being made to account for all expenditure, expected to go into debt for another person, your money being controlled, restrictions on money available to provide care for an animal companion'</p>	<p>11.33% of entire sample experienced financial abuse. 0.4% reported financial abuse of an animal companion</p> <p>9.8% of UK respondents experienced financial abuse</p> <p>By demographic information (number out of full sample)</p> <p>Sexual orientation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesbian: 8 of 79 • Gay: 2 of 45 • Bisexual: 8 of 70 • Heterosexual: 1 of 7 • Pansexual: 3 of 27 • Asexual: 0 of 1 • Queer: 2 of 15 <p>Gender:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female: 21 of 156 • Male: 3 of 55 • Non-binary: 0 of 26 <p>Identified as transgender:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 5 of 50 • No: 19 of 189

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors who experienced abuse from a male partner and who were accessing a domestic abuse or money and debt advice service ²⁷²	278	<p>Economic abuse was measured using the Scale of Economic Abuse, by asking if a partner ever:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stopped you from having enough money to buy food, clothes, or other necessities? 2. Stopped you from having enough money to pay the bills? 3. Tell you how you must spend money, rather than letting you make these decisions? 4. Get you to give them receipts or change? 5. Hide money from you? 6. Keep important financial information from you? 7. Make you ask them for money? 8. Stop you having a job or going to work? Or did/do they make it too hard for you to do so? 9. Make you get a credit card or loan, or buy something on credit, against your wishes? 10. Have a loan or credit card with YOUR name on it which you didn't agree to? Or did/have they ever bought something using your credit 11. Make you use your money to buy them things or pay their bills against your wishes? 12. Spend their money on whatever they want, while your money covers the essentials? 13. Steal things from you? 14. Put bills in your name, so that you had/have to pay them? 15. Build up debt in your name, eg by using your credit card, internet account, or phone? 16. Force or pressure you to give him your savings or other assets? 17. Stop you from having or accessing a personal or joint bank account? 18. Make you sign papers without telling you what they're for? 19. Break or destroy your things, or things in the house? 	<p>95% of women reported at least one form of economic abuse and 60% had experienced at least one form of coerced debt</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 55% 2. 54% 3. 63% 4. 36% 5. 57% 6. 73% 7. 63% 8. 46% 9. 50% 10. 32% 11. 66% 12. 79% 13. 40% 14. 50% 15. 46% 16. 47% 17. 30% 18. 16% 19. 56%
Women using outreach services ²⁷³	59		26% had their partner's debt in their name

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors of economic abuse during Covid-19 ²⁷⁴	360	Economic abuse across seven domains of everyday life: employment and education, finances, housing, accessing help and support, accessing daily necessities, child maintenance and welfare benefits	<p>All reported economic abuse, with 90% experiencing post-separation abuse and 10% experiencing abuse from a current partner</p> <p>During Covid-19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45% reported their employment or education situation had significantly or slightly worsened due to the perpetrator's actions • 43% said the perpetrator had interfered with their ability to work or study • 72% reported their financial situation had significantly or slightly worsened due to the perpetrator's actions • 79% said the perpetrator had attempted to control their finances, with 68% saying they had been successful • 17% reported their welfare benefit situation had significantly or slightly worsened due to the perpetrator's actions • 20% said the perpetrator had attempted to control their welfare benefits, with 5% reporting it had been successful • 84% were worried about their access to child maintenance payments due to the perpetrator's actions • Of those living with the perpetrator, 94% were worried about their access to economic resources and core necessities due to their partner's actions, compared to 45% not living with the perpetrator • 35% reported their housing situation had significantly or slightly worsened due to the perpetrator's actions
General population using the 2001 British Crime Survey ²⁷⁵	Not stated	Financial abuse	<p>Whilst 4% of women were found to have experienced domestic abuse, this rose to 6% when financial abuse was included. Similarly, although 21% of women reported at least one incident of domestic violence since the age of 16, this rose to 26% when financial and emotional abuse were included</p>

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors of domestic abuse accessing services ²⁷⁶	55	<p>Economic abuse as part of domestic abuse, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interfering with education and employment • Controlling access to economic resources • Refusing to contribute to economic costs such as household bills or bringing up children • Generating economic costs 	<p>89% reported economic abuse</p> <p>Interference with education and employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 49% reported the abuser had interfered with their education and employment • 78% of 18–24 year olds versus 44% of 35–44 year olds • 55% of women without children versus 46% of women with children • 56% of women accessing floating support versus women accessing independent advocacy (50%) and refuge (45%) services • 55% of women from Black and minority ethnic backgrounds <p>Controlling access to economic resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74% reported the abuser had controlled their access to economic resources • 84% of women aged 25–34, a higher percentage than any other age group • 76% of women without children versus 64% of those with • 83% of women accessing floating support versus women accessing independent advocacy (50%) and refuge (69%) services <p>Refusing to contribute</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12% reported the abuser refused to contribute to economic costs • Women over 25 were more likely to experience this form • Women with children were more likely to report experiencing this <p>Generating costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18% said their abuser's behaviour generated economic costs • More 18–34 year olds reported this than 25–54 year olds

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
General adult population ²⁷⁷	4002	Financial abuse, using questions around economic control, exploitation or sabotage	<p>18% of adults reported financial abuse in a current or past relationship</p> <p>Women were more likely to report financial abuse than men (60% vs 40%)</p> <p>By demographic information of all respondents reporting financial abuse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexuality: Heterosexual: 8% / Homosexual: 5% / Bisexual: 5% / Other: 0.5% / Prefer not to say: 2% • Age: Under 20: 0.5% / 20–29: 18% / 30–39: 26% / 40–49: 19% / 50–59: 15% / 60–69: 14% / 70–79: 7% / 80+: 0.5% • Ethnicity: White: 90% / BAME: 5% / Mixed ethnicity: 3% / None of these: 0.5% / Prefer not to say: 1.5% • Relationship status: Married or civil partnership: 47% / Living with partner: 15% / Living separately: 6% / Single: 11% / Widowed: 4% / Divorced: 13% / Separated: 2% / None of the above: 0% • Children: 71% who reported financial abuse had children • Working status: Full time: 55% / Part time: 15% / Student: 2% / Retired: 16% / Unemployed: 5% / Other not working: 6% • Personal income: None: 4% / Up to £20000: 43% / £20001–£50000: 28% / Over £50000: 19% / Prefer not to say: 7% • Household income: Up to £10000: 10% / £10000 to £20000: 20% / £20001–£50000: 36% / Over £50000: 25% / Prefer not to say: 9%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<p>By women who reported financial abuse's demographic information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexuality: Heterosexual: 91% / Homosexual: 2.5% / Bisexual: 5% / Other: 1% / Prefer not to say: 1% • Age: Under 20: 0.5% / 20–29: 13.5% / 30–39: 26% / 40–49: 21% / 50–59: 16% / 60–69: 17% / 70–79: 7% / 80+: 0.5% • Ethnicity: White: 91% / BAME: 6% / Mixed ethnicity: 2% / None of these: 0.5% / Prefer not to say: 1% • 55% of disabled women reported financial abuse • 73% had one or more child • Working status: Full time: 46% / Part time: 21% / Student: 2% / Retired: 19.5% / Unemployed: 4.5% / Other not working: 7% • Personal income: None: 4% / Up to £20000: 50% / £20001–£50000: 27% / Over £50000: 10% / Prefer not to say: 9% • Household income: Up to £10000: 12% / £10000 to £20000: 21% / £20001–£50000: 41% / Over £50000: 16% / Prefer not to say: 10% <p>By men who reported financial abuse's demographic information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heterosexual: 83% / Homosexual: 8% / Bisexual: 4% / Other: 0.25% / Prefer not to say: 3.75% • Age: Under 20: 0.25% / 20–29: 25% / 30–39: 27% / 40–49: 15% / 50–59: 15% / 60–69: 10% / 70–79: 6% / 80+: 1% • Ethnicity: White: 89% / BAME: 4% / Mixed ethnicity: 4% / None of these: 1% / Prefer not to say: 2.5% • 45% of disabled men reported financial abuse • 77% reported having one or more child • Working status: Full time: 70% / Part time: 7% / Student: 1.5% / Retired: 11% / Unemployed: 6.5% / Other not working: 4% • Personal income: None: 2% / Up to £20000: 33% / £20001–£50000: 29% / Over £50000: 32% / Prefer not to say: 4% • Household income: Up to £10000: 7% / £10000 to £20000: 20% / £20001–£50000: 28% / Over £50000: 39% / Prefer not to say: 6%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
First and second generation British Pakistani Muslims and British Gujarati Hindus, and Gujarati Hindus in India, and Pakistani Muslims in Pakistan ²⁷⁸	84	Economic abuse	39% reported experiencing economic abuse
Successful prosecutions of controlling or coercive behaviour ²⁷⁹	35	Economic abuse	Examples of economic abuse were identified in 60% of cases
Calls to Scotland's Domestic Abuse and Forced Marriage Helpline ²⁸⁰	Not stated	Financial abuse	Financial abuse was one of the most three common forms of violence reported by callers
Women-only shelters in Wales ²⁸¹	43	Financial abuse	Financial abuse was one of the most three common forms of violence reported by shelter clients
Snapshot of domestic abuse services in Bristol over a 24 hour period ²⁸²	154 individuals in 2006, 171 individuals in 2005	Financial domestic abuse: 1. Withholding money 2. Running up debt 3. Demanding money 4. Other financial abuse	59% reported financial abuse in 2005 and 49% in 2006 By measure in 2006 1. 19% 2. 12% 3. 10% 4. 6%

North America and the Caribbean

Canada

Table 47: Prevalence of economic abuse in Canada

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Men and women from the 2004 Canadian General Social Survey ²⁸³	7056 men and 8360 women	Financial abuse The following relevant measures were used: 1. Damages/destroys possessions/property 2. Prevents knowing about/access to income	Financial abuse was not reported on by itself, but 17.4% of men and 18.1% of women were found to have experienced any emotional or financial abuse By measure 1. 4.9% women / 2.7% men 2. 4% women / 2% men
Women in the Ottawa, Gatineau, Hull region ²⁸⁴	Not stated	Economic abuse	93%
Women with a current or former partner, using the 1999 General Social Survey ²⁸⁵	8771 women, of whom 1483 reported activity limitation	Financial abuse, using the question: 'Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?'	Among all women reporting contact with a current or former partner in the past 5 years by activity limitation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity limitation often: 8% Activity limitation sometimes: 6.9% No activity limitation: 3.4% Among women reporting intimate partner violence by activity limitation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity limitation often: 26.4% Activity limitation sometimes: 25.2% No activity limitation: 17.4%
Men and women with a current or former partner, using data from the 1999 General Social Survey ²⁸⁶	8771 women (1521 with activity limitation) and 7445 men (1263 with activity limitation)	Financial abuse, using the question: 'Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?'	Prevalence of financial abuse by gender and activity limitation status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women with activity limitation: 7.5% Women without activity limitation: 3.4% Men with activity limitation: 2.6% Men without activity limitation: 1.4%
Women with contact with a current or former partner, using the 2009 General Social Survey ²⁸⁷	6859, 5695 born in Canada and 1164 born outside of Canada	Financial abuse, using the question: 'Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?'	3.6% of immigrant women were found to have experienced financial abuse 4.5% of Canadian-born women were found to have experienced financial abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women with contact with a current or former partner, using the 2009 General Social Survey ²⁸⁸	6851, of which 322 reported a mental health-related activity limitation	Financial abuse, using the question: ‘Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?’	Prevalence by mental health-related activity limitation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity limitation always/often: 18.1% • Activity limitation sometimes: 9.5% • No activity limitation: 4%
Women with contact with a former partner, using the 2009 General Social Survey ²⁸⁹	1681, of which 1483 were Canadian-born and 202 were born outside of Canada	Financial abuse, using the question: ‘Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?’	By country of birth and length of residence in Canada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immigrant, 0–19 years in Canada: 11% • Immigrant, >20 years in Canada: 24.3% • Canadian-born: 18.7%
Women and men, using data from the 2014 General Social Survey ²⁹⁰	17950	Financial spousal abuse, measured using: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you ask 2. Forces you to give him or her your money, possessions, or property 3. Damage/destroy property was also included as a measure, but not within financial abuse 	By experiences of violence against animal companions (VAAC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiences of VAAC: 47.6% • No experience of VAAC: 2.5% By measure used and VAAC experiences <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. VAAC: 40% / No VAAC: 1.8% 2. VAAC: 40% / No VAAC: 1.3% 3. VAAC: 60% / No VAAC: 2%
Adults in Saskatchewan ²⁹¹	437 in total 283 who had experienced at least one of the full list of abusive behaviours	Economically abusive behaviors experienced by a current or former intimate partner. Relevant measures include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Act dismissive of your job 2. Call, text, or email you repeatedly while you are at work 3. Control how your or the family's money is spent 4. Prevent you from attending work 5. Come to your workplace to check up on you 	Prevalence among those who reported at least one of the full list of abusive behaviors <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 41% 2. 34.6% 3. 32.5% 4. 23.3% 5. 19.4% Prevalence among all respondents <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 26.5% 2. 22.4% 3. 21.1% 4. 15.1% 5. 12.6%
Victim-survivors in residential facilities ²⁹²	Not stated	Financial abuse	51%
Women victim-survivors of intimate partner violence involved in family law cases ²⁹³	27	Financial abuse	52%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women with contact with a current or former partner in last 5 years, using data from the 1999 General Social Survey ²⁹⁴	8842, 1596 of whom were immigrants (389 recent, 1207 non-recent)	Financial abuse, using the question: ‘Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?’	2.5% prevalence rate among recent immigrant women (0–9 years in Canada) 3.3% prevalence rate among non-recent immigrant women (>10 years in Canada)
Women victim-survivors involved in child custody disputes ²⁹⁵	62	Financial abuse following separation: 1. Financially ruining women 2. Hiding money or quitting a job to reduce support payments 3. Threatening a woman’s employment or opportunities to work 4. Spending money in the joint bank account	By measure 1. 61% 2. 56% 3. 43% 4. 41%
Married and cohabiting women, using data from the 1999 General Social Survey ²⁹⁶	7408	Financial abuse (within emotional abuse)	8%
Men and women, using the 2014 General Social Survey on Victimization ²⁹⁷	33127	Yes to at least one of the two items: 1. Prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked 2. Forced you to give him or her your money, possessions, or property	By gender • Women: 3% • Men: 2%
French-Canadian women whose partners gambled ²⁹⁸	156	Economic abuse	61% of women of partners with problem gambling reported perpetrating at least one economic abuse tactic against their partner 43% of women whose partners were not problem gamblers reported perpetrating at least one economic abuse tactic against their partner Women in these relationships were more likely to report having financial information hidden from them (53.7%) compared to partners of non-problem gamblers
Heterosexual men and women married or in a common-law relationship ²⁹⁹	Not stated	Financial intimate partner violence: 1. Prevents your access to the family income 2. Forces you to give money, possession or property 3. Damages your property (included under emotional abuse)	By measure 1. Female 0.9% / Male: 0.4% 2. Female: 0.3% / Male: 0.3% 3. Female: 0.4% / Male: 0.4%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Adults in Alberta ³⁰⁰	300	<p>If any partners had used any of the behaviors from the revised scale of economic abuse:</p> <p>Economic control</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make you ask for money • Demand to know how money was spent • Demand that you provide receipts and/or change when you spend money • Keep financial information from you • Make important financial decisions without talking to you first <p>Employment sabotage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threaten to make you leave work • Demand that you quit your job • Do things to keep you from going to your job <p>Economic exploitation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spend the money you need for rent or other bills • Pay bills late or not pay bills that were in your name or both of your names • Build up debt under your name by doing things like use a credit card in your name or run up the phone bill 	<p>Overall prevalence rate of 35%, and 17% who experienced severe economic abuse</p> <p>By demographic information and prevalence of economic abuse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male: 29.85% ± 5.75% • Female: 39.39% ± 8.45% • Caucasian: 34.26% ± 5.91% • Ethnic minority: 52.63% ± 24.73% • Income <\$30,000: 50% ± 24.01% • Income \$30–50,000: 33.33% ± 16.97% • Income \$50–75,000: 34.15% ± 15.15% • Income: \$75–100,000: 31.37% ± 13.18% • Sexual minority: 50% ± 33.18%
Women victim-survivors of intimate partner violence ³⁰¹	70	Economic violence	54.8%
Adults aged 60 and over, using data from the 1999 and 2004 General Social Survey ³⁰²	Not stated	<p>Financial abuse by an intimate partner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Damages or destroys your possessions or property 2. Prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you ask 	Overall five year prevalence of 1.2%
Women who were or had been in an intimate relationship in the previous 5 years ³⁰³	Not stated	<p>Financial abuse, using the question:</p> <p>‘Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?’</p>	4%
Male and female victim-survivors ³⁰⁴	155	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial or economic abuse 2. Damage of property 	<p>By sex</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Male: 59% / Female: 46% 2. Male: 34% / Female 52%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women and men reporting contact with a current or ex-partner in the previous 5 years, using data from the 1999 General Social Survey ³⁰⁵	17005	Financial abuse, using the question: 'Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?'	Women reported a prevalence rate of 4.1% Men reported a prevalence rate of 1.6%
Women and men reporting contact with a current or ex-partner in the previous 5 years, using data from the 1999 General Social Survey ³⁰⁶	9178 women 7827 men	Financial abuse, using the question: 'Has your partner prevented you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you asked?'	By gender and medication use 1. Any medication use: Women: 31.6% / Men: 12.6% 2. For sleep: Women: 25.2% / Men: 6.3% 3. For anxiety: Women: 20% / Men: 6.2% 4. For depression: Women: 16.9% / Men: 6%
Gay men experiencing violence following separation from an intimate partner ³⁰⁷	23	Economic violence during different periods of the relationship (commitment, ambivalence, separation, post-separation)	Half of participants mentioned experiencing economic violence. It is noted this is the form of abuse that increased the most once the relationship was called into question, quadrupling from the commitment period to ambivalence phase. By relationship period <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commitment: approximately 10%• Ambivalence: 40%• Separation: 40%• Post-separation: approximately 30%
HIV patients ³⁰⁸	853, including 194 females and 659 males	Economic abuse	Of 280 patients reporting abuse, 12% reported economic abuse
Gay and bisexual men who reported a history of intimate partner violence ³⁰⁹	154	Financial violence by an intimate partner	13.6% reported financial violence by any intimate partner

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women aged 15 and older, using the general population 2018 Survey of Safety in Public and Private Spaces	The full research was 45,893, but it is not stated how many of these were women used for this analysis	<p>Financial abuse is not reported on separately, but the following relevant measures were used:</p> <p>Intimate partner violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forced you to give them money or possessions 2. Followed you or hung around outside your home or work 3. Kept you from having access to a job, money, or financial resources 4. Damaged or destroyed your possessions or property 	<p>Women³¹⁰</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 6.4% / In last 12 months: 0.6% 2. Since age 15: 12.1% / In last 12 months: 0.9% 3. Since age 15: 5.1% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 4. Since age 15: 12.1% / In last 12 months: 1.2% <p>Women who were victims of intimate partner violence in the last 12 months and frequency³¹¹</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Once: 16.1% / A few times: 38.3% / Monthly or more: 45.5% 2. Once: 20.8% / A few times: 49.2% / Monthly or more: 29.9% 3. Not available 4. Once: 41.8% / A few times: 47.9% / Monthly or more: 10.3% <p>By age group and time period³¹²</p> <p>Women aged 15–24:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 3.3% / In last 12 months: 1.3% 2. Since age 15: 8.5% / In last 12 months: 4.4% 3. Since age 15: 1.9% / In last 12 months: not available 4. Since age 15: 6.1% / In last 12 months: 2.4% <p>Women aged 25 and older:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 6.6% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 2. Since age 15: 12.4% / In last 12 months: 0.6% 3. Since age 15: 5.4% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 4. Since age 15: 12.6% / In last 12 months: 1.1% <p>By Indigenous and non-Indigenous identity³¹³</p> <p>Indigenous women:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 15.9% / In last 12 months: 3% 2. Since age 15: 22.8% / In last 12 months: not available 3. Since age 15: 12.8% / In last 12 months: not available 4. Since age 15: 29.8% / In last 12 months: 2.9% <p>Non-Indigenous women:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 6% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 2. Since age 15: 11.7% / In last 12 months: 0.9% 3. Since age 15: 4.8% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 4. Since age 15: 11.5% / In last 12 months: 1.1%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<p>By sexuality³¹⁴</p> <p>Sexual minority women</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 17.1% / In last 12 months: 2.9% 2. Since age 15: 21% / In last 12 months: 3.5% 3. Since age 15: 10.3% / In last 12 months: not available 4. Since age 15: 24.3% / In last 12 months: 2.1% <p>Heterosexual women</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 6% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 2. Since age 15: 11.8% / In last 12 months: 0.8% 3. Since age 15: 5% / In last 12 months: 0.4% 4. Since age 15: 11.7% / In last 12 months: 1.2% <p>By visible minority status³¹⁵</p> <p>Visible minority women</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 3.4% / In last 12 months: not available 2. Since age 15: 6.6% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 3. Since age 15: 2.6% / In last 12 months: not available 4. Since age 15: 5.3% / In last 12 months: 0.7% <p>Non-visible minority women</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 7% / In last 12 months: 0.6% 2. Since age 15: 13.3% / In last 12 months: 0.9% 3. Since age 15: 5.6% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 4. Since age 15: 13.5% / In last 12 months: 1.3% <p>By disability³¹⁶</p> <p>Women with disabilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 9.6% / In last 12 months: 0.9% 2. Since age 15: 16.7% / In last 12 months: 1.4% 3. Since age 15: 8.2% / In last 12 months: 0.9% 4. Since age 15: 17.1% / In last 12 months: 1.6% <p>Women without disabilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 4.3% / In last 12 months: 0.4% 2. Since age 15: 9% / In last 12 months: 0.6% 3. Since age 15: 3.1% / In last 12 months: 0.2% 4. Since age 15: 8.8% / In last 12 months: 1% <p>By frequency, disability and intimate partner violence status³¹⁷</p> <p>Women with disabilities who experienced IPV in the past 12 months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not available 2. Once: 26.2% / A few times: 44.1% / Monthly or more: 29.7% 3. Not available 4. Once: 52.3% / A few times: 36.2% / Monthly or more: 11.5%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<p>Women without disabilities who experienced IPV in the past 12 months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not available 2. Not available 3. Not available 4. Once: 31.8% / A few times: 59.1% / Monthly or more: 9.1%
Men aged 15 and older, using the general population 2018 Survey of Safety in Public and Private Spaces	The full research was 45,893, but it is not stated how many of these were men used for this analysis	<p>Financial abuse is not reported on separately, but the following relevant measures were used:</p> <p>Intimate partner violence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forced you to give them money or possessions 2. Followed you or hung around outside your home or work 3. Kept you from having access to a job, money, or financial resources 4. Damaged or destroyed your possessions or property 	<p>Men³¹⁸</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 3.6% / In last 12 months: 0.6% 2. Since age 15: 3.9% / In last 12 months: 0.5% 3. Since age 15: 1.5% / In last 12 months: 0.2% 4. Since age 15: 6.9% / In last 12 months: 0.9% <p>Men who were victims of intimate partner violence in the last 12 months and frequency³¹⁹</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not available 2. Not available 3. Not available 4. Once: 53.1% / A few times: 41.2% / Monthly or more: 5.6% <p>By sexuality³²⁰</p> <p>Sexual minority men</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 9.5% / In last 12 months: not available 2. Since age 15: 9.6% / In last 12 months: not available 3. Since age 15: 2.9% / In last 12 months: not available 4. Since age 15: 11.9% / In last 12 months: not available <p>Heterosexual men</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since age 15: 3.4% / In last 12 months: 0.6% 2. Since age 15: 3.8% / In last 12 months: 0.4% 3. Since age 15: 1.5% / In last 12 months: 0.2% 4. Since age 15: 6.8% / In last 12 months: 0.9%
Canadian Regular Forces (military) personnel, including male and females ³²¹	2157	<p>Emotional and financial intimate partner violence are grouped together but the following relevant measure was used:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Damaged or destroyed possessions or property 	<p>25.1% reported experiencing any emotional or financial intimate partner violence, with 22% of females and 25.6% of males</p> <p>19.3% reported perpetrating any emotional or financial intimate partner violence, with 19.4% of males and 18.8% of females</p> <p>4.6% of males and 4.1% of females reported an intimate partner had damaged or destroyed their possessions or property</p>

Mexico

Table 48: Prevalence of economic abuse in Mexico

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Working married women ³²²	27823	Economic violence	18.5%
Women aged 15 and over in Guanajuato using the 2011 National Survey on the Dynamics of the Household Relationships ³²³	Not stated	Economic abuse by a partner in the last 12 months	28%
Women aged 15 or over ³²⁴	31765	Require permission from partner to work	39.9%

Trinidad and Tobago

Table 49: Prevalence of economic abuse in Trinidad and Tobago

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women who sought services from the Coalition against Domestic Violence Agency ³²⁵	30	Economic or financial abuse <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Has your partner destroyed your belongings? Has your partner taken your money or threatened to withdraw financial support if you don't do what he wants? Lack of basic human needs (food, shelter, clothing) Loss of victim's income, earning capacity, and employability 	By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 73% 83% 63% 67%
Women over 16 in the Couva district ³²⁶	364	Financial abuse	Overall prevalence rate of 34.6% By socio-economic group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working class: 41.4% Lower-middle class: 31.5% Middle class: 11.4% Upper middle class: 7.2%

Women aged 15 to 64 ³²⁷	1079	<p>Economic partner violence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refusal to give you money for household expenses, regardless of money being available for other things 2. Partner prohibited them from getting a job 3. Partner took their earnings or savings against their will 	<p>Lifetime prevalence rate of 11%</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 7% 2. 7% 3. 2%
------------------------------------	------	---	---

United States

Due to the amount of evidence from the United States, evidence from research with the general population and victim-survivors is presented separately here, beginning with the general population and followed by victim-survivors.

Table 50: Prevalence of economic abuse in the United States: general population

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Teenagers aged 13–18 ³²⁸	1000, plus a 100–person oversample of Asian-American teens	Financial abuse by a partner	<p>31% of teenagers experienced ‘warning signs’ of financial abuse from an intimate partner</p> <p>37% had felt pressure to say yes when a partner asked them for money, with 40% of Asian, 45% of Black and 44% of Hispanic teens reporting this. Boys were more likely to report this than girls (41% versus 34%)</p> <p>29% reported a partner did not pay them back as expected</p>
Female welfare recipients in Michigan ³²⁹	753	Work interference	48% of those who had experienced severe violence in the previous 12 months reported some direct form of work interference
Mothers, using data from the first six waves of Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study ³³⁰	Not stated	<p>Economic abuse was measured by if the mother’s partner had:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tried to prevent you from going to work and/or school 2. Withheld money, made you ask for money, or took your money 	31% experienced economic abuse
Taxpayers alleging abuse ³³¹	60	Taxpayers who were alleging abuse and requesting innocent spouse relief due to a partner’s inaccurate tax filing	91.67% (n=55) of requesting taxpayers who alleged abuse were women

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
10 to 18 year olds reporting on their current/most recent dating relationship ³³²	728	<p>Partner requests around money lending were measured as ‘Has your partner or ex-partner ever asked you to lend him or her money?’</p> <p>Partner economic control/influence was measured using ‘Has your partner or ex-partner ever told you how to spend your money?’</p>	<p>17.7% reported partner requests around lending money</p> <p>8.82% reported partner economic control/influence</p>
Staff in domestic abuse services ³³³	37	Economic abuse	<p>Nearly two-thirds of staff (60%) experienced economic abuse</p> <p>Of the 22 staff who had experienced economic abuse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 65% experienced economic restriction • 56% experienced economic exploitation • 32% were prevented or disrupted from earning an income
Mothers, using data from the Fragile Families study ³³⁴	3515	<p>Economic abuse was measured by if the mother’s partner had:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tried to prevent you from going to work and/or school 2. Withheld money, made you ask for money, or took your money 	33% experienced economic abuse
Undergraduate and graduate students ³³⁵	874	Economic abuse was measured as part of the psychological abuse measurement	<p>7% of women and 20% of men reported experiencing economic abuse</p> <p>8% of women and 12% of men reported perpetrating economic abuse</p>
Mothers, using the Fragile Families and Child Well-being Study. Follow ups were held at Year 1, 3 and 5 ³³⁶	<p>4898 at baseline</p> <p>4365 at Year 1</p> <p>4231 at Year 3</p> <p>4139 at Year 5</p>	<p>Economic abuse was measured by if the mother’s partner had:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tried to prevent you from going to work and/or school 2. Withheld money, made you ask for money, or took your money 	<p>There was an overall prevalence rate of 11.8% at Year 1, 13.5% at Year 3 and 15.1% at Year 5.</p> <p>By marital status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married: Year 1: 10.85 / Year 3: 12.4% / Year 5: 13.3% • Cohabiting: Year 1: 13% / Year 3: 14% / Year 5: 17.1% • Visiting: Year 1: 12.5% / Year 3: 16.3% / Year 5: 16%
Pregnant women aged over 18 and currently in a relationship ³³⁷	183	Revised Scale of Economic Abuse (SEA2) on a frequency scale of Never (1) to Quite Often (5)	<p>By income level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than \$2000: mean of 2 • \$20000–60000: mean of 1.7 • More than \$60000: mean of 1.6 <p>Economic abuse was positively associated with material hardship</p>

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women and men in an intimate relationship for more than a year ³³⁸	250	Property damage was included as a component of emotional abuse	Women's experiences of property damage were substantially higher than men's, and women's experiences increased with age
Korean immigrant women ³³⁹	64 victim-survivors and 63 non-victim-survivors	Economic abuse, using the Checklist of Controlling Behaviours	78.13% of the victim-survivors reported economic abuse in the last 12 months
Female bankruptcy filers ³⁴⁰	Not stated		17.8% of female bankruptcy filers who had experienced domestic violence in the year before bankruptcy, which the research notes is much higher than comparable baselines
Women living in a low-income neighbourhood ³⁴¹	824	<p>The research does not name financial or economic abuse, but the following measures are relevant:</p> <p>In the past 12 months, when you've had an argument, how often did your boyfriend or husband:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Withhold money, make you ask for money, or take yours 2. Prevent you from going to school or work 3. Harass you with telephone calls at work 4. Show up at your workplace and harass or bother you 5. Throw or smash or hit or kick an object 6. Destroy your belongings 7. Injure you so that you needed to stay home from work 8. Threaten to turn you in to DCFS, welfare, INS, etc <p>Has a boyfriend or husband ever:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Prevented you from going to school or work 10. Injured you so that you needed to stay home from work or your other activities 11. Threatened to turn you in to DCFS, welfare, INS, or some other govt. agency 12. Harassed you with telephone calls at work 13. Shown up at your workplace and harassed or bothered you 14. Caused you to lose your job 	<p>Prevalence by measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rarely: 5.2% / Sometimes, often or very often: 10.9% / Total: 16.1% 2. Rarely: 2.5% / Sometimes, often or very often: 5.5% / Total: 8% 3. Rarely: 0.8% / Sometimes, often or very often: 1% / Total: 1.8% 4. Rarely: 0.2% / Sometimes, often or very often: 1.5% / Total: 1.7% 5. Rarely: 7.5% / Sometimes, often or very often: 7.8% / Total: 5.3% 6. Rarely: 2.8% / Sometimes, often or very often: 3.2% / Total: 6% 7. Rarely: 0.8% / Sometimes, often or very often: 1% / Total: 1.8% 8. Rarely: 0.5% / Sometimes, often or very often: 0.7% / Total: 1.2% 9. Yes: 12% 10. Yes: 10.6% 11. Yes: 2.4% 12. 8.7% 13. 7.8% 14. 4.4%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Mothers, using data from the Fragile Families Study ³⁴²	2389	Economic violence	28% reported economic violence at Year 1 or Year 3
Men and women with partners ³⁴³	11327	Economic abuse, assessed using whether or not the respondents' current partner prevents him/her from knowing about or having access to family income, even when (s/he) asks	Overall prevalence of 2.1% 8% of those had experienced physical abuse reported economic abuse
Adults aged 60 and over ³⁴⁴	5777	Lifetime financial coercive control by an intimate partner	Prevalence rate of 1.8%
Women in Kansas aged 18 or over from the general community; who had received domestic or sexual violence support; or who were currently incarcerated ³⁴⁵	285 (the breakdown of the population is not given)	Relevant items in the psychological abuse measure include: 1. Smashed something 2. Withheld money 3. Stopped from going to work 4. Put you on an allowance	By item 1. 79.3% 2. 70.1% 3. 65.8% 4. 44.9%
Immigrants of South Asian origin over 18 residing in the US ³⁴⁶	468	Economic abuse, measured using: 1. Felt that you would be unable to secure or keep job because of pressure from spouse/ partner 2. Not allowed by spouse/ partner to have a personal bank account 3. Not allowed to spend money without approval from spouse/partner	42% of female participants and 29% of male participants reported economic abuse
Couples ³⁴⁷	Not stated	Financial infidelity, including: 1. Keeping purchases secret 2. Hiding debts or accounts 3. Lying about income 4. Draining money from savings 5. Lending money without consent	A third reported financial infidelity, either as a victim or perpetrator By measure 1. 31.4% 2. 28.7% 3. 22.6% 4. 10.4% 5. 6.9%
Women with children, using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study ³⁴⁸	3282	Economic was counted if the women answered 'sometimes' or 'often' to the questions: 1. How often [did/does partner] try to keep you from going to work or school? 2. How often [did/does partner] withhold money, make you ask for money, or take your money?	55.61% reported economic abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Adult females attending community college who had been in an intimate relationship in the last 12 months ³⁴⁹	435	Economic abuse was measured using the SEA-12	43.5% reported at least one tactic of economic abuse 77% of those who reported any other experiences of intimate partner violence also reported at least one form of economic abuse.
Nationally representative group of women ³⁵⁰	Not stated	Measured by asking if respondents had ever had a partner steal money from them	22% responded a partner had stolen money from them
Students at a Midwestern University ³⁵¹	487	<p>Economic abuse was measured using the Scale of Economic Abuse 2, on a scale of Never (1) to Very Often (5):</p> <p>Economic Restriction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep you from having the money you needed to buy food, clothes, or other necessities 2. Keep financial information from you 3. Decide how you could spend money rather than letting you spend it how you saw fit 4. Make you ask him/her for money 5. Hide money so that you could not find it 6. Demand that you give him/her receipts or change when you spent money 7. Keep you from having a job or going to work <p>Economic Exploitation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make you use your money to buy him/her things or pay his/her bills when you didn't want to 2. Spend his/her money however he/she wanted while your money went to pay for necessities 3. Take out a loan or buy something on credit in your name without your permission 4. Make you take out a loan or buy something on credit when you didn't want to 5. Put bills in your name, leaving you to pay them 6. Force or pressure you to give him/her your savings or other assets 7. Steal your property 	<p>Means by SEA2 measures and demographic information</p> <p>The SEA2 had an overall mean of 1.09, with Economic Restriction (ER) having a mean of 1.09 and Economic Exploitation having a mean of 1.08.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female: Overall: 1.07 / ER: 1.07 / EE: 1.07 • Male: Overall: 1.17 / ER: 1.18/ EE: 1.16 • White: Overall: 1.07 / ER: 1.07/ EE: 1.07 • Ethnic minority: Overall: 1.14 / ER: 1.15/ EE: 1.12 • Heterosexual: Overall: 1.08 / ER: 1.08/ EE: 1.07 • Sexual minority: Overall: 1.08 / ER: 1.09/ EE: 1.08 • Cohabitate: Overall: 1.18 / ER: 1.17/ EE: 1.18 • Non-cohabitate: Overall: 1.08 / ER: 1.08/ EE: 1.07 <p>Means of academic interference measures by demographic information</p> <p>The Work/School Abuse Scale had an overall mean of 1.09, Academic Interference (AI) was found to have a mean of 1.10 and Academic Restraint (AR) was found to have a mean of 1.07:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female: Overall: 1.07 / AI: 1.08/ AR: 1.05 • Male: Overall: 1.19 / AI: 1.18 / AR: 1.19 • White: Overall: 1.07 / AI: 1.08 / AR: 1.06 • Ethnic minority: Overall: 1.14 / AI: 1.16 / AR: 1.12 • Heterosexual: Overall: 1.08 / AI: 1.10 / AR: 1.07 • Sexual minority: Overall: 1.06 / AI: 1.09 / AR: 1.03 • Cohabitate: Overall: 1.15 / AI: 1.18 / AR: 1.12 • Non-cohabitate: Overall: 1.08 / AI: 1.09 / AR: 1.07

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
		<p>Academic interference was measured using the Work/School Abuse Scale, on a scale of Never (1) to Very Often (5):</p> <p>Academic Interference</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Come to school to harass you 2. Bother your school friends or teachers 3. Lie to your friends/teachers about you 4. Physically force you to leave school 5. Lied about your children's health or safety to make you leave school 6. Threatened you to make you leave school <p>Academic restraint:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sabotage the car so you couldn't go to school 2. Not show up for childcare so you couldn't go to school 3. Steal your keys or money so you couldn't go to school 4. Refuse to give you a ride to school 5. Physically restrain you from going to school 6. Threaten you to prevent you going to school <p>The research also developed the Education Sabotage Scale, on a scale of Never (1) to Very Often (5):</p> <p>Educational Access Sabotage</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevent you from attending classes sessions 2. Prevent you from attending school (for example, forced, coerced, or pressured you to drop-out, drop classes, change schools, or take a break from school) 3. Sabotage your transportation to school or classes (for example, hide your keys or bus pass, break something on your bike, car or moped) <p>Educational Success Sabotage</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep you from studying or completing homework 2. Start an argument or fight before an exam or important school deadline 3. Make you feel guilty for spending time on school 4. Accuse you of cheating on them with a classmate, lab partner, or study group member 5. Demand to know what is happening during class or study sessions (eg, going with you or interrogating you) 	<p>Means by Education Sabotage Scale measures and demographic information</p> <p>The Education Sabotage Scale was found to have a mean of 1.46, with Education Access (EA) found to have a mean of 1.24 and Educational Success (ES) found to have a mean of 1.60:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female: Overall: 1.45 EA: 1.22 / ES: 1.59 • Male: Overall: 1.51/ EA: 1.32 / ES: 1.62 • White: Overall: 1.44 /EA: 1.22 / ES: 1.57 • Ethnic minority: Overall: 1.51 / EA: 1.30 / ES: 1.64 • Heterosexual: Overall: 1.44 / EA: 1.23 / ES: 1.57 • Sexual minority: Overall: 1.56 EA: 1.22 / ES: 1.76 • Cohabitate: Overall: 1.59 EA: 1.40/ ES: 1.70 • Non-cohabitate: Overall: 1.45 / EA: 1.22 / ES: 1.58

Table 51: Prevalence of economic abuse in the United States:
victim-survivors of domestic abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Female victim-survivors of intimate partner violence accessing domestic abuse services ³⁵²	103	<p>Development of the Scale of Economic Abuse, a 28-item with subscales of economic control and exploitation:</p> <p>Economic Control</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Steal the car keys or take the car so you couldn't go look for a job or go to a job interview 2. Do things to keep you from going to your job 3. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work 4. Threaten you to make you leave work 5. Demand that you quit your job 6. Do things to keep you from having money of your own 7. Take your paycheck, financial aid check, tax refund check, disability payment, or other support payments from you 8. Decide how you could spend money rather than letting you spend it how you saw fit 9. Demand to know how money was spent 10. Demand that you give him receipts and/or change when you spent money 11. Keep you from having the money you needed to buy food, clothes, or other necessities 12. Hide money so that you could not find it 13. Keep you from having access to your bank accounts 14. Keep financial information from you 15. Make important financial decisions without talking with you about it first 16. Make you ask him for money 17. Threaten you or beat you up for paying the bills or buying things that were needed 	99% reported economic abuse in their lifetimes

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
		<p>Economic Exploitation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Take money from your purse, wallet, or bank account without your permission and/or knowledge 2. Force you to give him money or let him use your checkbook, ATM card, or credit card 3. Steal your property 4. Pay bills late or not pay bills that were in your name or in both of your names 5. Build up debt under your name by doing things like use your credit card or run up the phone bill 6. Refuse to get a job so you had to support your family alone 7. Gamble with your money or your shared money. 8. Have you ask your family or friends for money but not let you pay them back 9. Convince you to lend him money but not pay it back 10. Pawn your property or your shared property 11. Spend the money you needed for rent or other bills 	
Female victim-survivors accessing a domestic and sexual abuse service ³⁵³	93, interviewed 3 times over 4 months	Scale of Economic Abuse	<p>100% reported experiencing a form of economic abuse in their relationship prior to the T1 interview. The most common tactics were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demanding to know how money was spent: 93% • Dictating how money could be spent: 88% • Doing things to keep the woman from having money of her own: 85% <p>59% reported economic abuse in the 8 weeks between the second and third interviews. The most common tactics were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing things to keep the woman from having money of her own: 35% • Demanding to know how money was spent: 34% • Keeping financial information from the woman: 33%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Female victim-survivors accessing domestic abuse services ³⁵⁴	248	<p>Economic abuse was measured using the Revised Scale of Economic Abuse (SEA2), with subscales of economic restriction and economic exploitation:</p> <p>Economic Restriction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decide how you could spend money rather than letting you spend it how you saw fit 2. Make you ask him or her for money 3. Keep financial information from you 4. Keep you from having the money you needed to buy food, clothing, or other necessities 5. Hide money so that you could not find it 6. Demand that you give him/her receipts or change when you spent money 7. Keep you from having a job or going to work <p>Economic Exploitation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spend his/her money however he/she wanted while your money went to pay for necessities 2. Make you use your money to buy him/her things or pay his/her bills when you didn't want to 3. Steal your property 4. Put bills in your name, leaving you to pay them 5. Force or pressure you to give him/her your savings or other assets 6. Make you take out a loan or buy something on credit when you didn't want to 7. Take out a loan or buy something on credit in your name without your permission 	<p>96% had experienced at least one tactic of economic abuse</p> <p>By measure</p> <p>Economic restriction: 91%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 74% 2. 73% 3. 67% 4. 63% 5. 60% 6. 60% 7. 52% <p>Economic exploitation: 83 %</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 71% 2. 54% 3. 54% 4. 44% 5. 42% 6. 37% 7. 29%
Intimate partner violence victim-survivors accessing specialist services ³⁵⁵	94	Economic abuse measured using the Scale of Economic Abuse, on a frequency of Never (0) to Quite Often (4), at baseline, time 1 (10 weeks after baseline) and time 2 (8 weeks after time 2).	Economic abuse had a mean of 1.91 at baseline, of 0.45 at time 2 and 0.43 at time 2.
Resident records from a disability-focused domestic violence shelter ³⁵⁶	114	Financial abuse	10.5% reported financial abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women who had experienced IPV from a man in rural Kansas ³⁵⁷	56	Economic abuse when living and not living with a partner, on a frequency scale of Never (1) to Always (5).	89% reported economic abuse Economic abuse when living with a partner had a mean of 4 Economic abuse when not living with a partner had a mean of 2.18
Latina victim-survivors of intimate partner violence ³⁵⁸	200	Economic abuse was measured using the Scale of Economic Abuse-12, on a scale of Never (1) to Quite Often (5). The scale has 12 items across three subscales: economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage	Economic abuse had an overall mean of 2.61 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subscale of economic control had a mean of 3.11 The subscale of economic exploitation had a mean of 2.58 The subscale of employment sabotage had a mean of 1.99
Victim-survivors in a transitional housing program, of whom 93% were female ³⁵⁹	30	Seven items from the Scale of Economic Abuse, on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (Very Often)	59% reported their abuser quite often kept them from having money of their own 53% reported their abuser quite often kept them from having what they needed to buy food, clothes or other necessities 48% reported their abuser quite often did things to keep them from going to their job 43% reported their abuse quite often took their paycheck, financial aid, tax refund, disability or other support payments
Calls to the National Domestic Violence Hotline in 2018 ³⁶⁰	573670	Financial abuse	24%
Diverse sample of victim-survivors of intimate partner violence ³⁶¹	246	Surveillance control and abuse. Relevant measures include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring money, receipts, and belongings Monitoring work My partner showed up uninvited at my home, at school, or at other places he had no business being, to keep track of me or to bother me. 	By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11.5% 5.3% 26.4%
Protection order petitions in Arizona ³⁶²	607, 83 of which were by those 50 and over	Financial abuse by an intimate partner	By demographic information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full sample had a mean of .09 <50 had a mean of .09 ≥50 had a mean of .07 Women ≥50 had a mean of .1 Men ≥50 had a mean of 0

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Domestic violence shelter intake date for adult female victim-survivors of IPV ³⁶³	3924	Economic abuse	55% reported economic abuse
Victim-survivors of intimate partner violence receiving cash grants, 88% who were female/femme ³⁶⁴	525	Economic abuse using the Revised Scale of Economic Abuse	Overall prevalence rate of 96% 94% reported economic exploitation 95% reported economic exploitation 77% reported having their ability to earn income prevented or disrupted
Victim-survivors receiving cash grants, 69% who were female/femme and 18% who were gender non-confirming or non-binary ³⁶⁵	1000	Economic abuse	30% reported a harm-doer had removed money from their bank account without permission 23% reported a harm-doer controlled their access to their bank account 29% reported a harm-doer has monitored their bank account 13% reported a harm-doer had prevented them from having their own bank account 17% reported economic abuse as the reason they were unable to access their Covid-19 stimulus check
Young adults exposed to father-perpetrated domestic violence during childhood and adolescence ³⁶⁶	25	Financial abuse by their father or father-like figure against their mother	16 of the 25 (64%) reported their father perpetrating financial abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Victim-survivors of IPV accessing specialist services, 97% who were women ³⁶⁷	164	Economic abuse	<p>77% reported a partner had tried to control their financial decisions/resources</p> <p>73% reported a partner took money from them (44% often, 24% a few times, 6% once), with 21% reported <\$1000 taken, 45% reported \$1000–9999 taken, 10% reported \$10000–35000 taken and 13% reported more than \$35000 taken</p> <p>82% reported a partner damaged, destroyed or took their personal property</p> <p>59% reported a partner who harmed their credit score in one or more ways</p>
Female victim-survivors of IPV over 18 who had received a financial literacy curriculum from a domestic abuse service ³⁶⁸	120	Economic abuse was measured using the Scale of Economic Abuse, on a frequency scale of Never (1) to Quite Often (5). The 28 items were reduced to 12 items	<p>By public assistance status</p> <p>Public assistance recipients reported an economic abuse mean of 3.30.</p> <p>Non-recipients of public assistance reported an economic abuse mean of 2.49</p>
Female IPV victim-survivors taking part in a financial literacy intervention from a domestic abuse service ³⁶⁹	449	Financial abuse was measured on a frequency scale of Never (1) to Quite Often (5)	<p>The full sample had a mean of 2.6 for financial abuse</p> <p>The treatment group had a mean of 2.6, and the control group had a mean of 2.7</p>

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Female victim-survivors of IPV participating in a financial empowerment program evaluation through a domestic abuse service, 201 of whom participated in Spanish ³⁷⁰	436	<p>The research sought to validate a Spanish translation of the Scale of Economic Abuse-12, with a frequency of Never (1) to Quite Often (5). Items include:</p> <p>Economic sabotage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do things to keep you from going to your job 2. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work 3. Threaten you to make you leave work 4. Demand that you quit your job <p>Economic control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make you ask him/her for money 2. Demand to know how money was spent 3. Demand that you give him/her receipts and/or change when you spent money 4. Keep financial information from you 5. Make important financial decisions without talking with you about it first <p>Economic exploitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spend the money you needed for rent or other bills 2. Build up debt under your name by doing things like using your credit card or running up the phone bill 3. 12. Pay bills late or not pay bills that were in your name or in both of your names 	<p>The full sample reported a mean of 2.65, with the Spanish sample reporting a mean of 2.53 and the English sample of 2.74</p> <p>Mean by sample</p> <p>Employment sabotage: Full: 1.97 / Spanish: 1.93 / English: 2.01</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full: 2.48 / Spanish: 2.4 / English: 2.55 2. Full: 1.51 / Spanish: 1.38 / English: 1.63 3. Full: 1.92 / Spanish: 1.88 / English: 1.94 4. Full: 1.97 / Spanish: 2.06 / English: 1.9 <p>Economic control: Full: 3.15 / Spanish: 3.03 / English: 3.26</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full: 1.64 / Spanish: 2.45 / English: 3 2. Full: 3.38 / Spanish: 3.25 / English: 3.49 3. Full: 2.62 / Spanish: 2.6 / English: 2.3 4. Full: 3.4 / Spanish: 3.21 / English: 3.56 5. Full: 3.62 / Spanish: 3.63 / English: 3.62 <p>Economic exploitation: Full: 2.7 / Spanish: 2.5 / English: 2.87</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full: 3.03 / Spanish: 2.83 / English: 3.2 2. Full: 2.25 / Spanish: 2.02 / English: 2.43 3. Full: 2.82 / Spanish: 2.65 / English: 2.97
Staff in domestic violence shelters in New York City ³⁷¹	44 staff across 22 shelters	<p>Staff were asked:</p> <p>‘How many residents have a negative credit history due to domestic violence? For example, residents who were victims of intimate partner identity theft, have coerced debt (debt the resident took on because the abuser forced, threatened, or otherwise coerced the survivor into doing so), or otherwise have debt related to financial abuse.’</p>	<p>By approximate frequency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 0% • Very few: 9.09% • Some: 63.64% • Most: 20.45% • Nearly all: 6.82%
Female victim-survivors of IPV taking part in a financial curriculum with a domestic abuse service ³⁷²	449	Economic abuse was measured using the 12-item Scale of Economic Abuse, on a frequency scale of Never (1) to Quite Often (5)	Economic abuse at Time 1 had a mean of 2.59 and 1.43 at Time 4

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Men accessing gay domestic violence programs ³⁷³	52	Financial abuse by a partner. Items included: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 respondent's financial support 6. Refusing to contribute to his portion of expenses 	90% reported financial abuse By measure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 67% 2. 62% 3. 60% 4. 60% 5. 56% 6. 52%
Data from adult female residents of domestic violence shelter in the Southwest ³⁷⁴	511	Economic abuse	28% reported economic abuse
Domestic violence services in New York City ³⁷⁵	39 services, which serve over 25000 victim-survivors	Economic abuse	The majority of respondents had at least some clients who had been the victims of theft by an abusive partner 36% of respondents reported that, of employed clients, over half were often forced to give up control of their own earnings 79% of respondents reported clients had to ask permission to spend less than \$50, with 45% reporting clients required permission to spend \$20 or less
Latina victim-survivors in New York City ³⁷⁶	32, including 24 born outside of the US	Economic abuse	19 of the 32 (59.4%) reported economic abuse By immigration status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 of the 24 (58.3%) born outside of the US reported economic abuse • 5 of the 8 (63%) born in the US reported economic abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Female IPV victim-survivors participating in a financial literacy program through a domestic abuse service ^{377 378}	120	<p>A modified Scale of Economic Abuse, with 12 items:</p> <p>Economic exploitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>Economic control</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demand to know how money was spent 2. Make important financial decisions without talking with you about it first 3. Keep financial information from you 4. Make you ask him for money. 5. Demand that you give him receipts and/or change when you spent money <p>Employment sabotage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do things to keep you from going to your job 2. Demand that you quit your job 3. Threaten you to make you leave work 4. Beat you up if you said you needed to get a job/ go to work 	<p>94.2% experienced economic abuse within current partner or within last year or their relationship</p> <p>By measure</p> <p>Economic exploitation: 79%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 71.2% 2. 69.4% 3. 58.8% <p>Economic control: 92%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 88.3% 2. 82.6% 3. 76.9% 4. 74.4% 5. 72.5% <p>Employment sabotage: 88%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 68% 2. 59.3% 3. 59.3% 4. 31.6%
Victim-survivors taking part in a savings program ³⁷⁹	125	Economic abuse	Past prevalence of 67%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women in prison who were taking part in an economic education program aimed at victim-survivors of IPV ³⁸⁰	288	<p>Economic abuse from your most recent partner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does your partner prevent you from working or attending school? 2. Does your partner interfere with work performance through harassing and monitoring your activities? 3. Does your partner make you feel as though you don't have a right to know any details about money or household resources? 4. Does your partner prevent you from having access to household money or financial resources? 5. Does your partner steal money from you or your family? 6. Does your partner force you to give access to your accounts? 7. Does your partner refuse to help support the family financially? 8. Does your partner destroy your personal belongings? 9. Does your partner make financial or investment decisions that affect you or your family without consulting you? 10. Does your partner overuse your credit cards or refuse to pay the bills (negatively impacting your credit)? 11. Does your partner prevent you from owning or using credit cards or bankcards? 12. Does your partner refuse to put your name on bank accounts? 13. Does your partner refuse to put your name on other financial assets (such as a home)? 14. Does your partner forbid you from having a bank account? 15. Does your partner use money to force you to have sex? 16. Does your partner demand you hand over your paychecks? 17. Does your partner make you account for every penny you spend? 18. Does your partner require you to provide receipts for all your purchases (for example when you go to the grocery store)? 19. Does your partner withhold physical resources including food, clothes, necessary medications, or shelter for you and/or our children? 20. Does your partner take your car keys to prevent you from using the car? 	<p>All but 20 women (91%) reported at least one indicator of economic abuse. 50% reported between 9 and 18 indicators</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 50% 2. 51% 3. 55% 4. 62% 5. 50% 6. 39% 7. 46% 8. 74% 9. 71% 10. 58% 11. 34% 12. 63% 13. 25% 14. 18% 15. 19% 16. 34% 17. 54% 18. 43% 19. 26% 20. 65%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Female victim-survivors abused by a male partner in the last 6 months ³⁸¹	147	The Scale of Economic Abuse-12	A prevalence rate of 95% for at least one form of economic abuse, with 78% experiencing economic exploitation, 94% economic control and 68% employment sabotage
Gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender victim-survivors of domestic abuse giving testimony at a public hearing on GLBT domestic violence ³⁸²	42	Financial abuse	36% reported indicators of financial abuse
Domestic violence cases between a male and female in Quincy, Massachusetts ³⁸³	350		Nearly 60% of women reported some type of abusive control over their money by their partner
Domestic abuse organisations working with Muslim victim-survivors ³⁸⁴	9	Financial abuse	65% reported that victim-survivors experienced financial abuse
Young cisgender gay or bisexual men who reported IPV victimization or perpetration in the last 5 years ³⁸⁵	26	Financial abuse by an intimate partner: 1. Financial exploitation 2. Damaged property 3. Housing related 4. Kicked out 5. Employment related	By measure 1. 8 of 26 reported victimization 2. 3 of 26 reported victimization, 4 reported perpetration 3. 3 of 26 reported victimization 4. 3 of 26 reported victimization 5. 2 of 26 reported victimization

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Female victim-survivors of IPV accessing domestic violence programs ^{386 387}	457	<p>Economic abuse measured using the SEA-12:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make important financial decisions without talking with you about it first 2. Demand to know how money was spent 3. Keep financial information from you 4. Make you ask him/her for money 5. Demand that you give him receipt and/or change when you spent money 6. Spend the money you needed for rent or other bills 7. Pay bills late or not pay bills that were in your name or in both of your names 8. Build up debt under your name by doing things like use your credit card or run up the phone bill 9. Do things to keep you from going to your job 10. Demand that you quit your job 11. Threaten to make you leave work 12. Beat you up if you said you needed to go to work 	<p>Overall prevalence rate of 93%</p> <p>Only 1.3% reported experiencing economic abuse in isolation, 10.5% reported only psychological and economic abuse, 0.2% reported only physical and economic abuse, 29.8% reported physical, psychological and economic abuse, 3.5% reported psychological, sexual and economic abuse, and 47.7% reported all four forms</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 77.8% 2. 73.7% 3. 70.6% 4. 52.8% 5. 49.4% 6. 63.5% 7. 55.2% 8. 37.8% 9. 48.9% 10. 31% 11. 30.1% 12. 15.4%
Victims-survivors accessing a housing program, with follow up interviews over the course 24 months ³⁸⁸	<p>39 at baseline and 29 at 24 months</p> <p>38 of the 39 were women</p>	Financial abuse	<p>By time period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline: 44% • 3 months: 24% • 6 months: 32% • 9 months: 27% • 12 months: 18% • 15 months: 27% • 18 months: 27% • 21 months: 24% • 24 months: 21%
Male victim-survivors over 18 ³⁸⁹	80	Economic abuse	<p>21.3% reported current economic abuse</p> <p>55% reported past economic abuse</p>

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women calling the National Domestic Violence helpline ³⁹⁰	1863	<p>Coerced debt was assessed by asking:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has an intimate partner ever convinced or pressured you to borrow money or buy something on credit when you didn't want to? 2. If yes: What did you think would happen if you said 'no?'" 3. For a fraudulent transaction: "Have you ever found out about debt or bills that an intimate partner put in your name without you knowing?" <p>Coerced debt was established if the caller answered yes to either question 1 or 3</p>	<p>52% reported coerced debt</p> <p>22% reported a fraudulent transaction</p> <p>43% reported a coercive transaction with the following consequences reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical: 38% • Psychological: 66% • Economic: 10%
Women in domestic violence shelters ³⁹¹	19	Financial abuse	68% reported financial abuse

Oceania

Table 31: Prevalence of economic abuse in Pacific countries

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Pacific countries ³⁹²	Women who had experienced intimate partner violence	Not stated	Financially controlling, including had earnings or savings taken by a partner against their will	19% of victim-survivors had their partner take earnings or savings against their will, compared to 5% of non-victim-survivors

Australia

Table 32: Prevalence of economic abuse in Australia

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Police records of family and domestic violence events ³⁹³	492,393	There were several relevant abuse types: 1. Property damage 2. Possession of personal effects 3. Forced entry 4. Financial control	1. 22.3% 2. 0.9% 3. 0.5% 4. 0.01%
Domestic and Family Violence Death reviews, with 77.2% of those involving a male killing a female current or former partner ³⁹⁴	311	Financial abuse	27.4% of male primary domestic violence abusers who killed a female victim used economically or financially abusive tactics against the woman they killed
Women and men in South Australia who had experienced family violence ³⁹⁵	35 women, 4 men	Financial abuse	Over 30% experienced financial abuse
Saudi Arabian international students and their partners studying at universities in Australia ³⁹⁶	300 males and 200 females	The Controlling and Abusive Tactics Questionnaire was used, with three relevant items measured on a scale of Never (1) to Very Often (5): 1. My partner mainly controlled the money in our relationship 2. My partner excluded me from many of the financial decisions in our relationship 3. My partner deliberately kept me short of money	By measure 1. Male: 15.3% / Female: 95% 2. Male: 10.7% / Female: 99% 3. Male: 2.3% / Female: 76%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women in a relationship 12 months prior to the survey ³⁹⁷	10107	Financial abuse, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kept financial information from the respondent 2. Made major purchases using the respondent's money or shared money without talking to them 3. Refused to contribute to household expenses 4. Pressured or intimidated the respondent to give them money or access to their money 5. Pressured or coerced the respondent to give them access to their superannuation 6. Withheld money from the respondent that they needed for everyday expenses 7. Damaged, destroyed or stole any of the respondent's property 8. Made the respondent ask them for money, or made the respondent give them something in return for money (eg sex or affection) 	<p>19.3% of all respondents experienced financial abuse in the last 12 months during Covid-19</p> <p>10.9% of all respondents and 56.2% of those who identified as having experienced financial abuse experienced more than one form</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall: 12% / Among those who reported financial abuse: 62.2% 2. Overall: 7.8% / Among those who reported financial abuse: 40.4% 3. Overall: 6.9% / Among those who reported financial abuse: 35.8% 4. Overall: 6.3% / Among those who reported financial abuse: 32.7% 5. Overall: 2.7% / Among those who reported financial abuse: 14.2% 6. Overall: 5.5% / Among those who reported financial abuse: 28.4% 7. Overall: 5.4% / Among those who reported financial abuse: 27.7% 8. Overall: 4.9% / Among those who reported financial abuse: 25.6%
Women aged 18 and over were asked about their experiences of domestic violence in the last 3 months during Covid-19 and prior ³⁹⁸	15000	A number of relevant items were included: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Used the respondent's/shared money or made important financial decisions without talking to them 2. Damaged, destroyed or stole the respondent's property 3. Restricted the respondent's use of their phone, the internet or the family car 	<p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall: 4.7% / Among those reporting emotionally abusive, harassing or controlling behaviour: 40.2% 2. Overall: 2.7% / Among those reporting emotionally abusive, harassing or controlling behaviour: 23.4% 3. Overall: 2.6% / Among those reporting emotionally abusive, harassing or controlling behaviour: 22.2%
Data from the Personal Safety Survey in 2016 ³⁹⁹	Not stated	Economic and financial abuse	48% of women and 35% of men reporting emotional abuse from their most recent emotionally abusive partner also reported financial abuse

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women who had experienced financial abuse from a partner ⁴⁰⁰	125	<p>Measures included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Kept his financial affairs as secret Excluded you from or ignored your opinion on major financial decisions Made you feel you were not capable of managing money Insisted on controlling all the household finances and assets Monitored all your spending Refused to pay or help with childcare Made you put all your income into a joint account or his bank account Refused to pay child support Put your name on all the utilities bills – electricity, gas, water Would not contribute to household expenses Did not allow you to use or limits your use of a car Prevented you from working or studying Stole your money Insisted you show him all the receipts from your shopping Refused to work Refused to put your name on the property title Used your name to take out loans or borrow credit 	<p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 79% 62% 60% 54% 50% 49% 47% 47% 46% 36% 34% 33% 28% 26% 22% 19% 15%
Family mediation clients in Victoria ⁴⁰¹	121 adults (91 females, 30 males)	Financial control by a partner	<p>50% reported experiencing financial control</p> <p>23% reported perpetrating financial control</p> <p>Women reported a higher median of financial control, and 54% of women versus 38% of men reported financial control by a partner</p>
Single mothers ⁴⁰²	468	Financial abuse/pressure	<p>19% reported they had experienced domestic violence or financial abuse/pressure from their ex-partner</p> <p>Of women who experienced domestic violence, 59% reported their ex-partner deliberately made partial, sporadic or non-payments to cause financial uncertainty and distress. 51% reported their ex-partner used child support as a bargaining chip, 50% reported their ex-partner uses child support to manipulate their available income and 18% reported their ex-partner threatens or coerced them into not reporting the actual amount of child support paid</p>

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors of intimate partner violence ⁴⁰³	60	Financial abuse	65% reported financial abuse during the relationship
Migrant women ⁴⁰⁴	Not stated	Financial control	One in five migrant women in Australia experience family violence and of those, more than half experience financial control
Women patients of a psychiatrist and anti-dowry activist ⁴⁰⁵	Not stated	Dowry abuse	75% of patients who were experienced family violence were also experiencing dowry abuse in 2012, this decreased to 40% in 2018 following a change in family violence legislation in Victoria, which named dowry abuse as a form of family violence

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
General population ⁴⁰⁶	958	<p>Economic abuse, measured using the Revised Scale of Economic Abuse, plus a further six indicators:</p> <p>Economic Restriction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Decided how you could spend money rather than letting you spend it how you saw fit Made you ask him/her for money Hid financial information from you Kept you from having the money you needed to buy food, clothes, or other necessities Hid money so you could not find it Demanded you give him/her receipts or change when you spent money Kept you from having a job, or going to work or study <p>Economic exploitation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Spent his/her money however he/she wanted while your money went to pay for necessities Made you use your money to buy him/her things or pay his/her bills when you didn't want to Stole your belongings Put bills in your name, leaving you to pay them Forced or pressured you to give him/her your savings or other assets Made you take out a loan or buy something on credit when you didn't want to Took out a loan or bought something on credit in your name without your permission <p>Additional indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Made you sign business documents that were represented as something else, or that you didn't understand or agree with Made demands of your family for further, and/or exorbitant, dowry payments Made you work in the family business without pay or meeting legal employment conditions Forced you to claim government payments you were not entitled to Damaged or destroyed your belongings Forced you to apply for early access to your superannuation under the COVID-19 early release scheme (2020) 	<p>37% had experienced at least one indicator of economic abuse, 28% had experienced two, 22% had experienced three and 16% experienced five or more</p> <p>40% of women and 33% of men reported any indicator of economic abuse. 16% of women and 12% of men had experienced five or more indicators</p> <p>71.6% of those who had experienced another form of intimate partner violence had experienced one of more indicator of economic abuse, compared with 19.2% who had not experienced another form of abuse</p> <p>By measure, gender (10 most commonly reported only) and IPV victim-survivors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All: 15% / Women: 14% / Men: 16% / IPV victims: 35% All: 16% / Women: 18% / Men: 14% / IPV victims: 38% All: 20% / Women: 23% / Men: 17% / IPV victims: 43% All: 9% / Women: 12% / IPV victims: 24% All: 14% / Women: 16% / Men: 13% / IPV victims: 35% All: 10% / Men: 11% / IPV victims: 26% All: 10% / Women: 12% / Men: 12% / IPV victims: 27% All: 19% / Women: 20% / Men: 17% / IPV victims: 44% All: 14% / Women: 17% / Men: 12% / IPV victims: 37% All: 11% / Women: 14% / Men: 8% / IPV victims: 28% All: 12% / Women: 13% / Men: 11% / IPV victims: 31% All: 9% / IPV victims: 24% All: 9% / IPV victims: 22% All: 7% / IPV victims: 18% All: 5% / IPV victims: 12% All: 4% / IPV victims: 12% All: 5% / IPV victims: 13% All: 5% / IPV victims: 14% All: 14% / Women: 18% / Men: 11% / IPV victims: 39% All: 4% / IPV victims: 9%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women with problem gambling partners ⁴⁰⁷	48	Economic abuse	Nearly all 48 women with a problem gambling partner reported being subjected to severe economic abuse
Lesbian women ⁴⁰⁸	813 in a wider sample, 34.1% who identified as lesbian	Financial abuse	8% experiences financial abuse on one or more occasion
Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people in Victoria ⁴⁰⁹	390	Deprivation of financial independence whilst in a same-sex relationship	23.3% reported having experienced deprivation of financial independence
Women in a 1999 community survey in South Australia ⁴¹⁰	6004	Economic abuse was defined as withholding money or giving insufficient funds	8.8%
Women in the 2002–3 Australian findings of the International Violence Against Women Survey ⁴¹¹	Not stated		5% reported their current partner had destroyed or damaged their property
Women attending general practices in Queensland ⁴¹²	Not stated		3.3% reported their partner had taken their wallet and left them stranded in the previous 12 months 1.9% were not allowed to work outside the home

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
General population using the 2012 Personal Safety Survey ⁴¹³	17050	<p>The survey included 15 emotional abuse items, of which five were relevant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stopped or tried to stop you knowing about or having access to household money 2. Stopped or tried to stop you from working or earning money, or studying 3. Deprived you of basic needs (eg food, shelter, sleep, assistive aids); 4. Damaged, destroyed or stole any of your property 5. Stopped or tried to stop you from using the telephone, Internet or family car 	<p>11.5% of all adults experienced economic abuse from an intimate partner, with 15.7% of women and 7.1% of men experiencing economic abuse</p> <p>Prevalence by age and gender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18–29: Women: 9.66% / Men: 4.58% • 30–39: Women: 18.14% / Men: 8.22% • 40–49: Women: 20.91% / Men: 10.31% • 50–59: Women: 19.72% / Men: 8.6% • 60–69: Women: 16.84% / Men: 6.41% • 70+: Women: 8.53% / Men: 3.45% <p>By age, measure and gender</p> <p>18–29:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 4.07% / Men: 2.04% 2. Women: 3.85% / Men: 1.03% 3. Women: 2.39% / Men: 0.74% 4. Women: 7.26% / Men: 3.03% 5. Women: 5.55% / Men: 1.99% <p>30–39:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 9.61% / Men: 1.75% 2. Women: 6.72% / Men: 2.5% 3. Women: 4.14% / Men: 0.65% 4. Women: 13.22% / Men: 5.9% 5. Women: 10.04% / Men: 3.58% <p>40–49:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 12.5% / Men: 4.03% 2. Women: 9.05% / Men: 3.26% 3. Women: 5.33% / Men: 1.37% 4. Women: 14% / Men: 7.64% 5. Women: 10.14% / Men: 3.56% <p>50–59:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 11.59% / Men: 4.07% 2. Women: 8.01% / Men: 1.66% 3. Women: 4.87% / Men: 0.93% 4. Women: 10.55% / Men: 5.39% 5. Women: 9.01% / Men: 1.46% <p>60–69:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 10.01% / Men: 3.1% 2. Women: 7.5% / Men: 1.37% 3. Women: 3.01% / Men: 0.39% 4. Women: 7.83% / Men: 3.79% 5. Women: 5.77% / Men: 1.04% <p>70+:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 5.34% / Men: 0.8% 2. Women: 3.02% / Men: 1% 3. Women: 0.92% / Men: Not available 4. Women: 1.62% / Men: 1.54% 5. Women: 3.46% / Men: 0.97%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<p>By measure and gender</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women: 8.78% / Men: 2.69% 2. Women: 6.38% / Men: 1.85% 3. Women: 3.55% / Men: 0.74% 4. Women: 9.57% / Men: 4.72% 5. Women: 7.54% / Men: 2.25% <p>Prevalence of economic abuse by demographic information</p> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18–29: Women: 9.66% / Men: 4.58% • 30–39: Women: 18.15% / Men: 8.22% • 40–49: Women: 20.91% / Men: 10.31% • 50–59: Women: 19.72% / Men: 8.6% • 60–69: Women: 16.84% / Men: 6.41% • 70+: Women: 8.53% / Men: 3.45% <p>Marital status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Married/defacto: Women: 11.73% / Men: 5.6% • Separated/divorced: Women: 46.95% / Men: 23.15% • Widowed: Women: 11.24% / Men: 1.63% • Never married: Women: 12.98% / Men: 6.7% <p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree or diploma: Women: 13.23% / Men: 5.01% • Certificate: Women: 22.01% / Men: 8.77% • Year 11 or 12: Women: 14.91% / Men: 6.16% • Year 10 or below: Women: 16.48% / Men: 9.36% <p>Employment status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full-time: Women: 15.41% / Men: 7.08% • Part-time: Women: 12.63% / Men: 5.17% • Unemployed: Women: 23.09% / Men: 12.01% • Not in labour force: Women: 17.35% / Men: 7.17% <p>Household income quintile:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest: Women: 10.86% / Men: 6.59% • Fourth: Women: 12.26% / Men: 5.81% • Third: Women: 14.22% / Men: 7.74% • Second: Women: 20.57% / Men: 7.92% • Lowest: Women: 21.47% / Men: 8.28% <p>Personal income quintile:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest: Women: 13.46% / Men: 5.85% • Fourth: Women: 15.27% / Men: 9.02% • Third: Women: 17.57% / Men: 5.92% • Second: Women: 20.08% / Men: 9.21% • Lowest: Women: 12.08% / Men: 5.83%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
			<p>Disability status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disability: Women: 11.61% / Men: 5.72% Disability or long-term health condition: Women: 24.25% / Men: 10.06% <p>Health status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good, very good, excellent: Women: 13.54% / Men: 6.26% Fair or poor Women: 27.24% / Men: 12.31% <p>Financial stress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None or low: Women: 12.84% / Men: 6.04% Moderate: Women: 33.72% / Men: 17.53% High: Women: 62.96% / Men: 19.75% <p>Financial resilience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to raise \$2000: Women: 13.12% / Men: 6.49% Unable to raise \$2000: Women: 31.15% / Men: 11.46% <p>Physical IPV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No: Women: 6.24% / Men: 5.19% Yes: 62.09% / Men: 40.72% <p>Emotional IPV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No: Women: 1.59% / Men: 0.68% Yes: 62.07% / Men: 46.83%
Women in the Bowen Basin region or city of Mackay in Queensland ⁴¹⁴	532	<p>Economic abuse by an intimate partner was measured using:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> He prevents you from knowing about the family income/having access to family income He is stingy in giving you enough money to run the home 	<p>3.6% had experienced economic abuse in their current relationship⁴¹⁵</p> <p>Women who did not operate a joint bank account with their partner were 4.8 times more likely to experience economic abuse</p> <p>Women whose partners operated an individual account experienced three times the risk of economic abuse</p> <p>Women with a joint debt of between \$0–\$100000 were three times as likely to experience physical abuse (5x more likely in last 12 months) than women with no or more joint debt</p> <p>Women under 30 were at four times a risk of economic abuse</p> <p>By measure⁴¹⁶</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Always/often: 0.2% / Rarely: sometimes: 1.2% Always/often: 2.3% / Rarely/ sometimes: 0.9%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors of intimate partner violence ⁴¹⁷	134	Financial abuse	80% had experienced financial abuse
Women over 18 in an intimate heterosexual relationship in Queensland ⁴¹⁸	1864	<p>Economic abuse was measured using:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He is stingy in giving you enough money to run the home 2. He prevents you from knowing about the family income/having access to family income 	<p>5.4% of all women had experienced economic abuse from their current partner</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Always: 1.2% / Often: 0.6% / Rarely: 1.3% / Sometimes: 1.3% / Never: 95.7% 2. Always: 0.2% / Often: 0.5% / Rarely: 1.1% / Sometimes: 1% / Never: 97.5% <p>By demographic information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship type: Married: 5% / De facto: 8.1% • Years in relationship: <5: 10% / 5-15: 4.1% / 15: 5.4% • Age: <30: 5.4% / 30-45: 5.3% / 46-60: 5.2% / >60: 5.7% • Education: Primary: 10.9% / Junior secondary: 4.3% / Senior secondary: 5.1% / Technical: 7.8% / University: 4.2% • Women's smoking: Yes: 8.3% / No: 4.9% <p>Bank account status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint account: 3.9% / No joint account: 12.5% • Women's individual account: 4.8% / No women's individual account: 3.3% • Partner's individual account: 9% / No partner's individual account: 4% <p>Level of joint debt (in thousand Australian dollars)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None: 6.8% • <5: 7.1% • 5-10: 5.9% • 10-20: 23.7% • 20-50: 4.7% • 50-100: 1.8% • 100-200: 4.8% • >200: 4.1% • Don't know: 13.3%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Adults with diverse gender or sexuality in Australia or the UK who experienced domestic abuse and animal cruelty in an intimate relationship ⁴¹⁹	503, of which 258 were in Australia	Financial abuse was defined as: 'May include being made to account for all expenditure, expected to go into debt for another person, your money being controlled, restrictions on money available to provide care for an animal companion.'	<p>11.33% of entire sample experienced financial abuse. 0.4% reported financial abuse of an animal companion</p> <p>12.8% of Australian respondents experienced financial abuse</p> <p>By demographic (number out of full sample)</p> <p>Sexual orientation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesbian: 16 of 92 • Gay: 8 of 68 • Bisexual: 2 of 36 • Heterosexual: 1 of 4 • Pansexual: 3 of 30 • Asexual: 2 of 16 • Queer: 1 of 20 <p>Gender:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female: 22 of 148 • Male: 6 of 75 • Non-binary: 5 of 28 <p>Identified as transgender:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes: 1 of 46 • No: 28 of 212
Migrant women in Australia aged 19 to 65 ⁴²⁰	138	Financial abuse, measured using the Types of Abuse Scale	<p>50.1% experienced financial abuse</p> <p>29.2% reported their partner expected them to justify expenses</p> <p>25.4% reported their partner controlled their finances</p> <p>13.1% were prevented from gainful employment</p> <p>16.9% had money withheld</p> <p>19.2% were given an allowance</p>
Hearings from Australia and New Zealand social security tribunals ⁴²¹	89	Financial abuse	<p>By women's demographic information in sample</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander: 1 out of 2 • Culturally and linguistically diverse: 7 out of 18 • Older: 3 out of 6 • With disability: 16 out of 26 • Are or have been incarcerated: 3 out of 3 • Lesbian, gay, bisexual, intersex and transgender: 1 out of 2 • Living in rural and remote areas: 10 out of 28

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women victim-survivors supported by the Stepping Stones project ⁴²²	170		43% were dealing with joint debts and 85% were dealing with debts in their name Of these, 25% had a debt accrued by an abusive partner against their wishes, without their knowledge or understanding, or under duress
Women aged 18–50 who experienced fear of harm from an alcohol affected male partner ⁴²³	18	Alcohol-related abuse when a partner was alcohol-affected. Economic abuse was measured using: 1. Threatened or coerced to buy alcohol for him 2. Pressured her to earn more money 3. Prioritised household spending on his drinking 4. Controlled finances	By measure 1. 6% 2. 17% 3. 44% 4. 22%
Victim-survivors of intimate partner stalking ⁴²⁴	46	Financial abuse by an intimate partner	37% experienced financial abuse alongside the technology-facilitated stalking
Mothers who had left their home to escape domestic abuse and had received support from a domestic abuse service ⁴²⁵	46	Financial abuse	63% reported their partner kept all of the money to himself 48% reported being left without enough money to pay for food or bills

New Zealand

Table 33: Prevalence of economic abuse in New Zealand

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Currently-partnered women aged 18–64 in two family violence surveys ⁴²⁶	2123 in 2003 802 in 2019	Economic intimate partner violence: 1. Taken her money 2. Refused to give money for household expenses	<p>In 2003, 4.5% reported one act of economic abuse in their lifetime. In 2009, 8.9% reported one act of economic abuse in their lifetime</p> <p>By measure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2003: 2.7% / 2019: 5.6% 2003: 2.8% / 2019: 6.6% <p>By demographic information</p> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18–<30: 2003: 5.9% / 2019: 8.4% 30–<45: 2003: 5.3% / 2019: 7.5% 45–<55: 2003: 3.1% / 2019: 10.2% ≥55: 2003: 3.3% / 2019: 9.5% <p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary/secondary: 2003: 5.2% / 2019: 10.3% Tertiary: 2003: 3.6% / 2019: 8.1% <p>Relationship Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Married: 2003: 3.4% / 2019: 6.1% Cohabiting: 2003: 8.8% / 2019: 17.3% Divorced/ separated/broken up: Not available Widowed/partner died: Not available <p>Independent income</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes: 2003: 4.2% / 2019: 8.6% No: 2003: 5.5% / 2019: 9.6% <p>Deprivation level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least: 2003: 2.5 / 2019: 7.3% Moderately: 2003: 3.8% / 2019: 7.6% Most: 2003: 8.5% / 2019: 11.8% <p>Having family support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes: 2003: 4.4% / 2019: 8.1% No: 2003: 4.8% / 2019: 18.2%
Women and men aged 16 and over ⁴²⁷	2888	Economic intimate partner violence	<p>By disability type and gender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disability: Women: 14.1% / Men: 10% Physical: Women: 23% / Men: 18.5% Intellectual: Women: 20.6% / Men: 30% Psychological: Women: 33.3% / Men: 20% At least one: Women: 24.7% / Men: 19.8% Multiple: Women: 24.4% / Men: 22.3%

Papua New Guinea

Table 34: Prevalence of economic abuse in Papua New Guinea

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Women ⁴²⁸	143	Controlling behaviour included the following relevant measures: 1. Refuses to give you money for household expenses 2. Expects you to ask permission before seeking healthcare	By measure 1. Always: 6.9% / Frequently: 9.2% / Rarely: 10.7% / Never: 71.8% 2. Always: 17.6% / Frequently: 10.7% / Rarely: 35.1% / Never: 35.1%
Women attending antenatal and Voluntary Counselling and Testing Clinics ⁴²⁹ ⁴³⁰	415	Financial abuse by a partner	47% of women reported financial abuse in their relationships 6.2% of tertiary educated women versus 46.2% of non-tertiary educated women and 44.4% of women with other forms of post-school education experienced financial abuse 50% of women in paid employment versus 45.5% of those not in paid employment reported experiencing financial abuse 80.5% of financially abused women reported exchanging sex for money compared to 19.5% of non-financially abused women. 78.6% of financially abused women reported exchanging sex for goods, compared to 21.4% of non-financially abused women 26.9% of financially abused women were HIV positive, compared to 19.8% of non-financially abused women
Women aged 19 to 49 ⁴³¹	873	Economic abuse	52% reported lifetime economic intimate partner violence
Ever-partnered men and women in Bougainville ⁴³²	864 men and 879 women	Economic abuse was measured using: 1. Prohibited partner from working 2. Took partners' earnings 3. Forced partner out of the house 4. Withheld earnings from partner Women were asked if they had experienced these measures, men were asked if they had perpetrated them	55.4% of women reported any act of economic abuse in their lifetime, and 23.7% reported it in their current relationship 56.9% of men reported perpetrating any act of economic abuse in their lifetime and 29% in their current relationship By measure 1. Women: 21% / Men: 18.6% 2. Women: 35% / Men: 23.9% 3. Women: 21.9% / Men: 24.3% 4. Women: 28% / Men: 42.9%

Central and South America

Table 52: Prevalence of economic abuse in Brazil, Guatemala, Panama and Peru

Country	Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
Brazil	Service users of the House of Brazilian Women, which includes women victim-survivors and perpetrators ⁴³³	Around 50,000	Economic violence	5.2%
Guatemala	Rural women in Altiplano ⁴³⁴	448 receiving microcredit (treatment group) and 435 not receiving microcredit (control group)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you decide how to spend household income without your husband's permission? 2. Can you ask for a loan without your husband's permission? 3. Do you decide on your business spending without your husband's permission? <p>Women were asked the above questions, suggesting that a negative response indicated economic abuse</p>	<p>Number responding affirmatively to questions:</p> <p>Treatment Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 73% (27% responded negatively) 2. 11.6% (88.4% responded negatively) 3. 89% (11% responded negatively) <p>Control Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 60.7% (39.3% responded negatively) 2. 6% (94% responded negatively) 3. 82.1% (17.9% responded negatively)
Panama	Indigenous women ⁴³⁵	33	Having been refused money for household expenses, even when their partner had money for other things	39%
Peru	Women victim-survivors who suffer from depressive disorders in Lima, La Libertad and Amazonas ⁴³⁶	384 (250 from Lima, 80 from La Libertad and 54 from Amazonas)	Patrimonial violence	<p>Overall prevalence was 11%</p> <p>By region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lima: 11.6% • La Libertad: 9.2% • Amazonas: 10.1%

Columbia

Table 53: Prevalence of economic abuse in Colombia

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
National Demographic and Health Survey 2019, women aged 13–49 ⁴³⁷	Not stated	<p>Economic violence by an intimate partner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spending money earmarked for upkeep of the home 2. Prohibition from working or studying 3. Monitoring the spending of money 4. Threatening to take away financial support 5. Seize money or property 	<p>Overall prevalence of 31.1%</p> <p>By measure used</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 16.2% ever, 11.3% in last 12 months 2. 14% ever, 9% in last 12 months 3. 13.5% ever, 10.9% in last 12 months 4. 10.5% ever, 7.9% in last 12 months 5. 4.4% ever, 3% in last 12 months <p>By marital status and measure used</p> <p>Married: 23% ever experienced</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 9.2% ever, 5.6% in last 12 months 2. 9.3% ever, 4.4% in last 12 months 3. 10.8% ever, 8.7% in last 12 months 4. 5.9% ever, 4.1% in last 12 months 5. 1.7% ever, 1% in last 12 months <p>Partnered: 25.4% ever experienced</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 11.5% ever, 8.7% in last 12 months 2. 11.9% ever, 8.9% in last 12 months 3. 11.1% ever, 9.9% in last 12 months 4. 6.8% ever, 5.9% in last 12 months 5. 1.9% ever, 1.3% in last 12 months <p>Widowed: 40.1% ever experienced</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 22.2% ever, 13.7% in last 12 months 2. 23.8% ever, 11.3% in last 12 months 3. 14.8% ever, 10.7% in last 12 months 4. 12.8% ever, 8% in last 12 months 5. 4.8% ever, 4.4% in last 12 months <p>Divorced: 64.6% ever experienced</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 41.4% ever, 26.9% in last 12 months 2. 28.1% ever, 19.2% in last 12 months 3. 31.0% ever, 19.6% in last 12 months 4. 35.9% ever, 24.5% in last 12 months 5. 24.5% ever, 15.9% in last 12 months <p>Separated: 53.9% ever experienced</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 35.5% ever, 24.4% in last 12 months 2. 24.1% ever, 14.8% in last 12 months 3. 22.4% ever, 15.7% in last 12 months 4. 24.7% ever, 17.1% in last 12 months 5. 13.6% ever, 9.4% in last 12 months

Ecuador

Table 54: Prevalence of economic abuse in Ecuador

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
2011 National Survey of Family Relations and Gender Violence against Women involving women aged 15 and above. ⁴³⁸	18800	Economic violence Note: the survey asked about violence against women more generally, rather than intimate partner violence	Overall prevalence of 16.38% By demographic information Age: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15–25: 8.6% 26–35: 17.51% 36–45: 19.54% 46–55: 19.46% 56–65: 18.59% 65+: 13.56% Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> University or higher: 13.56% Secondary: 15.87% Primary/middle: 17.9% None: 22.26% Marital status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single: 5.48% Living with partner: 14.8% Married: 12.02% Separated/divorced: 47.03% Widowed: 19.65% Ethnicity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous: 16.26% People of Colour: 17.94% Mestizo: 16.4% White and others: 13.36% Area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural: 14.86% Urban: 16.99% Regions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coast: 14.63% Highlands: 18.14% Amazon: 17.86% Galapagos and others: 8.12%
2019 National Survey of Family Relations and Gender Violence against Women ⁴³⁹	Not stated	Patrimonial and economic violence Note: the survey asked about VAW rather than IPV	16.4%

Population of study	Sample size	Question or measures used	Prevalence
National Survey of Family Relations and Gender Violence against Women (year not stated) ⁴⁴⁰	Not stated	Economic violence Note: the survey asked about VAW rather than IPV	35.3%
Women aged 15-49 ⁴⁴¹	Not stated	Economic/patrimonial violence by a current partner	Married women: 12.1% Women in consensual unions: 11.5%
Women aged 15 to 49 attending outpatient care in Azogues ⁴⁴²	351	Patrimonial violence	22.5%

Endnotes

- 1 El-Nimr, N.A., Mamdouh, H.M., Ramadan, A., El Saeh, H.M., Shata, Z.N., (2021), 'Intimate partner violence among Arab women before and during the COVID-19 lockdown', *Journal of The Egyptian Public Health Association*, 96: 1-8.
- 2 Asma, B., (2017), *Financial Abuse of Working Women in Algeria*, University of Abd Alhamid Ibn.
- 3 Women's Affairs Department, (2018), *Gender Based Violence Indicators Study Botswana*, Women's Affairs Department.
- 4 Falb, K.L., Annan, J., Dpebo, D., Cole, H., Willie, T., Xuan, Z., Raj, A., Gupta, J., (2015), 'Differential Impacts of an Intimate Partner Violence Prevention Program Based on Child Marriage Status in Rural Côte d'Ivoire', *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 57(5): 552-558.
- 5 Lencha, B. Ameya, G., Baresa, G., Minda, Z., Ganfure, G., (2019), 'Intimate partner violence and its associated factors among pregnant women in Bale Zone, Southeast Ethiopia: A cross-sectional study', *PLOS ONE*, 14(5): 1-14.
- 6 Jatta, J.W., Baru, A., Fawole, O.I., Ojengbede, O.A., (2021), 'Intimate partner violence among pregnant women attending antenatal care services in the rural Gambia', *PLOS ONE*, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255723>
- 7 Allen, M. and Devitt, C., (2012), 'Intimate Partner Violence and Belief Systems in Liberia', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(17): 3514-3531.
- 8 El Feki, S., Heilman, B. and Barker, G., (eds), (2017) *Understanding Masculinities: Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) – Middle East and North Africa*, Cairo and Washington, D.C.: UN Women and Promundo-US.
- 9 Bikinesi, L.T., Mash, R., Joyner, K., (2017), 'Prevalence of intimate partner violence and associated factors amongst women attending antenatal care at Outapi clinic, Namibia: A descriptive survey', *African Journal of Primary Health Care & Family Medicine*, 9(1): 1-6.
- 10 Habumuremyi, P.D., Habamensh, V., (2019), 'The State of Domestic Violence in Rwanda and the Role of the Man: Root', *International Journal of CHUR Research Academy*, 2(1): 222-256.
- 11 Soumah, M.M. Diop, O., (2020), 'Domestic violence in Dakar', *Forensic Science International: Reports*, 2, <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsir.2020.100109>
- 12 Mohammed Ali Abaker, T., (2020), *Domestic Violence among Pregnant Women Attending Antenatal Clinics at Garri Hospital in Khartoum State*, University of Khartoum.
- 13 Jellali, I.A., Jellali, M.A., Gataa, R., Mechri, A., (2015), 'Violence against women in the marriage: cross-sectional study in the family planning clinic Monastir', *Medical Tunisia*, 93(8): 516-522.
- 14 Abu-Elin, M.M., Alshora, A.A., Sadaka, M.S., Abdeldaim, D.E., (2022), 'Domestic violence against married women during the COVID-19 pandemic in Egypt', *BMC Women's Health*, 94: 1-10.
- 15 El Maqsoud, S.A., Dabbous, N., Abu Nazel, M., (2011), 'Domestic violence against Women in Alexandria, Egypt: A Developing Country Perspective', *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, Suppl1: A23.
- 16 Cited in: Usta, J., Makarem, N.N., Habib, R.R., (2013), 'Economic Abuse in Lebanon: Experiences and Perceptions', *Violence Against Women*, 19(3): 356-375.
- 17 Cited in: Kisa, S., Gungor, R., Kisa, A., (2021), 'Domestic Violence Against Women in North African and Middle Eastern Countries: A Scoping Review', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211036070>
- 18 Cited in: Usta, J., Makarem, N.N., Habib, R.R., (2013), 'Economic Abuse in Lebanon: Experiences and Perceptions', *Violence Against Women*, 19(3): 356-375.
- 19 El Feki, S., Heilman, B. and Barker, G., (eds), (2017) *Understanding Masculinities: Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) – Middle East and North Africa*, Cairo and Washington, D.C.: UN Women and Promundo-US.
- 20 Addai, B.K., (2016), *Women's Socio-Demographic Characteristics And Their Experience Of Domestic Violence: A Case Study Of Awutu Senya East*, University of Ghana.
- 21 Ogum Alangea D., Addo-Lartey A.A., Sikweyiya Y., Chirwa E.D., Coker-Appiah D., Jewkes R., Mawuena Kofi Adanu, R., (2018), 'Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence among women in four districts of the central region of Ghana: Baseline findings from a cluster randomised controlled trial', *PLoS ONE*, 13(7): <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200874>
- 22 Institute of Development Studies, (2019), *Domestic violence in Ghana: incidence, attitudes, determinants and consequences*, Institute of Development Studies
- 23 Tonkorang, E.Y., (2018), 'Women's Autonomy and Intimate Partner Violence in Ghana', *International Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 44(2): 51-61.
- 24 Tenkorang, E.Y. 'Economic Abuse and Women's Sexual Autonomy: Evidence from Ghana' in Shackelford, T.K., (ed), (2021), *The SAGE Handbook of Domestic Violence*, Sage.
- 25 In: Yau, J.H., (2017), *Economic abuse as a form of intimate partner violence : definition, risk factors, and mental well-being*, University of Hong Kong.

- 26 Cabral, A., Baeten, J., Ngunjiri, K., Vellozo, J., Oduor, J., Haberer, J., Muwonge, T., Asiimwe, S., Heffron, R. (2018), 'Intimate partner violence and self-reported pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) interruptions among HIV-negative partners in HIV serodiscordant couples in Kenya and Uganda', *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 77(2): 154-159.
- 27 Kiarie, J.N., Farquhar, C., Richardson, B.A., Kabura, M.N., John, F.N., Nduati, R.W., John-Stewart, G.C., (2006), 'Domestic violence and prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV-1', *AIDS*, 20(13): 1763-1769.
- 28 Murthami, J.M., (2017), *Impact of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy on Women Exposed to Domestic Violence in Kibra Sub-County, Nairobi City County-Kenya*, University of Nairobi.
- 29 Sang, P., and Sang, L., (2014), 'Economic Abuse Prevalence In Kabisaga Sublocation, Nandi County, Kenya', *International Researchers*, 3(3): 141-151.
- 30 Pelser, E., Gondwe, L., Mayamba, C., Mhango, T., Phiri, W., Burton, P., (2005), *Intimate Partner Violence: Results From A National Gender-Based Violence Study In Malawi*, National Statistical Office.
- 31 Adam, V.Y., Erhus, E., (2022), 'One-year prevalence of domestic violence against women during the COVID-19 pandemic in an urban community in Southern Nigeria', *Journal of Community Medicine and Primary Health Care*, 34(1): 117-130.
- 32 Adegbite, O.B., Ajuwon, A.J., (2015), 'Intimate Partner Violence among Women of Child Bearing Age in Alimosho LGA of Lagos State, Nigeria', *African Journal of Biomedical Research*, 18(2): 135-146.
- 33 Agbo, M., Viashima, V.L., (2020), 'Effects Of Gender Based Violence On The Livelihood Of Women Farmers In Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria', *Fudma International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2): 16-28
- 34 Aguocha, C.M., Duru, C.B., Onoh, R.C., Olose, E.O., Igwe, M.N., Amadi, K.U., Ogwunga, J.N., (2017), 'Experience of intimate partner violence among female health workers in South East Nigeria', *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 20(8): 827-840.
- 35 Ezeudu, C.C., Akpa, O., Waziri, N.E., Oladimeji, A., Adedire, E., Saude, I., Nguku, P., Nsubuga, P., Fawole, O.I., (2019), 'Prevalence and correlates of intimate partner violence, before and during pregnancy among attendees of maternal and child health services, Enugu, Nigeria: mixed method approach, January 2015', *The Pan African Medical Journal*, 32(supp 1): 14.
- 36 Igbokew, C.C., Ukwuma, M.C., Onugwu, K.J., (2013), 'Domestic violence against Women: challenges to health and innovation', *Journal of Research in National Development*, 11(2): 27-35.
- 37 Iordye, P.Y., Osaghiobare, O.E., Ebohon, V.S., (2020), 'Domestic violence and family socio-economic status as correlates of public secondary school students' academic performance in Benue State, Nigeria', *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education Planning and Administration*, 54(2): 150-157.
- 38 Shualb Abolakale, M., (2019), 'Patterns Of Domestic Violence Among Married Adults In Ilorin Metropolis, Nigeria: Implication For Counselling', *Covenant International Journal Of Psychology*, 4(1): 55-70.
- 39 Fawole, O.I., Salawu, T.A., Olarinmoye, E.O.A., (2011), 'Intimate Partner Violence: Prevalence and Perceptions of Married Men in Ibadan, Nigeria', *Community Health Equity Research & Policy*, 30(4): 349-364.
- 40 Cited in: Clarke, S., (2014), "...Economic abuse to me is not seen, you know?" Service provider's perceptions of women's experiences of economic abuse within domestic violent relationships, University of Cape Town.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Dunkle, K.L., Jewkes, R., Brown, H.C., Yoshihama, M., Gray, G.E., McIntyre, J.A., Harlow, S.D., (2004), 'Prevalence and Patterns of Gender-based Violence and Revictimization among Women Attending Antenatal Clinics in Soweto, South Africa', *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 160(3): 230-239.
- 44 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(14): 1-11.
- 45 Gibbs, A., Dunkle, K., and Jewkes, R., (2018), 'Emotional and economic intimate partner violence as key drivers of depression and suicidal ideation: A cross-sectional study among young women in informal settlements in South Africa', *PLOSOne*, 13(4): e0194885.
- 46 Haffeejee, S., Vetten, L., Greyling, M., (2006), *Violence and Abuse in the lives of women and girls incarcerated at three Gauteng women's prisons*, Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.
- 47 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.
- 48 Knight, L., Ranganathan, M., Abramsky, T., Polzer-Ngwato, T., Muvhango, L., Molebatsi, M., Stöckl, H., Lees, S., Watts, C., (2020), 'Intervention with Microfinance for AIDS and Gender Equity (IMAGE): Women's Engagement with the Scaled-up IMAGE Programme and Experience of Intimate Partner Violence in Rural South Africa', *Prevention Science*, 21: 268-281.

- 49 Kordom, A., Julie, H., Arunachallam, S., (2014), 'Intimate partner violence amongst undergraduate nursing students : part 1 : contemporary issues in nursing', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 28(6); 1842-1860.
- 50 Matthews, S., Abrahams, N., (2001), *Combining Stories and Numbers: An Analysis of the Impact of the Domestic Violence*, The Gender Advocacy Programme & The Medical research Council.
- 51 Njezula, A.B., (2006), *Investigating Domestic Violence against Women in South Africa*, University of the Western Cape.
- 52 Ogunmefun, C.A., (2003), *Intimate Partner Violence as an obstacle to safer sex practice in South Africa*, University of Natal, Durban.
- 53 Ranganathan, M., Knight, L., Abramsky, T., Muvhango, L., Ngwato, T.P., Mbobelatsi, M., Ferrari, G., Watts, C., Stöckl, H., (2021), 'Associations Between Women's Economic and Social Empowerment and Intimate Partner Violence: Findings From a Microfinance Plus Program in Rural North West Province, South Africa', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(15-16): 7747-7775.
- 54 Schneider, V., and Vetten, L., (2006), *Equal or Different: Comparing women and men's use of the Domestic Violence Act*, Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.
- 55 Slabbert, I., (2010), *The Experience of Low-Income Female Survivors of Domestic Violence*, Stellenbosch University.
- 56 Cited in: Smythe, D., and Artz, L., (2005), 'Money matters: structural problems with implementing the DVA', *Agenda*, 19(66): 24-33.
- 57 Kapiga, S., Harvey, S., Muhammad, A.K., Stöckl, H., Mshana, G., Hashim, R., Hansen, C., Lees, S., 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: 190.
- 58 Halim, N., Steven, E., Reich, N., Badi, L., Messersmith, L., (2018), 'Variability and validity of intimate partner violence reporting by couples in Tanzania', *PLOS ONE*, 13(3): 1-18.
- 59 Mahenge, B., Stöckl, H., Abubakari, A., Mbwambo, J., Jahn, A., (2016), 'Physical, Sexual, Emotional and Economic Intimate Partner Violence and Controlling Behaviors during Pregnancy and Postpartum among Women in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania', *PLOS ONE*, 11(10): 1-10.
- 60 Messersmith, L.J., Halim, N., Mzliangwe, E.S., Reich, N., Badi, L., Bingham Holmes II, N., Servidone, M., Simmons, E., Kawemama, P., (2021), 'Childhood Trauma, Gender Inequitable Attitudes, Alcohol Use and Multiple Sexual Partners: Correlates of Intimate Partner Violence in Northern Tanzania', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(1-2): 820-842.
- 61 Levto, R., Vlahovicova, K., Barker, G., Stiefvater, E., Lugano, D., and Mulokozi, A. D., (2018), *Momentum Toward Equality: Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) in Tanzania*, Washington, DC: Promundo-US, Uzazi na Malezi Bora Tanzania, and Tanzania Commission for AIDS.
- 62 Cabral, A., Baeten, J., Ngure, K., Velloza, J., Odoyo, J., Haberer, J., Muwonge, T., Asiimwe, S., Heffron, R. (2018), 'Intimate partner violence and self-reported pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) interruptions among HIV-negative partners in HIV serodiscordant couples in Kenya and Uganda', *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 77(2): 154-159.
- 63 Evarist, A.G., Pio, K.F., (2017), 'Structural Family Counselling and Transformation of Home Financial Constraints: a case of selected families in Kampala, Uganda', *Nkumba Business Journal*, 16: 153-171.
- 64 Vlahovicova, K., Spindler, E., Levto, R., Hakobyan, L., (2019), *Evolving Perspectives: Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) in Central Uganda*, Washington, DC: Promundo-US and International Center for Research on Women.
- 65 Batawu, F., (2016), *The effectiveness of the Domestic Violence Act in addressing domestic violence in customary related marriages: A case study for Gokwe urban district for the period January 2011 to December 2012*, Bindura University of Science Education.
- 66 Chipange, S., (2013), *An investigation into the factors associated with intimate partner violence and their effects among women in Zimbabwe. a case study of Musasa clients*, Bindura University of Science Education.
- 67 Dohwe, M., Haruzvishe, C., Zvinavashe, M., Mhlanga, M., Mugadza, G., (2016), 'Domestic violence and its association with adverse pregnancy outcomes in Zimbabwe: a descriptive correlational study', *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, 5(3): 11-17.
- 68 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(12): 57-65.
- 69 El-Nimr, N.A., Mamdouh, H.M., Ramadan, A., El Saeh, H.M., Shata, Z.N., (2021), 'Intimate partner violence among Arab women before and during the COVID-19 lockdown', *Journal of The Egyptian Public Health Association*, 96: 1-8.
- 70 Moshtagh, M., Amiri, R., Sharafi, S., Arab-Zozani, M., (2021), 'Intimate Partner Violence in the Middle East Region: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F15248380211036060>
- 71 UNFPA/SCFWCA, (2018), *Gender equality and gender relations in Azerbaijan: current trends and opportunities. Findings from the Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES)*, Baku, Azerbaijan.

- 72 Bubshait, M., Al-Jamea, L., Al-Ekri, E., Al Ubaidi, B.A., Al-Dhubaib, D., Najem, W., Husain, H., (2021), 'Prevalence of Domestic Violence & Associated Risk Factors Among Adult Females attending Primary Care in the Kingdom of Bahrain', *International Medical Journal*, 28(3): 4413-4425.
- 73 Jiwatram-Negrón, T., Hunt, T., Nikitin, D., Rychkova, O., Ermolaeva, I., Sharonova, N., Mukambetov, A., Gilbert, L., (2018), 'An exploratory study of economic abuse among substance-involved women in Kyrgyzstan', *Journal of Substance Use*, 23(4): 358-365.
- 74 Ayuwat, D., and Sananikone, S., (2018), 'Influential Factors Among Male Population, Which Associated with the Economic Violence Against Women in Laos', *Gender issues*, 35: 330-338.
- 75 Oyunbileg, S., Sumberzul, N., Udval, N., Wang, J., Janes, C., (2009), 'Prevalence and Risk Factors of Domestic Violence among Mongolian Women', *Journal of Women's Health*, 18(11): 1873-1880.
- 76 The Asia Foundation, (2015), *Beyond Fragility and Inequity: Women's Experiences of the Economic Dimensions of Domestic Violence in Timor-Leste*, The Asia Foundation.
- 77 Cited in: Kisa, S., Gungor, R., Kisa, A., (2021), 'Domestic Violence Against Women in North African and Middle Eastern Countries: A Scoping Review', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211036070>
- 78 Cited in: Afrin, Z., (2017), 'Combating Domestic Violence in Bangladesh: Law, Policy and Other Relevant Considerations', *Annual Survey of International and Comparative Law*, 161-174.
- 79 Dalal, K., Rahman, F., Jansson, B., (2009), 'Wife Abuse In Rural Bangladesh', *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 41(5): 561-573.
- 80 Fulu, E., Warner, X., Miedema, S., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., Lang, J., (2013), *Why Do Some Men Use Violence Against Women and How Can We Prevent It? Quantitative Findings from the United Nations Multi-country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific*, UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNV.
- 81 Hossen, A., (2014), *Measuring Gender-based violence: Results of the Violence Against Women (VAW) Survey in Bangladesh*, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics.
- 82 Khan, Z., Cheong, Y.F., Miedema, S., Naved, R.T., Yount, K.M., (2020), 'Women's experiences of economic coercion and depressive symptoms in Matlab, Bangladesh', *SSM - Population Health*, 12(December): 100641.
- 83 Naved, R.T., Al Mamun, M., Parvin, K., Willan, S., Gibbs, A., Yu, M., Jewkes, R., (2018), 'Magnitude and correlates of intimate partner violence against female garment workers from selected factories in Bangladesh', *PLOS ONE*, 13(11): 1-22.
- 84 Soron, T.R., Ashiq, M.A.R., Al-Hakeen, M., Chowdhury, Z.F., Ahmed, H.U., Chowdhury, C.A., (2021), 'Domestic Violence and Mental Health During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Bangladesh', *JMIR Formative Research*, 5(9): 1-6.
- 85 Wahab, N., and Suriyabandara, V., (2020), 'Eradicating of Domestic Violence against women: a Comparative Study on Legal Framework between Sri Lanka and Bangladesh', *High Technology Letters*, 26 (11): 263-283.
- 86 Yount, K.M., Cheong, Y.F., Miedema, S., Naved, R.T., (2021), 'Development and Validation of the Economic Coercion Scale 36 (ECS-36) in Rural Bangladesh', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(13-14): NP10726-NP10757.
- 87 Fulu, E., Warner, X., Miedema, S., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., Lang, J., (2013), *Why Do Some Men Use Violence Against Women and How Can We Prevent It? Quantitative Findings from the United Nations Multi-country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific*, UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNV.
- 88 Postmus, J.L., Nikolova, K., Lin, H., Johnson, L., (2021), 'Women's Economic Abuse Experiences: Results from the UN Multi-Country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(15-16): NP13115-NP13142.
- 89 Dunkle, K.L., Wong, F.Y., Nehl, E.J., Lin, L., He, N., Huang, J., Zheng, T., (2013), 'Male-on-Male Intimate Partner Violence and Sexual Risk Behaviors Among Money Boys and Other Men Who Have Sex With Men in Shanghai, China', *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, 40(5): 362-365.
- 90 Fulu, E., Warner, X., Miedema, S., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., Lang, J., (2013), *Why Do Some Men Use Violence Against Women and How Can We Prevent It? Quantitative Findings from the United Nations Multi-country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific*, UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNV.
- 91 Postmus, J.L., Nikolova, K., Lin, H., Johnson, L., (2021), 'Women's Economic Abuse Experiences: Results from the UN Multi-Country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(15-16): NP13115-NP13142.
- 92 Cited in: Ibid.
- 93 Yau, J.H.Y., (2017), *Economic Abuse as a Form of Intimate Partner Violence: Definition, Risk Factors, and Mental Well-being*, University of Hong Kong.
- 94 Yau, J.H.Y., Fong, D.Y.T., Wong, J.Y.H., (2020), 'Risk Factors for and Mental Well-Being Outcomes of Economic Abuse in Hong Kong Chinese Population', *Violence and Victims*, 35(2): 246-265.
- 95 Cited in: Yau, J.H.Y., Wong, J.Y.H., Choi, E., P.H., Fong, D.Y.T., (2019), 'Transcultural Validation of the 12-Item Scale of Economic Abuse in Chinese Population', *Violence and Victims*, 24(5): 804-817.
- 96 Yu, H., Jiang, Z., Bao, W., Xu, G., Yang, R., Shen, M., (2018), 'Association of intimate partner violence during pregnancy, prenatal depression, and adverse birth outcomes in Wuhan, China', *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 18, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-018-2113-6>

- 97 Mammadov, B., Vural, G., Tosun, O., (2018), 'Risk Factors Associated with Intimate Partner Violence during Pregnancy in Northern Cyprus', *Cyprus Journal of Medical Sciences*, 1: 9-14.
- 98 Anitha, S., Roy, A., and Yalamarty, H., (2016), *Disposable Women: Abuse, Violence and Abandonment in Transnational Marriages: Issues for policy and practice in the UK and India*, University of Lincoln.
- 99 Banerjee, S., Kallakuru, R.R., Kumar, Y., Pai, M., Kumar, N., Tushaus, D., (2016), 'Conducting A Community Needs Assessment: A Student-Client Approach To Clinic Research', *International Journal of Clinical Legal Education*, 23: 52-86.
- 100 Biswas, C.S., Pal, M., Bharati, P., (2022), 'Violence against women in West Bengal: its extent and causes', *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 6(1): 149-171.
- 101 Fernandez, K., and Debnath, D.J., (2014), 'Study of intimate partner violence against women in an urban locality of Pune', *Medical Journal of Dr D.Y. Patil Vidyapeeth*, 7(4): 425-428.
- 102 Kanougiya, S., Daruwalla, N., Gram, L., Gupta, A.D., Sivakami, M., Osrin, D., (2021), 'Economic abuse and its associations with symptoms of common mental disorders among women in a cross-sectional survey in informal settlements in Mumbai, India', *BMC Public Health*, 21: 1-14.
- 103 Kathpalia, J., Tyagi, R., Chander, S., (2021), 'Rural women and factors affecting domestic violence in Haryana', *The Journal of Rural and Agricultural Research*, 21(1): 17-20.
- 104 Nadda, A., Malik, J.S., Rohilla, R., Chahal, S., Chayal, V., Arora, V., (2018), 'Study of Domestic Violence among Currently Married Females of Haryana, India', *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 40(6): 534-539.
- 105 Ohlan, R., (2021), 'Economic violence among women of economically backward Muslim minority community: the case of rural North India', *Future Business Journal*, 7(28): 1-11.
- 106 Panda, P.K., (2014), 'Role of Micro Finance in Reduction of Domestic Violence Against Women: An Economic Analysis', *Indian Journal of Economics & Business*, 13(3): 449-462.
- 107 Pewa, P., Thomas, S., Dagli, R., Solanki, J., Arora, G., Garla, B., (2015), 'Occurrence of domestic violence among women and its impact on oral health in Jodhpur City', *The Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice*, 16(3): 227-233.
- 108 Raje, V., (2015), 'Study of Domestic Violence against Married Women in Western Maharashtra of India', *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 10(1): 1-10.
- 109 Rasheed, D., (2015), 'Domestic violence and women's health', *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, 76(3): 461-479.
- 110 Saidi, R., Siddegowda, Y.S., (2013), 'A comparative study of Iranians and Indians about the types of domestic violence', *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings*, 2(2): 242-250.
- 111 Shah, S.H., Rajani, K., Kataria, L., Trivedi, A., Patel, S., Mehta, K., (2012), 'Perception and prevalence of domestic violence in the study population', *Indian Psychiatry Journal*, 21(2): 137-143.
- 112 Chowbey, P., (2017), 'Women's narratives of economic abuse and financial strategies in Britain and South Asia', *Psychology of Violence*, 7(3): 459-468.
- 113 Afdal, A., Alizamar, A., Ifdil, I., Erlamsyah, E., Taufik, T., (2017), 'Guidance And Counseling Services For Women Victims Of Domestic Violence' , *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 118: 935-939.
- 114 Fulu, E., Warner, X., Miedema, S., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., Lang, J., (2013), *Why Do Some Men Use Violence Against Women and How Can We Prevent It? Quantitative Findings from the United Nations Multi-country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific*, UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNV.
- 115 Nazaruddin, N., Rasdiyanah, A., Saleh Ridwan, M., Kurniati, K., (2021), 'Divorce Due To Domestic Violence In Sinjai District (Perspective Analysis of Islamic Law)', *Jurnal Diskursus Islam*, 9(2): 137-151.
- 116 Cited in: Yau, J.H.Y., (2017), *Economic Abuse as a Form of Intimate Partner Violence: Definition, Risk Factors, and Mental Well-being*, University of Hong Kong.
- 117 Cited in: Barzilay, A.R., (2017), 'Power in the Age of In/Equality: Economic Abuse, Masculinities, and the Long Road to Marriage Equality', *Akron Law Review*, 451: 323-366.
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 Aghakhani, N., Nia, H.S., Moosavi, E., Eftekhari, A., Zarei, A., Bahrami, N., Nikoonejad, A.R., (2015), 'Study of the Types of Domestic Violence Committed Against Women Referred to the Legal Medical Organization in Urmia - Iran', *Iranian Journal Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences*, 9(4): e2446.
- 120 Nasrabadi, A.N., Abbasi, N.H., Mehrdad, N., (2015), 'The Prevalence of Violence Against Iranian Women and Its Related Factors', *Global Journal of Health Science*, 7(3): 37-45.
- 121 Masoumi, Z., Babahyidarian, F., Sangestani, G., Roshanaei, G., (2019), 'Assessment of Different Types of Domestic Violence Against Pregnant Mothers Exposed to Violence in Sahneh City', *Pajouhan Scientific Journal*, 17(2): 24-30.
- 122 Meybodi, F.B., Hassani, M., (2009), 'Prevalence of Violence Against Women by their Partners in Kerman', *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Clinical Psychology*, 15(3): 300-307.
- 123 Cited in: Moshtagh, M., Amiri, R., Sharafi, S., Arab-Zozani, M., (2021), 'Intimate Partner Violence in the Middle East Region: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*,

- 124 Ibid.
- 125 Sahraian, A., Ghanizadeh, A., Hashemi, S.H., Mohammadi, M.R., Ahmadzadeh, L., (2019), 'Prevalence and Predictors of Domestic-Violence towards', *Iranian Journal Psychiatry*, 10(4): 233–238.
- 126 Zarei, M., Rasolabadi, M., Gharibi, F., Seidi, J., (2017), 'The prevalence of violence against women and some related factors in Sanandaj city (Iran) in 2015', *Electron Physician*, 9(11): 5746–5753.
- 127 Saidi, R., Siddegowda, Y.S., (2013), 'A comparative study of Iranians and Indians about the types of domestic violence', *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings*, 2(2): 242–250.
- 128 Al-Deen, N.S., Ali Hasan, L., Talib, M., (2021), 'Intimate Partner Violence among Sample of Married Women Attending Primary Health Care Center in Al-Russafa Sector, 2018', *Journal of University of Shanghai for Science and Technology*, 23(11): 273–284.
- 129 Ali, S.K., (2015), 'Domestic Violence Encountered among Kurdish Women', *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(3): 37–33.
- 130 Rasol, S.J., and Abas, S.F., (2021), 'The Effect of Abusive Factors on the Emergence of the Financial Abuse between Partners: An Exploratory Study for the opinions of a sample of married women within the geographical location at Duhok city specifically Avro City', *Academic Journal of Nawroz University*, 10(4): 50–61.
- 131 Alsawalqa, R.O., (2020), 'Economic Abuse of Women in Amman, Jordan: A Quantitative Study', *SAGE Open*, October–December 2020: 1–13.
- 132 Alsawalqa, R.O., (2021), 'Women's abuse experiences in Jordan: A comparative study using rural and urban classifications', *Humanities and social sciences communications*, 8: 186.
- 133 Safadi, R.R., Daibes, M.A., Haidar, W.H., Al-Nawafleh, A.H., Constantino, R.E., (2018), 'Assessing Intimate Partner Abuse: Associated Factors and Health Consequences among Jordanian Women', *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 39(4): 344–352.
- 134 Cited in: Yau, J.H., (2017), *Economic abuse as a form of intimate partner violence: definition, risk factors, and mental well-being*, University of Hong Kong.
- 135 Awwad, J., Ghazeeri, G., Nassar, A.H., Bazi, T., Fakh, A., Fares, F., and Seoud, M., (2014), 'Intimate Partner Violence in a Lebanese Population Attending Gynecological Care: A Cultural Perspective', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(14): 2592–2609.
- 136 Usta, J., Farver, J.A.M., Pashayan, N., (2007), 'Domestic violence: The Lebanese experience', *Public Health*, 121(3): 208–219.
- 137 El Feki, S., Heilman, B. and Barker, G., (eds), (2017), *Understanding Masculinities: Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) – Middle East and North Africa*, Cairo and Washington, D.C.: UN Women and Promundo-US.
- 138 Gurung, S., and Acharya, J., (2015), 'Gender-based Violence Among Pregnant Women of Syangja District, Nepal', *Osong Public Health and Research Perspectives*, 7(2): 101–107.
- 139 Gupta, P.P., Bhandari, R., Khanal, V., and Gupta, S., (2018), 'A cross-sectional study on domestic violence in emergency department of Eastern Nepal', *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 7(3): 542–545.
- 140 Rijal, A., Sharm, C., Thapa, R., (2022), 'Experience of Domestic Violence among Infertile Women Attending a Clinic of a Tertiary Level Hospital, Kathmandu, Nepal', *American Journal of Nursing Research*, 10(2): 41–45.
- 141 Ahmad, D., Ali Shah, S.Z., Shabbir, M.R., (2022), 'Economic Violence against Women in Punjab: Dimensions, Determinants and its Implications on Women Social Status in Society', *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*, 8(1): 13–24.
- 142 Asad, Z., Ahmad, M., (2012), 'Husband Related Factors Compelling Women to Take Asylum in Sheltered Homes a Case Control Survey in Lahore', *Annals of King Edward Medical University*, 18(2): 234–238.
- 143 Azhar, Z., Sohail, M.M., Ysin, G., Mahmood, B., Mushtaw, S.K., (2012), 'Exploring Socio-Economic Factors Behind Domestic Violence Against Women in Sargodha District', *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 2(9): 1617–1626.
- 144 Chatha, S.A., Ahmad, K., Sheikh, K.S., (2014), 'Socio-economic Status and Domestic Violence: A Study on Married Women In Urban Lahore, Pakistan', *South Asian Studies*, 29(1): 229–237.
- 145 Khoso, I., Shafiq, K., Abdi, A.R., Shaikh, F.M., (2011), 'Problems and Challenges Faced by the Rural Women: A Case Study of Balochistan', *Asian Culture and History*, 3(1): 158–165.
- 146 Rabbani, F., Qureshi, F., Rizvi, N., (2008), 'Perspectives on domestic violence: case study from Karachi, Pakistan', *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal*, 14(2): 415–426.
- 147 Shaheen, A., (2014), 'Intimate Partners and Multifaceted Violent Behaviour in Pakistan', *Pakistan Perspectives*, 19(1): 27–56.
- 148 Chowbey, P., (2017), 'Women's narratives of economic abuse and financial strategies in Britain and South Asia', *Psychology of Violence*, 7(3): 459–468.
- 149 Ashfaq, S., Iram, K., and Rehan, N., (2018), *The International Men and Gender Equality Survey – Pakistan (PAK-IMAGES)*, Islamabad: Population Council, Rutgers, Rozan, and Ministry of Human Rights.

- 150 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(4): 642-662.
- 151 Haj-Yahia, M.M., (2000), '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(4): 435-463.
- 152 Cited in: Usta, J., Makarem, N.N., Habib, R.R., (2013), 'Economic Abuse in Lebanon: Experiences and Perceptions', *Violence Against Women*, 19(3): 356-375.
- 153 El Feki, S., Heilman, B. and Barker, G., (eds), (2017), *Understanding Masculinities: Results from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES) - Middle East and North Africa*, Cairo and Washington, D.C.: UN Women and Promundo-US.
- 154 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(7): 808-826.
- 155 Abolfotouh, M.A., and Almuneef, M., (2019), 'Prevalence, pattern and factors of intimate partner violence against Saudi women', *Journal of Public Health*, 42(3): 206-214.
- 156 Barnawi, F.H., (2017), 'Prevalence and Risk Factors of Domestic Violence Against Women Attending a Primary Care Center in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(8): 1171-1186.
- 157 Cited in: Usta, J., Makarem, N.N., Habib, R.R., (2013), 'Economic Abuse in Lebanon: Experiences and Perceptions', *Violence Against Women*, 19(3): 356-375.
- 158 Han, Y., Young Choi, H., (2021), 'Risk factors affecting intimate partner violence occurrence in South Korea: Findings from the 2016 Domestic Violence Survey', *PLOS ONE*, 16(3): e0247916.
- 159 Han, Y., Kim, H., and An, N., (2022), 'Factors Associated with Coping Behaviors of Abused Women: Findings from the 2016 Domestic Violence Survey', *Healthcare*, 2022,10, 622.
- 160 Young Um, M., Kim, H.J., and Palinkas, L.A., (2016), 'Correlates of Domestic Violence Victimization Among North Korean Refugee Women in South Korea', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(13): 2037-2058.
- 161 Fulu, E., Warner, X., Miedema, S., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., Lang, J., (2013), *Why Do Some Men Use Violence Against Women and How Can We Prevent It? Quantitative Findings from the United Nations Multi-country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific*, UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNV.
- 162 Pathiraja, D.Y., Pathiraja, R.P., Senanayake, L., Edirisinghe, R.M., Mapitigama, N., (2020), 'Gender-based violence: Experiences from two tertiary care settings in Sri Lanka', *F1000 Research*, 9(269): 1-11.
- 163 Postmus, J.L., Nikolova, K., Lin, H., Johnson, L., (2021), 'Women's Economic Abuse Experiences: Results from the UN Multi-Country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(15-16): NP13115-NP13142.
- 164 Department of Census and Statistics, (2020), *Women's Wellbeing Survey - 2019. Findings from Sri Lanka's first dedicated National Survey on Violence against Women and Girls*, Department of Census and Statistics, Sri Lanka.
- 165 Akar, T., Aksakal, F.N., Demirel, B., Durukan, E., Özkan, S., (2010), 'The Prevalence of Domestic Violence Against Women Among a Group Woman: Ankara, Turkey', *Journal of Family Violence*, 25: 449-460.
- 166 Akyuz, A., Seven, M., Sahiner, G., Bilal, G., (2013), 'Studying The Effect of Infertility on Marital Violence in Turkish Women', *International Journal of Fertility and Sterility*, 6(4): 286-293.
- 167 Alan, H., Yilmaz, S.D., Filiz, E., Ario, A., (2016), 'Domestic Violence Awareness and Prevention among Married Women in Central Anatolia', *Journal of Family Violence*, 31: 711-719.
- 168 Alkan, Ö., Özar, Ş., and Ünver, Ş., (2021), 'Economic violence against women: A case in Turkey', *PLOS One*, 16(3): 1-23.
- 169 Cited in: Ibid.
- 170 Ibid.
- 171 Ibid.
- 172 Ibid.
- 173 Aslan, E., Bodur, G., Beji, N.K., Alkan, N., Aksoy, Ö., (2019), 'Exposure to domestic violence in women living in Istanbul and Aegean regions: a Turkish sample', *Ciênc. saúde coletiva*, 24(8): 2835-2844.
- 174 Bağcıoğlu, E., Vural, M., Karababa, I.F., Akşin, M., Selek, S., (2014), 'Decrease in Domestic Violence During Pregnancy: A Study From Turkey', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(2): 203-216.
- 175 Basar, F., and Demirci, N., (2018), 'Domestic violence against women in Turkey', *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 34(3): 660-665.
- 176 Çelika, A.S., and Kircab, N., (2018), 'Prevalence and risk factors for domestic violence against infertile women in a Turkish setting', *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 231: 111-116.
- 177 Ciftci, S., and Acik, Y., (2000), 'Domestic violence and affecting factors among married women aged between 15-49 Years', *Medicine Science International Medical Journal*, 9(4): 856-865.
- 178 Duran, S., and Eraslan, S.T., (2019), 'Violence against women: Affecting factors and coping methods for women', *Journal of The Pakistan Medical Association*, 69(1): 53-57.

- 179 Erten, B., and Keskin, P., (2018), 'For Better or for Worse?: Education and the Prevalence of Domestic Violence in Turkey', *American Economic Journal Applied Economics*, 10(1): 64–105.
- 180 Gul, H., Gul, A., and Kara, K., (2020), 'Intimate partner violence (IPV) types are common among Turkish women from high socioeconomic status and have differing effects on child abuse and contentment with life', *Northern Clinics of Istanbul*, 7(4): 359–365.
- 181 Babacan Gümüş, A., Şipkin, S., Erdem, Ö., (2020), 'The prevalence of intimate partner violence against women and women's methods of coping with partner violence', *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing*, 11(2): 79–87.
- 182 Güvenç, R., Hacıoğlu Yıldırım, M., Yıldırım, E.A., (2022), 'The overlooked relationship between subtle partner sexual violence and sexual dysfunction?', *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 10.1080/14681994.2022.2043548
- 183 Izmirli, G.O., Sonmez, Y., Sezik, M., (2014), 'Prediction of domestic violence against married women in southwestern Turkey', *Gynecology & Obstetrics*, 127(3): 288–292.
- 184 Karakoç, B., Gülseren, L., Çam, B., Gülseren, Ş., Tenekeci, N., Mete, L., (2015), 'Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence and Associated Factors', *Archives of Neuropsychiatry*, 52(4): 324–330.
- 185 Kaya, A., Yilmazer, H.S., Ozcaliskan, B., Aktas, E.O., (2021), 'The Characteristics of intimate partner violence cases', *Medicine Science International Medical Journal*, 10(4): 1337–1344.
- 186 Öyekçi, D.G., Yetim, D., Şahin, E.M., (2012), 'Psychosocial factors affecting various types of intimate partner violence against women', *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 23(2): 1–7.
- 187 Cited in: Ozer, M., and Fidrmuc., (2017), *Male Education and Domestic Violence in Turkey: Evidence from a Natural Experiment*, Brunel University Department of Economics and Finance.
- 188 Ozer, M., and Fidrmuc., (2017), *Male Education and Domestic Violence in Turkey: Evidence from a Natural Experiment*, Brunel University Department of Economics and Finance.
- 189 Özpinar, S., Horasan, G.D., Baydur, H., Canbay, T., (2016), 'Factors affecting the views and experiences of women living in the city centre of Manisa, Turkey, regarding domestic violence', *Australian Journal of Primary Health*, 22(5): 466–471.
- 190 Selek, S., Vural, M., Cakmak, I., (2012), 'Abused nurses take no legal steps: a domestic violence study carried out in eastern Turkey', *Psychiatria Danubina*, 24(4): 386–391.
- 191 Sen, S., and Bolsoy, N., (2017), 'Violence against women: prevalence and risk factors in Turkish sample', *BMC Women's Health*, 17: 1–9.
- 192 Moshtagh, M., Amiri, R., Sharafi, S., Arab-Zozani, M., (2021), 'Intimate Partner Violence in the Middle East Region: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F15248380211036060>
- 193 Cited in: Kisa, S., Gungor, R., Kisa, A., (2021), 'Domestic Violence Against Women in North African and Middle Eastern Countries: A Scoping Review', *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211036070>
- 194 Yount, K.M., Krause, K.H., and VanderEnde, K.E., (2015), 'Economic Coercion and Partner Violence Against Wives in Vietnam: A Unified Framework?', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(20): 3307–3331.
- 195 Cited in: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, (2011), *Preventing And Responding To Domestic Violence: Trainee's manual for law enforcement and justice sectors in Vietnam*, UNODC.
- 196 Ibid.
- 197 Cited in: Doyle, J.L., (2020), 'Experiences of intimate partner violence: The role of psychological, economic, physical and sexual violence', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 80, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2020.102370>
- 198 Cited in: Van Gelder, N., Ligthart, S., Astro, L., Oertelt-Prigione, S., (2021), 'Economic abuse amongst Dutch women (formerly) victimised by intimate partner violence and abuse: A mixed methods approach', *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies*, 24(2): 89–107.
- 199 De Donder, L., Lang, G., Luoma, M.L., Penhale, B., Ferreira-Alves, J., Tamutiene, I., Santos, A.J., Koivusilta, M., Enzenhofer, E., Perttu, S., Savola, T., Verte, D., (2011), 'Perpetrators of abuse against older women: A multi-national study in Europe', *The Journal of Adult Protection*, 13(6): 302–314.
- 200 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 201 Luoma, M.L., Koivusilta, M., Lang, G., Enzenhofer, E., De Donder, L., Verté, D., Reingarde, J., Tamutiene, I., Ferreira-Alves, J., (2011), *Prevalence Study of Abuse and Violence Against Older Women. Results of a Multi-cultural Survey in Austria, Belgium, Finland, Lithuania and Portugal*, Finland: National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL).
- 202 Ibid.
- 203 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 204 Ibid.
- 205 Ibid.
- 206 Ibid.
- 207 Ibid.
- 208 Solidarité Femmes, (2020), *Extrait de l'Analyse Globale des données issues des appels au « 3919-Violences Femmes Info » Année 2019*, Fédération Nationale Solidarité Femmes.

- 209 Solidarité Femmes, (2020), *Extrait de l'Analyse Globale des données issues des appels au « 3919-Violences Femmes Info » Année 2020*, Fédération Nationale Solidarité Femmes.
- 210 Stöckl, H., and Penhale, B., (2014), 'Intimate Partner Violence and Its Association With Physical and Mental Health Symptoms Among Older Women in Germany', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(17): 3089–3111.
- 211 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 212 Ibid.
- 213 Ibid.
- 214 Ibid.
- 215 Ibid.
- 216 Ibid.
- 217 Ibid.
- 218 Luoma, M.L., Koivusilta, M., Lang, G., Enzenhofer, E., De Donder, L., Verté, D., Reingarde, J., Tamutiene, I., Ferreira-Alves, J., (2011), *Prevalence Study of Abuse and Violence Against Older Women. Results of a Multi-cultural Survey in Austria, Belgium, Finland, Lithuania and Portugal*, Finland: National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL).
- 219 Zakirova, V., (2005), 'War against the Family: Domestic Violence and Human Rights in Russia – A View from the Bashkortostan Republic', *Current Sociology*, 53(1): 75–91.
- 220 Mrsevic, Z., and Hughes, D.M., (1997), 'Violence Against Women in Belgrade, Serbia: SOS Hotline 1990–1993', *Violence Against Women*, 3(2): 101–128.
- 221 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 222 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 223 Seith, C., (2001), 'Security Matters: Domestic Violence and Public Social Services', *Violence Against Women*, 7(7): 799–820.
- 224 Miškulin, I., (2020), 'Economic Violence against Women in Croatia: A Comparative Study between Continental and Maritime County', *Collegium antropologicum*, 44(3): 115–119.
- 225 Luoma, M.L., Koivusilta, M., Lang, G., Enzenhofer, E., De Donder, L., Verté, D., Reingarde, J., Tamutiene, I., Ferreira-Alves, J., (2011), *Prevalence Study of Abuse and Violence Against Older Women. Results of a Multi-cultural Survey in Austria, Belgium, Finland, Lithuania and Portugal*, Finland: National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL).
- 226 Cited in: Seith, C., (2001), 'Security Matters: Domestic Violence and Public Social Services', *Violence Against Women*, 7(7): 799–820.
- 227 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 228 Pomicino, L., Beltramini, L., Romito, P., (2019), 'Freeing Oneself From Intimate Partner Violence: A Follow-Up of Women Who Contacted an Anti-violence Center in Italy', *Violence Against Women*, 25(8): 925–944.
- 229 ECOVIO, (2020), *D3.1. Report on gender-based economic violence at European level*, ECOVIO.
- 230 ECOVIO, (2021), *WP2: DETERMINING THE SCOPE OF THE EA WITHIN GBV CONTEXTS AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS: Econometrics analysis*, ECOVIO.
- 231 Luoma, M.L., Koivusilta, M., Lang, G., Enzenhofer, E., De Donder, L., Verté, D., Reingarde, J., Tamutiene, I., Ferreira-Alves, J., (2011), *Prevalence Study of Abuse and Violence Against Older Women. Results of a Multi-cultural Survey in Austria, Belgium, Finland, Lithuania and Portugal*, Finland: National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL).
- 232 Žukauskienė, R., Kaniušonytė, G., Bakaitytė, A., Truskauskaitė – Kunevičienė, I., (2019), 'Prevalence and Patterns of Intimate Partner Violence in a Nationally Representative Sample in Lithuania', *Journal of Family Violence*, 36: 117–130.
- 233 Grigaitė, U., Karalius, M., Jankauskaitė, M., (2019), 'Between experience and social 'norms', identification and compliance: economic and sexual intimate partner violence against women in Lithuania', *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 3(3): 303–321.
- 234 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 235 Van Gelder, N., Ligthart, S., Astro, L., Oertelt-Prigione, S., (2021), 'Economic abuse amongst Dutch women (formerly) victimised by intimate partner violence and abuse: A mixed methods approach', *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies*, 24(2): 89–107.
- 236 Halicka, M., Halicki, J., Kramkowska, E., Szafranek, A., (2015), 'Law Enforcement, the Judiciary and Intimate Partner Violence against the Elderly in Court Files', *Studia Socjologiczne*, 2015(2): 195–214.
- 237 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 238 Cited in: Broża-Grabowska, P., (2011), 'Women's Experience of Poverty in Context of Power Inequality and Financial Abuse in Intimate Relationship', *European History of Social Work*, 9(2): 1–67.
- 239 Cited in: WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 240 Meseguer-Santamaría, M.L., Sánchez-Alberola, F., Vargas-Vargas, M., (2021), 'Intimate Partner Violence against Women with Disabilities in Spain: A Public Health Problem', *International Journal of Environmental Research*, 18(2): 1–11.

- 241 Domenech del Rio, I., and Sirvent Garcia del Valle, E., (2017), 'The Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence on Health: A Further Disaggregation of Psychological Violence—Evidence From Spain', *Violence Against Women*, 23(14): 1771-1789.
- 242 ECOVIO, (2021), *WP2: DETERMINING THE SCOPE OF THE EA WITHIN GBV CONTEXTS AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS: Econometrics analysis*, ECOVIO.
- 243 Luoma, M.L., Koivusilta, M., Lang, G., Enzenhofer, E., De Donder, L., Verté, D., Reingarde, J., Tamutiene, I., Ferreira-Alves, J., (2011), *Prevalence Study of Abuse and Violence Against Older Women. Results of a Multi-cultural Survey in Austria, Belgium, Finland, Lithuania and Portugal*, Finland: National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL).
- 244 Wilkund, M., (2021), *The Cashless Society – Possible Impacts For Women Experiencing Economic Abuse*, Malmö University.
- 245 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 246 Bilovol, O., (2020), 'Economic Violence As A Type Of Domestic Violence: Statutory Regulation And The First Experience Of Application Of The Criminal Legislation Of Ukraine', *European Cooperation*, 4(48): 22-34.
- 247 Aitken, R., and Munro, V., (2018), *Domestic abuse and suicide: exploring the links with Refuge's client base and work force*, University of Warwick and Refuge.
- 248 AVA, (2018), *Hand in Hand. Survivors of Multiples Disadvantage Discuss Service & Support*, AVA.
- 249 Barron, J., (2012), *The Domestic Abuse and Money Education Project (DAME): Final Report*, Bristol: Women's Aid.
- 250 Butt, E., (2020), *Know Economic Abuse 2020 report*, Refuge.
- 251 Ibid.
- 252 Davidge, S. and Magnusson, L., (2019), *The Domestic Abuse Report 2019: The Economics of Abuse*, Bristol: Women's Aid.
- 253 Cited in: Doyle, J.L., (2020), 'Experiences of intimate partner violence: The role of psychological, economic, physical and sexual violence', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 80,
- 254 Ibid.
- 255 Gill, A., (2004), 'Voicing the Silent Fear: South Asian Women's Experiences of Domestic Violence', *The Howard Journal*, 43(5): 465-483.
- 256 Graham-Kevan, N., and Archer, J., (2003), 'Physical Aggression and Control in Heterosexual Relationships@ The Effect of Sampling', *Violence and Victims*, 18(2): 181-196.
- 257 Graham-Kevan, N., and Archer, J., (2008), 'Does Controlling Behavior Predict Physical Aggression and Violence to Partners?', *Journal of Family Violence*, 23(7): 539-548.
- 258 Halliwell, G., Daw, J., Hay, S., Dheensa, S., Jacob, S., (2021), 'A life barely half lived': domestic abuse and sexual violence practitioners' experiences and perceptions of providing care to survivors of non-physical abuse within intimate partner relationships', *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 5(2): 249-269.
- 259 Howard, M., and Skipp, A., (2015), *Unequal, Trapped and Controlled: Women's Experience of Financial Abuse and Potential Implications for Universal Credit*, TUC.
- 260 Humphreys, C., and Thiara, R., (2003), 'Neither justice nor protection: women's experiences of post-separation violence', *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 25(3): 195-214.
- 261 Kelly, L. and Westmarland, N., (2015), *Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programmes: Steps Towards Change. Project Mirabal Final Report*, London and Durham: London Metropolitan University and Durham University.
- 262 Kelly, L., Sharp-Jeffs, N., Klein, R., (2014), *Finding the costs of freedom: how women and children rebuild their lives after domestic violence*, London: Solace Women's Aid.
- 263 Cited in: Kutin, J., Reid, M. and Russell, R., (2019), 'What is this thing called money? Economic abuse in young adult relationships', *Journal of Social Marketing*, 9(1): 111-128.
- 264 Magić, J., and Kelley, P., (2018), *LGBT+ people's Experiences of Domestic Abuse: a report on Galop's domestic abuse advocacy service*, London: Galop.
- 265 Martin, J., Jahan, N., Habib, T., (2020), *Sisters Against Abuse (SAA) 2017-2019*, London Muslim Centre.
- 266 McGorry, P., and McMahon, M., (2021), 'Prosecuting controlling or coercive behaviour in England and Wales: Media reports of a novel offence', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 21(4): 566-584.
- 267 McIlwaine, C., Granada, L., and Valenzuela-Oblitas, I., (2019), *The Right To Be Believed: Migrant women facing Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) in the 'hostile immigration environment' in London*, Latin American Women's Rights Service.
- 268 McMurray, A., (2017), *Women's Experience of Violence: Mapping Experiences and Responses*, Women's Centres Regional Partnership.
- 269 Mirza, N., (2015), *Family Abuse In Scotland Contesting Universalisations and Reconceptualising Agency*, University of Edinburgh.
- 270 Richardson, J., and Butler, A., (2021), *The Single Parent Debt Trap*, London: Gingerbread and StepChange.
- 271 Riggs, D.W., Taylor, N., Fraser, H., Donovan, C., and Signal, T., (2021), 'The Link Between Domestic Violence and Abuse and Animal Cruelty in the Intimate Relationships of People of Diverse Genders and/or Sexualities: A Binational Study', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(5-6): NP2169-NP3195.

- 272 Surviving Economic Abuse, (2020), *Recognising and responding to the scale of coerced debt: Final evaluation of the Economic Justice Project*, London: Surviving Economic Abuse.
- 273 Cited in Ibid.
- 274 Surviving Economic Abuse, (2021), *The Cost of Covid-19: Economic abuse throughout the pandemic*, London: Surviving Economic Abuse.
- 275 Cited in: Sharp, N., (2008), 'What's Yours Is Mine': *The Different Forms of Economic Abuse and its Impact on Women and Children Experiencing Domestic Abuse*, London: Refuge.
- 276 Ibid.
- 277 Sharp-Jeffs, N., (2015), *Money Matters: research into the nature and extent of financial abuse within intimate relationships in the UK*, London: Refuge and Co-operative Bank.
- 278 Chowbey, P., (2017), 'Women's narratives of economic abuse and financial strategies in Britain and South Asia', *Psychology of Violence*, 7(3): 459-468.
- 279 Sharp-Jeffs, N. and Learmouth, S., (2017), *Into Plain Sight. How economic abuse is reflected in successful prosecutions of controlling or coercive behaviour*, London: Surviving Economic Abuse.
- 280 WAVE, (2019), *WAVE Country Report 2019: The Situation of Women's Specialist Support Services in Europe*, WAVE.
- 281 Ibid.
- 282 Westmarland, N., (2006), *Victim-survivors in contact with organisations in Bristol*, Bristol: University of Bristol and SaferBristol.
- 283 Ansara, D.L. and Hindin, M.J., (2010), 'Exploring gender differences in the patterns of intimate partner violence in Canada: a latent class approach', *Epidemiology & Community Health*, 64: 849-854.
- 284 CCFWE, (2021), *Re: Submission: Guideline on Complaint-Handling Procedures for Banks and Authorized Foreign Banks*, CCFWE.
- 285 Cohen, M.M., Forte, T., Du Mont, J., Hyman, I., Romans, S., (2005), 'Intimate partner violence among Canadian women with activity limitations', *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 59(10): 834-839.
- 286 Cohen, M.M., Forte, T., Du Mont, J., Hyman, I., Romans, S., (2006), 'Adding Insult to Injury: Intimate Partner Violence Among Women and Men Reporting Activity Limitations', *Annals of Epidemiology*, 16(8): 644-651.
- 287 Du Mont, T. and Forte, T., (2012), 'An exploratory study on the consequences and contextual factors of intimate partner violence among immigrant and Canadian-born women', *BMC Public Health*, 14..
- 288 Du Mont, T. and Forte, T., (2014), 'Intimate partner violence among women with mental health-related activity limitations: a Canadian population based study', *BMJ Open*, 2(6).
- 289 Du Mont, J., Hyman, I., O'Brien, K., White, M.E., Odette, F., Tyyskä, V., (2012), 'Factors associated with intimate partner violence by a former partner by immigration status and length of residence in Canada', *Annals of Epidemiology*, 22(11): 772-777.
- 290 Fitzgerald, A.J., Barrett, B.J., Gray, A., Cheung, C.H., (2020), 'The Connection Between Animal Abuse, Emotional Abuse, and Financial Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Evidence From a Nationally Representative Sample of the General Public', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(5-6):2331-2353.
- 291 Giesbrecht, C.J., (2022), 'The Impact of Intimate Partner Violence in the Workplace: Results of a Saskatchewan Survey', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(3-4): 1960-1973.
- 292 Cited in: Glenn, R., (2021), *2019 Churchill Fellowship to study service responses to women experiencing or escaping domestic financial abuse USA, Canada, UK*, Winston Churchill Memorial Trust.
- 293 Hrymak, H., and Hawkins, K., (2021), *Why Can't Everyone Just Get Along? How BC's Family Law System Puts Survivors in Danger*, Rise Women's Legal Centre.
- 294 Hyman, I., Forte, T., Du Mont, J., Romans, S., Cohen, M.M., (2006), 'The Association Between Length of Stay in Canada and Intimate Partner Violence Among Immigrant Women', *American Journal of Public Health*, 96(4): 654-659.
- 295 Jaffe, P.G., Crooks, C.V., Poisson, S.E., (2003), 'Common Misconceptions in Addressing Domestic Violence in Child Custody Disputes', *Juvenile Family Court*, 54(4): 57-67.
- 296 Kaukinen, C., (2008), 'Status Compatibility, Physical Violence, and Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships', *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(2): 452-471.
- 297 Cited in: Kutin, J., 'Women's Economic Abuse and Control of Male Intimate Partners', in Shackelford, T.K., (ed), (2021), *The SAGE Handbook of Domestic Violence*, Sage.
- 298 Ibid.
- 299 Lysova, A., Dim, E.E., Dutton, D., (2019), 'Prevalence and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence in Canada as Measured by the National Victimization Survey', *Partner Abuse*, 10(2): 199-221.
- 300 McKay White, R., Fjellner, D., (2022), 'The Prevalence of Economic Abuse Among Intimate Partners in Alberta', *SAGE Open*, 12(1): 1-13.
- 301 Ouellet, F., Hetroy, E., Patard, G., Gauthier-Daies, C., Leclerc, C., (2021), 'Co-Occurrence of Violence on the Severity of Abuse in Intimate Relationships', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, DOI: 10.1177/08862605211064238
- 302 Poole, C., and Rietsclin, 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(2): 120-137.

- 303 Power, E.M., (2006), 'Economic Abuse and Intra-household Inequities in Food Security', *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 97: 258-260.
- 304 Roebuck, B., McGlinchey, D., Hastie, K., Taylor, M., Roebuck, M., Bhele, S., Hudson, E., Xavier, R.G., (2020), *Male Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence in Canada*, Victimology Research Centre.
- 305 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(12): 1495-1514.
- 306 Romans, S., Cohen, M.M., Forte, T., Du Mont, J., Hyman, I., (2008), 'Gender and psychotropic medication use: The role of intimate partner violence', *Preventive Medicine*, 46(6): 615-621.
- 307 Roy, V., Thibault, S., Tudeau, C., Fournier, C., Champagne, C., (2022), 'Intimate Partner Violence Among Gay Men and Its Consequences in a Separation Context', *Partner Abuse*, 13(1): 77-99.
- 308 Siemieniuk, R.A.C., Krentz, H.B., Gish, J.A., Gill, M.J., (2010), 'Domestic Violence Screening: Prevalence and Outcomes in a Canadian HIV Population', *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 24(12):L 763-770.
- 309 Siemieniuk, R.A.C., Miller, P., Woodman, K., Ko, K., Krentz, H.B., Gill, M.J., (2012), 'Prevalence, clinical associations, and impact of intimate partner violence among HIV-infected gay and bisexual men: a population-based study', *HIV Medicine*, 14(5): 293-302.
- 310 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1A Intimate partner violence, since age 15 and in the past 12 months, by type of intimate partner violence, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00003/tbl/tbl01a-eng.htm>
- 311 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1B Frequency of violence among those who experienced intimate partner violence in the past 12 months, by type of violence and gender, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00003/tbl/tbl01b-eng.htm>
- 312 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1 Intimate partner violence since age 15 and in the past 12 months, by type of intimate partner violence and age group, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00009/tbl/tbl01-eng.htm>
- 313 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1 Intimate partner violence since age 15 and in the past 12 months, by type of intimate partner violence and Indigenous identity, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00007/tbl/tbl01-eng.htm>
- 314 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1 Intimate partner violence since age 15 and in the past 12 months, by type of intimate partner violence and sexual orientation, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00005/tbl/tbl01-eng.htm>
- 315 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1 Intimate partner violence, since age 15 and in the past 12 months, by type of intimate partner violence and visible minority, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00008/tbl/tbl01-eng.htm>
- 316 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1A Intimate partner violence since age 15 and in the past 12 months, by type of intimate partner violence and disability status, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00006/tbl/tbl01a-eng.htm>
- 317 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1B: Frequency of violence among women who experienced intimate partner violence in the past 12 months, by type of violence and disability status, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00006/tbl/tbl01b-eng.htm>
- 318 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1A Intimate partner violence, since age 15 and in the past 12 months, by type of intimate partner violence, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00003/tbl/tbl01a-eng.htm>
- 319 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1B Frequency of violence among those who experienced intimate partner violence in the past 12 months, by type of violence and gender, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00003/tbl/tbl01b-eng.htm>
- 320 Statistics Canada, (2021), *Table 1 Intimate partner violence since age 15 and in the past 12 months, by type of intimate partner violence and sexual orientation, Canada, 2018*, Available at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2021001/article/00004/tbl/tbl01-eng.htm>
- 321 Zamorski, M.A., and Wiens-Kinkaid, M.E., (2013), 'Cross-sectional prevalence survey of intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization in Canadian military personnel', *BMC Public Health*, 13: 1019.
- 322 Aguirre, E., (2019), *Domestic violence and women's earnings: Does frequency matter?*, University of York.
- 323 Rosas-Vargas, R., León-Andrade, M., Hernández-Ortega, A., Rodríguez-Haros, B., (2019), 'The work of government institutions in Guanajuato, around gender violence against rural women: analysis through a case study', *Agricultura, Sociedad Y Desarrollo*, 16: 43-60.
- 324 Villarreal, A., (2007), 'Women's Employment Status, Coercive Control, and Intimate Partner Violence in Mexico', *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(2): 418-434.

- 325 Janagan Johnson, E., (2017), 'An Exploratory Study on the Impact of Domestic Violence on the Families in Trinidad and Tobago, the West Indies', *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work*, 14(1): 19-34.
- 326 Nagassar, R.P., Rawlins, J.M., Sampson, N.R., Zackerali, 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(1): 20-25.
- 327 Pemberton, C., and Joseph, J., (2018), *National Women's Health Survey for Trinidad and Tobago*, Inter-American Development Bank.
- 328 All State Foundation, (2021), *Early Warning – Signs of Financial Abuse Beginning in Teen Relationships*, Available at: <https://jausa.ja.org/dA/27b89bed2f/criticalIssuePdfDocument/Early%20Warning%20%20Signs%20of%20Financial%20Abuse%20Beginning%20in%20Teen%20Relationships.pdf>
- 329 Cited in: Anderberg, D., and Rainer, H., (2013), 'Economic Abuse: a theory of intrahousehold sabotage', *Journal of Public Economics*, 97: 282-295.
- 330 Cheung, S.P., and Huang, C.C., (2022), 'Childhood Exposure to Intimate Partner Violence and Teen Dating Violence', *Journal of Family Violence*, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10896-022-00377-7>
- 331 Clarke, J., (2014), '(In)Equitable Relief: How Judicial Misconceptions about Domestic Violence Prevent Victims from Attaining Innocent Spouse Relief under I.R.C. Sec. 6015 (F)', *Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law*, 22(4): 826-856.
- 332 Copp, J.E., Mumford, E.A., Taylor, B.G., (2016), 'Money Lending Practices and Adolescent Dating Relationship Abuse: Results from a National Sample', *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45: 1902-1916.
- 333 Doyle, K., Guerra, P., and Passi, S. (2021), *Prioritizing Financial Security In The Movement To End IPV: A Roadmap*, FreeFrom.
- 334 Gottlieb, A., and Mahabir, M., (2021), 'The Effect of Multiple Types of Intimate Partner Violence on Maternal Criminal Justice Involvement', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(13-14): 6797-6820.
- 335 Harned, M.S., (2001), 'Abused Women or Abused Men? An Examination of the Context and Outcomes of Dating Violence', *Violence and Victims*, 16(3): 269-285.
- 336 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(5): 780-786.
- 337 Johnson, L., (2021), 'Exploring factors associated with pregnant women's experiences of material hardship during COVID-19: a cross-sectional Qualtrics survey in the United States', *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 21:1-14.
- 338 Karakurt, G., and Silver, K.E., (2013), 'Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: The Role of Gender and Age', *Violence and Victims*, 28(5): 804-821.
- 339 Kim, C., (2019), 'Social Isolation, acculturative stress and intimate partner violence (IPV) victimization among Korean immigrant women', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 72: 87-95.
- 340 Littwin, A., (2012), 'Coerced Debt: The Role of Consumer Credit in Domestic Violence', *California Law Review*, 100(4): 951-1026.
- 341 Lloyd, S., (1997), 'The Effects of Domestic Violence on Women's Employment', *Law & Policy*, 19(2): 139-167.
- 342 Viske Nicholson, J., Chen, Y., Huang, C.C., (2018), 'Children's exposure to intimate partner violence and peer bullying victimization', *Children and Youth Services Review*, 91: 439-446.
- 343 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.
- 344 Policastro, C., and Finn, M.A., (2017), 'Coercive Control and Physical Violence in Older Adults: Analysis Using Data from the National Elder Mistreatment Study', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(3): 311-330.
- 345 Pyles, L., (2006), 'Economic Well-Being and Intimate Partner Violence: New Findings about the Informal Economy', *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 33(3): 101-126.
- 346 Rai, A. and Choi, Y., (2021), 'Domestic Violence Victimization among South Asian Immigrant Men and Women in the United States', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/2F08862605211015262>
- 347 Harzog, B., (2022), *Survey: 30% Have Dealt With Financial Infidelity*, Available at: <https://money.usnews.com/credit-cards/articles/survey-30-have-either-committed-financial-infidelity-or-been-a-victim>
- 348 Voth Schrag, R.J., (2015), 'Economic Abuse and Later Material Hardship: Is Depression a Mediator?', *Affilia*, 30(3): 341-351.
- 349 Voth Schrag, R.J., and Ravi, K.E., (2020), 'Measurement of Economic Abuse Among Women Not Seeking Social or Support Services and Dwelling in the Community', *Violence and Victims*, 35(1): 3-19.
- 350 Cited in: Voth Schrag, R.J., Robinson, S.R., and Ravi, K., (2019), 'Understanding Pathways within Intimate Partner Violence: Economic Abuse, Economic Hardship and Mental Health', *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 28(2): 222-242.
- 351 Virden, T.R., (2020), *College Students' Experiences of Economic Abuse: The Development of the Education Sabotage Scale*, Michigan State University.
- 352 Adams, A.E., Sullivan, C.M., Bybee, D., Greeson, M.R., (2008), 'Development of the Scale of Economic Abuse', *Violence Against Women*, 14(5): 563-588.
- 353 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(3): 363-376.

- 354 Adam, A.E., Greeson, M.R., Littwin, A.K., Javorka, M., (2019), 'The Revised Scale of Economic Abuse (SEA2): Development and initial psychometric testing of an updated measure of economic abuse in intimate relationships', *Psychology of Violence*, 10(3): 268–278.
- 355 Adams, A.E., and Beeble, M.L., (2019), 'Intimate Partner Violence and Psychological Well-Being: Examining the Effect of Economic Abuse on Women's Quality of Life', *Psychology of Violence*, 9(5): 517–525.
- 356 Ballan, M.S., Freyer, M., Romanelli, M., (2021), 'Intimate Partner Violence, Disability, and Pain: A Retrospective Study', *Journal of Family Violence*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-021-00331-z>
- 357 Bosch, K., and Bergen, B.M., (2006), 'The influence of supportive and nonsupportive persons in helping rural women in abusive partner relationships become free from abuse', *Journal of Family Violence*, 21(5): 311–320.
- 358 Cardenas, I., Johnson, L., Postmus, J.L., (2021), 'Improving Quality of Life Among Latina Intimate Partner Violence Survivors Through Economic Empowerment', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(15–16): NP14564–NP14587.
- 359 Lee Clark, D., Wood, L., Sullivan, C.M., (2019), 'Examining the Needs and Experiences of Domestic Violence Survivors in Transitional Housing', *Journal of Family Violence*, 34: 275–286.
- 360 Cited in: Crump, T.G., (2020), 'The Forgotten Survivor: The Articulated Needs of Survivors of Psychological and Economic Abuse Who Stay', *Violence and Gender*, 7(4):167–174.
- 361 Dardis, C.M., Ahrens, C., Howard, R.L., Mechanic, M.B., (2021), 'Patterns of Surveillance, Control, and Abuse Among a Diverse Sample of Intimate Partner Abuse Survivors', *Violence Against Women*, 27(15–16): 2882–2909.
- 362 Durfee, A., and Goodmark, L., (2021), 'Gender, Protection Orders, and Intimate Partner Violence in Later Life: A Study of Protective Order Filings in Arizona', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(21–22): 10479–10498.
- 363 Durfee, A., and Messing, J.T., (2012), 'Characteristics Related to Protection Order Use Among Victims of Intimate Partner Violence', *Violence Against Women*, 18(6): 701–710.
- 364 Doyle, K., Durrenre, A., and Passi, S., (2020), *Survivors Know Best: How to Disrupt Intimate Partner Violence during Covid-19 and Beyond*, FreeFrom.
- 365 Durrenre, A., Doyle, K., and Passi, S., (2021), *Trust Survivors: Building an Effective and Inclusive Cash Assistance Program*, FreeFrom.
- 366 Haselschwerdt, M.L., Hlavaty, K., Carlson, C., Schneider, M., Maddox, L., Skipper, M., (2019), 'Heterogeneity Within Domestic Violence Exposure: Young Adults' Retrospective Experiences', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(7): 1512–1538.
- 367 Hess, C., and Del Rosario, A., (2018), *Dreams Deferred: A Survey on the Impact of Intimate Partner Violence on Survivors' Education, Careers, and Economic Security*, Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- 368 Hetling, A., and Postmus, J.L., (2014), 'Financial Literacy and Economic Empowerment of Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence: Examining the Differences Between Public Assistance Recipients and Nonrecipients', *Journal of Poverty*, 18(2): 130–149.
- 369 Johnson, L., (2018), *Increasing financial empowerment for survivors of intimate partner violence*, Rutgers University.
- 370 Johnson, L., Hoge, G.L., Nikolova, K., Postmus, J.L., (2021), 'Escala de Abuso Economico: Validating the Scale of Economic Abuse-12 (SEA-12) in Spanish', *Journal of Family Violence*, 36: 885–897.
- 371 Johnston, D., and Subrahmanyam, D., (2018), *Denied! How Economic Abuse Perpetuates Homelessness For Domestic Violence Survivors*, CAMBA Legal Services Inc..
- 372 Lin, H., (2021), *Female survivors of intimate partner violence: financial strain, depression, and financial education*, Rutgers University.
- 373 Merrill, G.S., and Wolfe, V.A., (2008), 'Battered Gay Men: An Exploration of Abuse, Help Seeking, and Why They Stay', *Journal of Homosexuality*, 39(2):1–30.
- 374 Meza, T., (2003), *Predicting the outcome behaviors of women entering a domestic violence shelter*, Arizona State University.
- 375 Office of the Manhattan Borough President, (2012), *Economic Abuse: The Untold Cost of Domestic Violence*, Manhattan: Office of the Manhattan Borough President.
- 376 Ortiz-Rodriguez, Y., (2016), *Help-Seeking Latina Victims of Domestic Violence and the Programs That Serve Them in New York City*, The City University of New York.
- 377 Postmus, J.L., Plummer, S., McMahon, S., Murshid, N.S., Kim, M.S., (2011), 'Understanding Economic Abuse in the Lives of Survivors', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(3): 411–430.
- 378 Postmus, J.L., Plummer, S., Stylianou, A.M., (2016), 'Measuring Economic Abuse in the Lives of Survivors: Revising the Scale of Economic Abuse', *Violence Against Women*, 22(6): 692–703.
- 379 Sanders, C.K., (2010), *Savings Outcomes of an IDA Program for Survivors of Domestic Violence*, Center for Social Development, Washington University.
- 380 Sanders, C.K., (2016), 'Promoting Financial Capability of Incarcerated Women for Community Reentry: A Call to Social Workers', *Journal of Community Practice*, 24(4): 389–409.
- 381 Sauber, E.W., and O'Brien, K.M., (2020), 'Multiple Losses: The Psychological and Economic Well-Being of Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(15–16): 3054–3078.

- 382 GLBT Domestic Violence Coalition, Jane Doe Inc., (2005), *Shelter/Housing Needs for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender (GLBT) Victims of Domestic Violence*, GLBT Domestic Violence Coalition, Jane Doe Inc..
- 383 Cited in: Shobe, M.A., and Dienemann, J., (2008), 'Intimate Partner Violence in the United States: An Ecological Approach to Prevention and Treatment', *Social Policy and Society*, 7(2): 185–195.
- 384 Peaceful Families Project, (2010), *Domestic Abuse Statistics*, Available at: <https://www.peacefulfamilies.org/statistics.html>
- 385 Stults, C.B., Brandt, S.A., Hale, J.F., Rogers, N., Kreienberg, A.E., Griffin, M., (2020), 'A Qualitative Study of Intimate Partner Violence Among Young Gay and Bisexual Men', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(3–4): NP2251–NP2287.
- 386 Stylianou, A.M., (2018), 'Economic Abuse Experiences and Depressive Symptoms among Victims of Intimate Partner Violence', *Journal of Family Violence*, 33: 381–392.
- 387 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(16): 3186:3204.
- 388 Sullivan, C.M., Strom, J., Sheridan-Fulton, E., (2019), *Evaluation of a domestic violence rapid re-housing program in Houston, Texas: Final report*, MSU Research Consortium on Gender-Based Violence.
- 389 Tsui, V., (2014), 'Male Victims of Intimate Partner Abuse: Use and Helpfulness of Services', *Social Work*, 59(2): 121–130.
- 390 Adams, A.E., Littwin, A.K., Javorka, M., (2020), 'The Frequency, Nature and Effects of Coerced Debt Among a National Sample of Women Seeking Help for Intimate Partner Violence', *Violence Against Women*, 26(11): 1324–1342.
- 391 Moe, A. and Bell, M., (2004), 'Abject Economics: The Effects of Battering and Violence on Women's Work and Employability', *Violence Against Women*, 10(1): 29–55.
- 392 Taylor, C.A., and Michael, S., (2020), *Gender domestic violence and its big bite on small island states- Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu*, The University of the South Pacific.
- 393 Adily, A., Karystianis, G., Butler, T., (2021), *Text mining police narratives to identify types of abuse and victim injuries in family and domestic violence events*, Australian Institute of Criminology.
- 394 Australian Domestic and Family Violence Death Review Network and Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety, (2022), *Australian Domestic and Family Violence Death Review Network Data Report: Intimate partner violence homicides 2010–2018*, ANROWS.
- 395 Bagshaw, D., Brown, T., Wendt, S., Campbell, A., McInnes, E., Tinning, B., Batagol, B., Sifris, A., Tyson, D., Baker, J., and Fernandez Arias, P., (2010), *Family Violence And Family Law In Australia: The Experiences And Views Of Children And Adults From Families Who Separated Post-1995 And Post-2006*, Monash University, University of South Australia, James Cook University.
- 396 Bin Ahmed Alasmari, A., Frederico, M., Cleak, H., Lewis, V., Walker, G., (2021), 'Prevalence of intimate partner violence among Saudi Arabian international students and their spouses', *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, DOI: 10.1080/15426432.2022.2049433
- 397 Boxall, H., and Morgan, A., (2021), *Intimate partner violence during the COVID-19 pandemic*, ANROWS.
- 398 Boxall, H., Morgan, A., and Brown, R., (2020), *The prevalence of domestic violence among women during the COVID-19 pandemic*, Australian Institute of Criminology Statistical Bulletin 28.
- 399 Cited in: Breckenridge, J., (2020), *Understanding Economic and Financial Abuse in Intimate Partner Relationships*, Sydney: Gendered Violence Research Network.
- 400 Cameron, P., (2014), *Relationship problems and money: women talk about financial abuse*, Women's Information and Referral Exchange.
- 401 Cleak, H., Schofield, M.J., Axelsen, L., Bickerdike, A., (2015), 'Screening for Partner Violence Among Family Mediation Clients: Differentiating Types of Abuse', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(7): 1118–1146.
- 402 Cook, K., Goodall, Z., McLaren, J., Edwards, T., (2019), *Debts and disappointment: mothers' experiences of the child support system*, Swinburne University of Technology, National Council for Single Mothers and Their Children.
- 403 Douglas, H., 'Nonphysical Abuse and Coercive Control', in Douglas, H., (2021), *Women, Intimate Partner Violence, and the Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 404 Cited in: Fitz-Gibbon, K., McGowan, J., Mead, J., (2021), *Prevention of Financial Abuse Workshop: Workshop Summary Report*, Monash University.
- 405 Gethin, A., (2019), 'Strengthening laws to protect women from dowry abuse in Australia', *Human Rights Defender*, 28(3): 13–15.
- 406 Glenn, R., and Kutin, J., (2021), *Economic Abuse In Australia: Perceptions and experience*, Centre for Women's Economic Safety.
- 407 Hing, N., O'Mullan, C., Nuske, E., Breen, H., Mainey, L., Taylor, A., Frost, A., Greer, N., Jenkinson, R., (2020), *The relationship between gambling and intimate partner violence against women*, ANROWS.
- 408 Cited in: Hudson, N., (2019), 'Family violence laws: Traditional narratives and the (in)visibility of lesbian relationships and lesbian-parented families', *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 23(3): 357–382.

- 409 Ibid.
- 410 Cited in: Kutin, J., Russell, R., and Reid, M., (2017), 'Economic abuse between intimate partners in Australia: prevalence, health status, disability and financial stress', *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 41(3): 269-274.
- 411 Ibid.
- 412 Ibid.
- 413 Ibid.
- 414 Lockie, S., (2011), 'Intimate partner abuse and women's health in rural and mining communities', *Intimate partner abuse and women's health in rural and mining communities*, 20(2): 198-215.
- 415 Lockie, S., Nancarrow, H., Sharma, S., (2010), 'The impact of intimate partner abuse on women's health in the Bowen Basin and Mackay region of Central Queensland, Australia', *Journal of Rural and Tropical Public Health*, 9: 7-13.
- 416 Lockie, S., (2011), 'Intimate partner abuse and women's health in rural and mining communities', *Rural Society*, 20(2): 198-215.
- 417 MacDonald, F., (2012), *Spotlight on Economic Abuse: a Literature and Policy Review*, Good Shepard Youth & Family Service and Kildonan Uniting Care.
- 418 Nancarrow, H., Burke, K., Lockie, S., Viljoen, R., Choudhury, J., (2011), *Intimate partner abuse of women in Queensland*, Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research CQ University.
- 419 Riggs, D.W., Taylor, N., Fraser, H., Donovan, C., and Signal, T., (2021), 'The Link Between Domestic Violence and Abuse and Animal Cruelty in the Intimate Relationships of People of Diverse Genders and/or Sexualities: A Binational Study', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(5-6): NP2169-NP3195.
- 420 Satyen, L. Piedra, S., Rangnathan, A., Golluccio, N., (2018), 'Intimate Partner Violence and Help-Seeking Behavior among Migrant Women in Australia', *Journal of Family Violence*, 33: 447-456.
- 421 Sleep, L., (2019), *Domestic violence, social security and the couple rule*, ANROWS.
- 422 Smallwood, E., (2015), *Stepping stones: legal barriers to economic equality after family violence*, Melbourne: Women's Legal Service Victoria.
- 423 Wilson, I.M., Graham, K., and Taft, A., (2017), 'Living the cycle of drinking and violence: A qualitative study of women's experience of alcohol-related intimate partner violence', *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 36(1): 115-124.
- 424 Woodlock, D., (2017), 'The Abuse of Technology in Domestic Violence and Stalking', *Violence Against Women*, 23(5): 584-602.
- 425 Zerk, D.M., Mertin, P.G., Proeve, M., (2009), 'Domestic Violence and Maternal Reports of Young Children's Functioning', *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(7): 423-432.
- 426 Fanslow, J.L., Malihi, Z., Hashemi, L., Gulliver, P., McIntosh, T., (2021), 'Change in prevalence of psychological and economic abuse, and controlling behaviours against women by an intimate partner in two cross-sectional studies in New Zealand, 2003 and 2019', *BMJ Open*, 11: e044910.
- 427 Fanslow, J.L., Malihi, Z.A., Hashemi, L., Gulliver, P.J., McIntosh, T.K.D., (2021), 'Lifetime Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence and Disability: Results From a Population-Based Study in New Zealand', *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 61(3): P320-328.
- 428 Eves, R., and Titus, A., (2020), *Women's Economic Empowerment among Coffee Smallholders in Papua New Guinea*, Australian National University.
- 429 Lewis, I., (2009), 'How is HIV transmission in PNG influenced by violence against women and attitudes towards condoms?', *Catalyst*, 39(2): 29-55.
- 430 Lewis, I., Maruia, B., Walker, S., (2008), 'Violence against women in Papua New Guinea', *Journal of Family Studies*, 14(2-3): 183-197.
- 431 Postmus, J.L., Nikolova, K., Lin, H., Johnson, L., (2021), 'Women's Economic Abuse Experiences: Results from the UN Multi-Country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(15-16): NP13115-NP13142.
- 432 Fulu, E., Warner, X., Miedema, S., Jewkes, R., Roselli, T., Lang, J., (2013), *Why Do Some Men Use Violence Against Women and How Can We Prevent It? Quantitative Findings from the United Nations Multi-country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific*, UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNV.
- 433 Almeida, J., Rocha, R., Signorellie, M., Silva, V., Prado, S., Evans, D., (2020), 'The House of the Brazilian Woman: impacts of a cross-sectoral public health policy for abused women', *European Journal of Public Health*, Volume 30, Supplement 5.
- 434 Cepeda, I., Lacalle-Calderon, M., Torralba, M., (2021), 'Microfinance and Violence Against Women in Rural Guatemala', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(3-4): 1391-1413.
- 435 Cant, A.K., and Pheiffer, S.E., (2011), *Intimate Partner Violence and Alcohol Abuse in the Indigenous Populations of Panama*, University of South Florida.
- 436 Suvo-Vega, J.A., Meneses-La-Riva, M.E., Paredes-Díaz, S.E., Fernández-Bedoya, V.H., (2020), 'Domestic violence: The day-to-day life of Peruvian women experiencing depressive disorders', *Harmoni Sosial: Jurnal Pendidikan IPS*, 7(2):96-103.
- 437 Deere, C.D., and Leon, M., (2021), 'From Marital Power to Economic and Patrimonial Violence in Colombia', *Estudios Socio-Juridicos*, 23(1):219-252.
- 438 Edeby, A., San Sebastián, M., (2021), 'Prevalence and sociogeographical inequalities of violence against women in Ecuador: a cross-sectional study', *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 20: 130

- 439 Quezada-Astudillo, J.P., and Zamora-Vázquez, A.F., (2021), 'Violation of the rights of women victims of economic and patrimonial violence', *FiPCAEC*, 6(3): 476-498.
- 440 de los Ángeles Estrella-González, M., Cluet de Rodríguez, I., Pérez-Uchuarí, P.E., Sigüenza-Bermeo, M.V., Ramírez-Coronel, A.A., (2020), 'Gender Violence in the Women of Azogues', *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(9):22-26.
- 441 Deere, C.D., and Leon, M., (2021), 'Consensual Unions, Property Rights, and Patrimonial Violence against Women in Latin America', *Social Politics*, 29(2): 608-633.
- 442 de los Ángeles Estrella-González, M., Cluet de Rodríguez, I., Pérez-Uchuarí, P.E., Sigüenza-Bermeo, M.V., Ramírez-Coronel, A.A., (2020), 'Gender Violence in the Women of Azogues', *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(9):22-26.