

PREVALENCE OF ECONOMIC ABUSE AMONG A SAMPLE OF EGYPTIAN WOMEN: A CROSS-SECTIONAL SURVEY

Reham nafad elbendary¹, Mohamed Masoud², Karima Mokhtar Mohamed¹, Nazih Ramadan¹

¹ Department of Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, Kasr Alainy Street, Cairo 11562, Egypt

² Department of Public Health and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Fayoum University, Fayoum, Egypt

Corresponding Author: Dr. Nazih Ramadan,

Email : drnazihramadan@kasralainy.edu.eg, Tel:01066866336

Submit Date 2025-08-28

Revise Date 2025-10-07

Accept Date 2025-10-09

Abstract

Background: Any violent activity directed at a family member or another individual that results in physical, sexual, emotional, social, economic, or even suicidal harm is classified as domestic violence. Economic abuse is a form of domestic and family violence that involves a pattern of behavior that controls a person's ability to acquire, use and maintain economic resources, in a way that threatens their economic security and potential for self-sufficiency. **Methodology:** A cross-sectional survey was conducted among females attending outpatient gynecology and obstetrics clinic between April and June 2025. A structured, interviewed questionnaire was taken from the participants after giving informed consent. The questionnaire included data about Participants' sociodemographic details, information about abuser and forms, reasons, action towards economic abuse if present. **Aim of the study:** to assess the prevalence of economic abuse among females in Egypt, describing its main forms and manifestations, and exploring associated demographic or social factors. **Results:** Out of the 416 women who were included in our study, most of the participants were aged 31–50 years. Economic abuse was statistically higher among divorced. Nearly half of the participants reported sharing in family expenses, and the other half don't. The majority of non sharing participants reported Coercion and prevention from working. Coercion methods included physical violence, emotional manipulation, psychological and verbal abuse. The most common abusers were husbands and the common cause of abuse was low income while addiction was reported as a common cause. **Conclusion:** economic abuse is common among females especially in low income economies when associated with low educational level or addiction.

Key words: economic abuse, Egyptian, women, addiction

Introduction

Any violent activity directed at a family member or another individual that results in physical, sexual, emotional, social, economic, or even suicidal harm is classified as domestic violence (Dufort et al., 2014). Violence against women affects millions of people globally and is a significant human rights and public health issue (Hassan et al., 2023). One important but little-known type of intimate partner violence (IPV) is economic abuse, which

includes acts that limit a spouse's access to money, thereby diminishing their autonomy and self-reliance (Adams et al., 2008). Abusers employ tactics such as monitoring expenses, limiting economic access, and sabotaging job opportunities to increase survivors' economic dependence (Postmus et al., 2012).

Economic abuse remains poorly understood, despite its significant consequences, particularly in terms of how

it affects economic stability and how factors such as education, employment status, and attitudes towards gender dynamics may influence its impact (Postmus et al., 2022). Intersectional disparities worsen when authorities fail to recognize economic abuse as a form of intimate partner violence, leaving victims vulnerable to further economic, sexual, and psychological exploitation (Bruno et al., 2025). Survivors may experience increased psychological and economic disempowerment if they avoid seeking employment or education due to fear of physical harm or visible harm.

There is a lack of information regarding the effects and manifestations of economic abuse in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Results from a study conducted by Chatterji et al. in 2025 show that survivors in LMICs bear a significant burden of economic abuse. The prevalence rates of economic abuse in Egypt have risen significantly from 12.2% before the COVID-19 pandemic to 30.3% after it, indicating an increase in economic control during crises (Abu-Elenin et al., 2022). Research on economic abuse of Egyptian women is still limited. To address this gap, this study aims to examine the frequency and patterns of economic abuse among a sample of Egyptian women.

Subjects and methods

Study design and participants:

Between April 1st and June 2025, A cross-sectional survey was conducted among females attending outpatient gynecology and obstetrics clinic at Fayoum University Hospital to assess the prevalence and forms of economic abuse. The survey included Egyptian females who were at least eighteen years old and willing to participate.

Study population and sample

The study population included Egyptian females who were at least

eighteen years old and willing to participate.

Inclusion criteria:

- Females
- Age 18 years and >18 year
- Able to read and understand the questionnaire

Exclusion criteria:

- Incomplete responses
- Refuse to consent

Sampling Method

To recruit volunteers, a convenience sampling strategy was employed. The form was accompanied by a statement describing the questionnaire's objectives, benefits, guidelines for completion, and expected time required. Prior to completing the questionnaire, all participants were requested to state that they had read and agreed to the informed consent declaration. Those who declined to participate were excluded.

Sample Size

Epi info 7.2.2.6 was utilized to calculate the necessary sample size using a statistical formula developed for proportion estimates. The sample size required for a prevalence rate of 50% with a margin of error of 5% and a confidence level of 95% ($z=1.96$) indicates that at least 384 respondents were needed to estimate the proportion of women experiencing economic abuse in Egypt.

Study Tool

A structured, interviewed questionnaire was used to collect data. A pilot sample ($n = 30$) was used to examine the survey questions' simplicity. Then the survey form was edited. Finally, the questionnaire formed of the following sections:

Section 1: Participants' sociodemographic details, including age, gender, marital status, children number and education level.

Section 2: information about abuser (age, education, occupation, relationship)

and forms, reasons, action towards economic abuse if present.

The questions in the questionnaire were derived from previous research (Bruno et al., 2025). To ensure consistency in both language and content, the English-language questions were translated into Arabic and then back into English by experts. The content of the questionnaire was validated by three public health specialists.

Study Variables

Dependent Variables (Outcomes): three outcome variables were assessed in our survey:

1. Sharing in family expenses (Yes/No)
2. Economic abuse (Yes/No)
3. Being repeatedly asked for money against one's will (No/Sometimes/Yes)

Independent Variables:

The sociodemographic characteristics were manipulated as independent variables.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS version 27 (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.). Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were used to summarize the study variables. Inferential statistics using chi-square (χ^2) was performed for assessing associations between independent variables and each of the three outcome variables. Multiple logistic regression analyses were conducted to identify independent predictors of the three outcomes. The outcome variable "being asked for money against one's will" was recoded to become a binary variable as responses of "Yes" and "Sometimes" were grouped together against "No" responses. For each regression model, independent variables with a p-value ≤ 0.20 in bivariate analysis were entered into the model, then a backward stepwise elimination procedure was used. Adjusted odds ratios (AORs)

with their 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were estimated. Statistical significance was indicated at $P < 0.05$.

Ethical considerations:

The Research Ethics Committee at Fayoum Faculty of Medicine approved the study (IRB: 684). This included maintaining confidentiality and privacy for all participants. All participants provided informed consent to confirm their voluntary agreement through a written consent form before completing the questionnaire. Additionally, they had the freedom to leave the research at any moment without suffering any penalties.

Results

Out of the 416 women who were included in the study, most of participants (59.1%)

were aged 31–50 years. Most of the studied women (66.6%) were inhabitants of sub-urban area followed by rural (23.1%) and urban (10.3%) areas. Most of the women (76.0%) lived with their husband and (77.6%) were married. More than one third (37.7%) were illiterate while only (14.7%) had a university education, and (22.8%) completed their secondary education. The majority of the participants (89.2%) had children with (50.5%) had 1-3 children. The family size was > 4 in most participants (69.2%). Most of the females (62.3%) were not employed, table 1.

Nearly half (48.8%) reported sharing in family expenses. Economic abuse was reported by (22.8%) of participants, while (18.3%) and (12.3%) stated keeping asked for money against their willingness either usually or sometimes, respectively, table 2.

Among those who did not share expenses, the majority (85.0%) reported abusers refuse to let them work. On the

other hand, of those who shared expenses, most participants (70.4%) did that by consent, while (29.6%) were coerced. Coercion methods included physical violence (33.3%), emotional manipulation (16.7%), psychological (15.0%) and verbal (13.3%) abuse, and threats including children (11.7%), table 3.

Most abusers were aged 31-50 (58.4%). Husbands were the main abusers as reported by most participants (67.7%), followed by fathers (25.0%). Illiterate and secondary education (29.2%) were the most common educational level of the abusers.

Table 1: Basic characteristics

		N	%
Age (years)	19-20	23	5.5%
	21-30	71	17.1%
	31-40	117	28.1%
	41-50	129	31.0%
	>51	76	18.3%
Residence	Urban	43	10.3%
	Rural	96	23.1%
	Sub-Urban	277	66.6%
who do you live with?	A relative	10	2.4%
	Brother	8	1.9%
	Father	73	17.5%
	Husband	316	76.0%
	None	9	2.2%
Marital status	Married	323	77.6%
	Single	24	5.8%
	Widowed	45	10.8%
	Divorced	24	5.8%
Educational level	Illiterate	157	37.7%
	Primary	46	11.1%
	Preparatory	57	13.7%
	Secondary	95	22.8%
	University	61	14.7%
Have children	No	45	10.8%
	yes	371	89.2%
Children number	No children	45	10.8%
	1-3	210	50.5%
	>3	161	38.7%
Family number	<3	10	2.4%
	3-4	118	28.4%
	>4	288	69.2%
Employment	No	259	62.3%
	yes	157	37.7%

Table 2: Economic abuse pattern

Most abusers (61.5%) were employed, table 4.

Low income (38.5%) was the most reported reason among abusers while addiction was reported by (14.6%) of the studied women. Most women (60.4%) gave the abusers the money, while (24.0%) usually tried to stall requests and only (15.6%) confronted the abuser. Nearly Half (51.0%) seek help, with more than half of them (57.1%) reported positive results of seeking help, table 5.

		N	%
Sharing in family expenses	No	213	51.2%
	yes	203	48.8%
economic abuse	No	321	77.2%
	yes	95	22.8%
Does your husband or someone close to you keep asking you for money against your will?	No	289	69.5%
	Sometimes	51	12.3%
	yes	76	18.3%

Table 3: Patterns in Sharing in family expenses

	N	%
Sharing in family expenses		
No	213	51.2%
<i>Does the person who financially exploits you refuse to let you work?</i>	181	85.0%
<i>Does he borrow money and not repay it?</i>	15	7.0%
<i>Has he taken your inheritance?</i>	10	4.7%
<i>Does he sell household belongings?</i>	7	3.3%
Yes	203	48.8%
By consent	143	70.4%
By coercion	60	29.6%
<i>Physical violence by hitting or bodily harm</i>	20	33.3%
<i>Affection-seeking and emotional manipulation</i>	10	16.7%
<i>Humiliation and psychological abuse</i>	9	15.0%
<i>Verbal abuse</i>	8	13.3%
<i>Threatening with children</i>	7	11.7%
<i>Other*</i>	6	10.0%

*Other: (sexual violence, blackmailing, monitoring you)

Table 4: Characteristics of abusers among participants with economic abuse (N=96)

		N	%
Age (years)	19-20	1	1.0%
	21-30	11	11.5%
	31-40	30	31.3%
	41-50	26	27.1%
	>51	28	29.2%
Degree of relationship	Husband	65	67.7%
	Father	24	25.0%
	Brother	7	7.3%
Educational level	Illiterate	28	29.2%
	Primary	4	4.2%
	Preparatory	20	20.8%
	Secondary	28	29.2%
	University	16	16.7%
Employment	No	37	38.5%
	yes	59	61.5%

Table 5: Reasons for and actions toward economic abuse as reported by participants with economic abuse (N=96)

		N	%
Reasons for economic abuse	Low income	37	38.5%
	Addicted*	14	14.6%
	Ill	12	12.5%
	Others	33	34.4%
Action	I strongly refuse and confront him	15	15.6%
	I give him the money	58	60.4%
	I usually stall him until he stops asking or gives up	23	24.0%
Seeking help*	No	47	49.0%
	Yes	49	51.0%
Results of asking help	Negative	21	42.9%
	Positive	28	57.1%

*Seeking help (Family, Friends, Neighbors and primary care providers)

*Addicted(Tramadol and Cannabis)

Our findings revealed that sharing in family expenses was a statistically higher among urban inhabitants (76.7%), divorced (79.2%) and widowed (55.6%), participants who had university education (73.8%), and who were employed (97.5%). Economic abuse was a statistically higher among divorced (66.7%), and who were employed (43.9%). Keeping asked for money was a statistically higher among urban inhabitants (44.2%, for sometimes and yes), divorced (62.5%), and who were employed (52.2%), tables 6-8.

Multiple logistic regression analysis recognized that divorced (AOR =9.875, 95% CI: 2.995-32.554, $p<0.001$), widowed (AOR = 3.278, 95% CI: 1.422-7.557,

$p=0.005$) and women how were employed (AOR = 208.892, 95% CI: 71.119-613.562, $p<0.001$) to be statistically significant predictors for sharing in family expenses. Similarly, divorced (AOR =12.539, 95% CI: 4.385-35.855, $p<0.001$) and employed women (AOR = 8.279, 95% CI: 4.714-14.540, $p<0.001$) were statistically significant predictors for economic abuse. Likewise, divorced (AOR =5.327, 95% CI: 2.060-1.776, $p=0.001$), participants received preparatory education (AOR = 2.800, 95% CI: 1.353-5.798, $p=0.006$), and women how were employed (AOR = 68.458, 95% CI: 3.880-10.749, $p<0.001$) were predictors for keeping asked for money, table 9.

Table 6: Relation between basic characteristics and sharing in family expenses

Sharing in family expenses	P-value [#]
----------------------------	----------------------

		No		yes		
		N	%	N	%	
Age (years)	19-20	13	56.5%	10	43.5%	0.160
	21-30	45	63.4%	26	36.6%	
	31-40	58	49.6%	59	50.4%	
	41-50	64	49.6%	65	50.4%	
	>51	33	43.4%	43	56.6%	
Residence	Urban	10	23.3%	33	76.7%	<0.001*
	Rural	53	55.2%	43	44.8%	
	Sub-Urban	150	54.2%	127	45.8%	
who do you live with?	A relative	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	0.076
	Brother	3	37.5%	5	62.5%	
	Father	28	38.4%	45	61.6%	
	Husband	173	54.7%	143	45.3%	
	None	3	33.3%	6	66.7%	
Marital status	Married	175	54.2%	148	45.8%	0.012*
	Single	13	54.2%	11	45.8%	
	Widowed	20	44.4%	25	55.6%	
	Divorced	5	20.8%	19	79.2%	
Educational level	Illiterate	90	57.3%	67	42.7%	<0.001*
	Primary	21	45.7%	25	54.3%	
	Preparatory	36	63.2%	21	36.8%	
	Secondary	50	52.6%	45	47.4%	
	University	16	26.2%	45	73.8%	
Have children	No	20	44.4%	25	55.6%	0.337
	Yes	193	52.0%	178	48.0%	
Children number	No children	20	44.4%	25	55.6%	0.268
	1-3	103	49.0%	107	51.0%	
	>3	90	55.9%	71	44.1%	
Family number	<3	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	0.124
	3-4	52	44.1%	66	55.9%	
	>4	157	54.5%	131	45.5%	
Employment	No	209	80.7%	50	19.3%	<0.001*
	Yes	4	2.5%	153	97.5%	

#Chi-squared test, *Significant at $p < 0.050$

Table 7: Relation between basic characteristics and sharing in economic abuse

economic abuse

P-value[#]

		No		yes		
		N	%	N	%	
Age (years)	19-20	16	69.6%	7	30.4%	0.118
	21-30	55	77.5%	16	22.5%	
	31-40	82	70.1%	35	29.9%	
	41-50	108	83.7%	21	16.3%	
	>51	60	78.9%	16	21.1%	
Residence	Urban	34	79.1%	9	20.9%	0.951
	Rural	74	77.1%	22	22.9%	
	Sub-Urban	213	76.9%	64	23.1%	
who do you live with?	A relative	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	0.195
	Brother	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	
	Father	51	69.9%	22	30.1%	
	Husband	252	79.7%	64	20.3%	
	None	7	77.8%	2	22.2%	
Marital status	Married	255	78.9%	68	21.1%	<0.001*
	Single	19	79.2%	5	20.8%	
	Widowed	39	86.7%	6	13.3%	
	Divorced	8	33.3%	16	66.7%	
Educational level	Illiterate	130	82.8%	27	17.2%	0.084
	Primary	30	65.2%	16	34.8%	
	Preparatory	45	78.9%	12	21.1%	
	Secondary	73	76.8%	22	23.2%	
	University	43	70.5%	18	29.5%	
Have children	No	33	73.3%	12	26.7%	0.517
	Yes	288	77.6%	83	22.4%	
Children number	No children	33	73.3%	12	26.7%	0.610
	1-3	160	76.2%	50	23.8%	
	>3	128	79.5%	33	20.5%	
Family number	<3	9	90.0%	1	10.0%	0.486
	3-4	88	74.6%	30	25.4%	
	>4	224	77.8%	64	22.2%	
Employment	No	233	90.0%	26	10.0%	<0.001*
	Yes	88	56.1%	69	43.9%	

#Chi-squared test, *Significant at $p < 0.050$

Table 8: Relation between basic characteristics and sharing in Does your husband or someone close to you keep asking you for money against your will?

		Keep asking money						P- value [#]
		No		Sometimes		yes		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
Age (years)	19-20	15	65.2%	2	6.6%	6	26.1%	0.390
	21-30	47	66.2%	13	8.7%	11	15.5%	
	31-40	75	64.1%	17	18.3%	25	21.4%	
	41-50	94	72.9%	14	14.5%	21	16.3%	
	>51	58	76.3%	5	10.9%	13	17.1%	
Residence	Urban	24	55.8%	11	25.6%	8	18.6%	0.025*
	Rural	65	67.7%	15	15.6%	16	16.7%	
	Sub-Urban	200	72.2%	25	9.0%	52	18.8%	
who do you live with?	A relative	6	60.0%	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	0.144
	Brother	2	25.0%	3	37.5%	3	37.5%	
	Father	49	67.1%	9	12.3%	15	20.5%	
	Husband	226	71.5%	35	11.1%	55	17.4%	
	None	6	66.7%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	
Marital status	Married	230	71.2%	36	11.1%	57	17.6%	0.019*
	Single	15	62.5%	3	12.5%	6	25.0%	
	Widowed	35	77.8%	5	11.1%	5	11.1%	
	Divorced	9	37.5%	7	29.2%	8	33.3%	
Educational level	Illiterate	118	75.2%	18	11.5%	21	13.4%	0.139
	Primary	28	60.9%	7	15.2%	11	23.9%	
	Preparatory	34	59.6%	6	10.5%	17	29.8%	
	Secondary	68	71.6%	14	14.7%	13	13.7%	
	University	41	67.2%	6	9.8%	14	23.0%	
Have children	No	27	60.0%	10	22.2%	8	17.8%	0.093
	Yes	262	70.6%	41	11.1%	68	18.3%	
Children number	No children	27	60.0%	10	22.2%	8	17.8%	0.103
	1-3	154	73.3%	18	8.6%	38	18.1%	
	>3	108	67.1%	23	14.3%	30	18.6%	
Family number	<3	8	80.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	0.710
	3-4	77	65.3%	15	12.7%	26	22.0%	
	>4	204	70.8%	35	12.2%	49	17.0%	
Employment	No	214	82.6%	28	10.8%	17	6.6%	<0.001 *
	Yes	75	47.8%	23	14.6%	59	37.6%	

#Chi-squared test, *Significant at $p < 0.050$

Table 9: Logistic regression

	B	P-value	Adjusted odds Ratio (AOR)	95% C.I. for AOR	
sharing in family expenses					
Residence					
Rural	Reference				
Urban	0.574	0.364	1.775	0.514	6.128
Sub-urban	-0.563	0.110	0.569	0.285	1.136
Marital status					
Married	Reference				
Single	-0.446	0.576	0.640	0.135	3.048
Widowed	1.187	0.005	3.278	1.422	7.557
Divorced	2.290	<0.001*	9.875	2.995	32.554
Employment					
Not employed	Reference				
Employed	5.342	<0.001*	208.892	71.119	613.562
Constant	-1.453	<0.001*	0.234		
Economic abuse					
Age					
19-20	Reference				
21-30	1.077	0.119	2.936	0.759	11.355
31-40	0.460	0.332	1.584	0.625	4.016
41-50	0.549	0.173	1.731	0.786	3.813
>51	-0.340	0.413	0.712	0.316	1.606
Marital status					
Married	Reference				
Single	-0.577	0.370	0.561	0.159	1.985
Widowed	-0.189	0.711	0.828	0.304	2.251
Divorced	2.529	<0.001*	12.539	4.385	35.855
Employment					
Not employed	Reference				
Employed	2.114	<0.001*	8.279	4.714	14.540
Constant	-2.646	<0.001*	0.071		
Does your husband or someone close to you keep asking you for money against your will?					
Residence					
Rural	Reference				
Urban	0.310	0.513	1.363	0.539	3.448
Sub-urban	-0.459	0.115	0.632	0.357	1.118
Marital status					
Married	Reference				
Single	0.332	0.518	1.394	0.509	3.820
Widowed	-0.282	0.501	0.754	0.331	1.717
Divorced	1.673	0.001*	5.327	2.060	13.776
Educational level					
Illiterate	Reference				
Primary	0.485	0.220	1.624	0.748	3.523

	B	P-value	Adjusted odds Ratio (AOR)	95% C.I. for AOR	
Preparatory	1.030	0.006*	2.800	1.353	5.798
Secondary	0.104	0.756	1.110	0.576	2.139
University	-0.579	0.173	0.561	0.244	1.288
Employment					
Not employed	Reference				
Employed	1.865	<0.001*	6.458	3.880	10.749
Constant	-1.648	<0.001*	0.192		

*Significant at p<0.050

Discussion

Economically, women's abuse is a prevalent global issue that varies in prevalence and impact depending on the location and socioeconomic status. For instance, a nationally representative survey in Sweden revealed that 8% of women experienced economic abuse from current partners, 25% from previous partners, with motherhood increasing the risk (Bruno et al., 2024). In New Zealand, 15% of ever-partnered women reported economic abuse, with the most common behavior being withholding money for household expenses (8.8%); those experiencing economic abuse had significantly higher odds of poor mental health and economic hardship compared to unexposed women (Mellar et al., 2024). In Jordan, economic abuse by spouses affected 55.5% of urban and 44.5% of rural married working women, with higher prevalence in urban areas; risk factors included lower education, shorter marriage duration, and husband's employment status (Alsawalqa, 2020; Alsawalqa, 2021).

Socioeconomic factors such as lower education, unemployment, and traditional gender roles contribute to vulnerability to economic abuse, while higher education and longer marriage duration can offer protection in certain contexts (Alsawalqa, 2020; Alsawalqa, 2021; Steinert et al., 2023). Economic abuse often co-occurs with other forms of intimate partner

violence and is linked to increased food insecurity, depression, and future economic challenges (Postmus et al., 2022; Mellar et al., 2024; Alsawalqa, 2021). Women from marginalized communities, including migrants, low-income individuals, and those in patriarchal societies, face a higher risk of economic abuse, which can persist even after leaving abusive relationships, perpetuating poverty and limiting opportunities for recovery (Fawole, 2008; Anitha, 2019; Mellar et al., 2024; Steinert et al., 2023).

The study was conducted in the gynecology and obstetrics clinic at Fayoum University Hospital. Fayoum University Hospital was chosen due to its size and location: it is a 228- bed hospital provides comprehensive care for patients in Fayoum governorate. It is staffed by 194 nurses with different nursing qualifications including bachelor and diploma degrees. The hospital has 11 inpatient units as follows: medical (36 beds), surgical (36 beds), obstetrics (18 beds), pediatrics (26 beds), intensive care (22 beds), ophthalmology (18 beds), urology (18 beds), orthopedics (26 beds), premature (6 beds), and hemodialysis (10 beds) units, in addition to the operation rooms (10 beds) (El meghawri et al., 2017). In addition, its location in an agricultural and low socioeconomic zone in Egypt.

Research highlights economic abuse as a distinct aspect of intimate partner

violence that undermines women's economic independence, restricts access to resources, and poses long-term security challenges (**Bruno et al., 2025**). This study found that 22.8% of women directly experienced economic abuse, aligning with global prevalence rates of 15% to 30% (**Kutin et al., 2017; Jury et al., 2016**), with divorced and widowed women at higher risk. This is consistent with findings by **Kanougiya et al. (2021)** and **Yau et al. (2020)**, indicating that separated women are particularly vulnerable to economic abuse. The study also revealed that economic decision-making often involved various forms of pressure, with nearly a third of women managing household expenses involuntarily, highlighting a lack of economic autonomy. Additionally, the majority of non-economically active women reported being prevented from working, indicating a structural form of control. This underscores the importance of work and education in empowering women to break free from such forms of domination (**Alsawalqa, 2020**).

Our research has established that divorced and widowed women report higher levels of economic abuse, which is consistent with international literature indicating that economic intimate partner violence (IPV) is prevalent and persists even after marriages end (**Bruno et al., 2025**). Emotional coercion and psychological abuse were also prevalent in our sample, aligning with **Moawad et al. (2021)**, who found that 96% of Egyptian women who experienced violence during the COVID-19 pandemic reported emotional abuse. This suggests that economic abuse is not an isolated phenomenon but part of a continuum of coercion that includes verbal humiliation, psychological manipulation, and, in some cases, physical violence. Additionally, as noted by **Moawad et al. (2021)**, shorter husbands with fewer work hours and a

history of violence increase women's vulnerability, creating a cycle of socio-economic coercion and repeated abuse.

These coercive behaviors encompass not only economic abuse but also repeated psychological, verbal, and physical abuse. For instance, economic coercion involving money transfer often includes threats, humiliation, and manipulation. This is consistent with the findings of **White et al. (2024)**, who identified psychological IPV as the most common form of abuse. Therefore, economic abuse cannot be separated from the broader spectrum of coercion, exposing women to increased vulnerability, diminished agency, and heightened psychological distress.

A surprising finding from our study is that 14.6% of participants cited addiction as a contributing factor to IPV, specifically referring to Tramadol and cannabis abuse by their partners, in line with the findings of **Alkan et al. (2021)** and **Kanougiya et al. (2021)**. These studies also revealed a strong correlation between drug use and economic coercion. Addiction not only depletes household resources but also fosters controlling behavior, as abusers use earnings to fuel their addiction and restrict women's economic autonomy.

Our data also reveal complex relationships between education, employment, and susceptibility to economic exploitation. Women with higher education and employment were more likely to share economic responsibilities, contrary to some previous studies. While education is often seen as protective (**Alsawalqa, 2020; Antai et al., 2014; Asencios-Gonzales et al., 2018**), other studies have linked higher education levels to increased risk of economic abuse (**Alkan et al., 2021; Yau et al., 2020**). These conflicting findings suggest that education not only empowers women but also

challenges traditional gender roles, triggering coercive responses from partners. Further exploration is needed to understand this dual effect in future research.

The majority of participants in our study (%90.5) were mothers, and our results indicate that being a mother increases the risk of economic abuse, consistent with the findings of **Bruno et al. (2025)** and **Alkan et al. (2021)**. Pregnancy and childcare can make women more vulnerable to economic exploitation, as they often rely on partners for resources and support in childcare, exposing them to economic coercion embedded in societal norms.

In conclusion, our findings suggest that economic abuse rarely occurs in isolation but is part of a broader pattern of coercive behaviors that include economic control, job restrictions, verbal abuse, psychological manipulation, and, in extreme cases, physical violence. Placing economic abuse within the context of IPV, our research emphasizes the importance of prioritizing physical safety, economic independence, access to resources, and economic education about rights. Policy responses should focus on a combination of support programs for women and accountability measures for perpetrators, particularly those with substance abuse issues.

Limitations of the study:

This is a single hospital-based study (Fayoum University Hospital), so generalization to other populations or areas may be limited.

Self-reported information might suffer from recall bias or under-reporting, particularly when the discussion involves sensitive matters such as abuse and addiction.

The cross-sectional design prevents establishing causality between economic and associative factors

Conclusion and recommendations

economic abuse is common among females especially in low income economies when associated with low educational level or addiction. It is recommended to integrate awareness strategies about the risks of economic abuse into women's health and social empowerment programs in Egypt. Furthermore, future studies using longitudinal methodologies are suggested to more accurately determine causality and risk factors.

References:

- Abu-Elenin, M. M., Elshora, A., Sadaka, M., & Abdeldaim, D. E. (2022). Domestic violence against married women during the COVID-19 pandemic in Egypt. *BMC Women's Health*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-022-01674-5>
- Alkan, Ö., Özar, Ş., & Ünver, Ş. (2021). Economic violence against women: A case in Turkey. *PLoS One*, 16(3), Article e0248630. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248630>
- Alsawalqa, R. (2020). Economic Abuse of Women in Amman, Jordan: A Quantitative Study. *SAGE Open*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020982616>
- Alsawalqa, R. (2021). Women's abuse experiences in Jordan: A comparative study using rural and urban classifications. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00853-3>

- Anitha, S. (2019). Understanding Economic Abuse Through an Intersectional Lens: Financial Abuse, Control, and Exploitation of Women's Productive and Reproductive Labor. *Violence Against Women*, 25, 1854 - 1877. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801218824050>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2014.917195>
- Asencios-Gonzalez, Z., Vara-Horna, A., McBride, J. B., Santi Huaranca, I., Chafloque-Céspedes, R., & Alberto Díaz, R. (2018). Factors associated with intimate partner economic violence against female micro-entrepreneurs in Peru. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 13(6), 1597–1614. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJoEM-08-2017-0294>
- Bruno, L., Strid, S., & Ekbrand, H. (2025). Men's economic abuse toward women in Sweden: findings from a national survey. *Violence against women*, 31(9), 2194-2218..
- Chatterji, S., O'Connor, J., Zane, A., & Steinert, J. I. (2025). Economic Abuse in Low and Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380251325194>
- Dufort M, Stenbacka M, Gumpert CH. Physical domestic violence exposure is highly associated with suicidal attempts in both women and men. Results from the national public health survey in Sweden. *Eur J Public Health*. 2014;25(3):413–418.
- El meghawri, R., Shazly, M., Hussein, F. (2017). 'Assessment of Essential of Magnetism in Nursing Practice Environment at Fayoum University Hospital', *Zagazig Nursing Journal*, 13(2), pp. 132-150. doi: 10.21608/znj.2017.38619
- Fawole, O. (2008). Economic Violence To Women and Girls. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 9, 167 - 177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838008319255>
- Hassan, H. E., Nasr, E. H., & Mohamed, S. S. A. (2023). Violence against infertile women: a comparative study. *Nurse Care Open Acces J*, 9(4), 168-178.
- Jury, A., Thorburn, N., & Weatherall, R. (2016). Women's experiences of economic abuse in Aotearoa New Zealand. Women's Refuge, NCIWR Inc. <https://womensrefuge.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/economic-abuse-report-.pdf>
- Kanougiya, S., Daruwalla, N., Gram, L., Apoorwa Deepak, G., Muthusamy, S., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10904-8>
- Kutin, J., Russell, R., & Reid, M. (2017). Economic abuse between intimate partners in Australia: Prevalence, health status, disability and financial stress. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Health*, 41(3), 269–274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/17536405.12651>

- Mellar, B., Fanslow, J., Gulliver, P., & McIntosh, T. (2024). Economic Abuse by An Intimate Partner and Its Associations with Women's Socioeconomic Status and Mental Health. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 39, 4415 - 4437. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605241235140>
- Moawad, A. M., El Desouky, E. D., Salem, M. R., Elhawary, A. S., Hussein, S. M., & Hassan, F. M. (2021). Violence and sociodemographic related factors among a sample of Egyptian women during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Egyptian journal of forensic sciences*, 11(1), 29.
- Postmus, J. L., Nikolova, K., Lin, H. F., & Johnson, L. (2022). 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.
- Steinert, J., Boehret, I., Satish, R., Sharma, S., & Chatterji, S. (2023). 'We don't get money in our own hands': evidence from focus group discussions on economic abuse against women in two states of India. *BMJ Global Health*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2023-012576>
- White, S. J., Sin, J., Sweeney, A., Salisbury, T., Wahlich, C., Montesinos Guevara, C. M., ... & Mantovani, N. (2024). Global prevalence and mental health outcomes of intimate partner violence among women: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 25(1), 494-511.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1891/VV-D-18-00057>
- Yount, K. M., Krause, K. H., & VanderEnde, K. E. (2016). Economic coercion and partner violence against wives in Vietnam: A unified framework? *Journal*

الملخص العربي

دراسة انتشار العنف الاقتصادي بين عينة من النساء المصريات: دراسة مقطعية

ريهام نفاذ البنداري¹، محمد مسعود²، كريمة مختار محمد¹، نزيه رمضان¹

¹ قسم الطب الشرعي والسموم الاكلينيكية بكلية الطب جامعة القاهرة

² قسم الصحة العامة بكلية الطب جامعة الفيوم

المقدمة: يُصنف أي نشاط عنيف موجه نحو أحد أفراد الأسرة أو فرد آخر يؤدي إلى ضرر بدني، أو جنسي، أو عاطفي، أو اجتماعي، أو مالي، أو حتى الانتحار على أنه عنف منزلي.

منهجية البحث: تم إجراء مسح مقطعي بين النساء المترددات على عيادة أمراض النساء والتوليد الخارجية في الفترة بين أبريل ويونيو 2025. وتم أخذ استبيان عن طريق عمل مقابلة مع المشاركات بعد الحصول على موافقتهن المستنيرة. وشمل الاستبيان بيانات عن الخصائص الاجتماعية والديموغرافية للمشاركات، ومعلومات عن التعرض للعنف ومن هو الشخص المتسبب، وأشكال العنف الاقتصادي، وأسبابها، والإجراءات المتخذة تجاهها في حال وجودها.

النتائج: من بين 416 امرأة شملتهن الدراسة، كانت أغلب المشاركات في الفئة العمرية 31-50 سنة. وكانت معدلات العنف الاقتصادي أعلى بشكل ذو دلالة إحصائية بين المطلقات. أفادت الدراسة أن نصف المشاركات يساهمن في النفقات الأسرية، بينما النصف الآخر لا يشاركن. وقد أفادت غالبية المشاركات غير المساهمات في النفقات الأسرية بتعرضهن للإكراه والمنع من العمل. وشملت أساليب الإكراه العنف الجسدي، والتلاعب العاطفي، والإساءة النفسية واللفظية. وكان أكثر المسيئين شيوعاً هم الأزواج، وكان السبب الشائع للعنف هو انخفاض الدخل، بينما تم الإبلاغ عن الإدمان كسبب شائع أيضاً.

الاستنتاج: الإساءة الاقتصادية شائعة بين الإناث، خاصة في الاقتصادات المنخفضة الدخل عند ارتباطها بانخفاض المستوى التعليمي أو وجود إدمان.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الإساءة الاقتصادية، مصريات، نساء، إدمان.