INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE, EMPLOYMENT, AND THE WORKPLACE
Consequences and Future Directions

JENNIFER E. SWANBERG
T. K. LOGAN
CAROLINE MACKE
University of Kentucky

The purpose of this article is to examine the literature on violence against women and employment. After a brief discussion of the definition and consequences of intimate partner violence, the article reviews the research and related literatures to describe the (a) types of job interference tactics used by abusers, (b) employee-level consequences of partner violence, (c) victimized employee responses to intimate partner violence, (d) organizational-level consequences of partner violence, and (e) employer responses to intimate partner violence. Future research directions and workplace implications are discussed.

Key words: *intimate partner violence, women's employment, workplace policy*

DURING THE PAST 30 YEARS, the percentage of women in the labor force has increased from 44% in 1973 to 59.5% in 2003, and women currently comprise 47% of the total labor force (U.S. Department of Labor, 2004). Yet the structure and culture of workplaces have failed to evolve as the needs of the contemporary workforce have changed (Bailyn, 1993; Bailyn, Drago, & Kochan, 2001; Googins, 1991; Williams, 2000). Numerous organizations still adhere to policies and practices that are explicitly and implicitly laden with gendered assumptions (Swanberg, 2004; Williams, 2000). As such, issues that disproportionately affect women compared to men have been marginalized by management (Williams, 2000). Research suggests organizations that consider employees' work and family concerns when making decisions pertaining to workplace policy often reap positive results for employees and employers (Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1998; Galinsky & Bond, 1998). Moreover, theory and research have demonstrated a reciprocal relationship between work and family, with the effects of one sphere positively or negatively influencing the other (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1994; Tenbrunsel, Brett, Moaz, Stroh, & Reilly, 1995). Regardless of the empirical and theoretical findings, workplaces have been slow to consider the complex lives of today's workforce when making organizational decisions (See Bailyn et al., 2001; Barnett, 1999). Such delays have critical implications for

women and families. In particular, organizations have lagged behind in recognizing that intimate partner violence is not just a domestic issue, but it has significant implications for the workplace

According to data from the National Violence Against Women Study,[1] lifetime prevalence rates of intimate partner violence have been estimated at 22.1% for women (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). The study further indicated that approximately 1.3 million women are subjected to intimate partner violence annually in the United States alone (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Other data suggest that women physically assaulted by an intimate partner in the past year were likely to experience 3.4 separate assaults (National Center for Injury Prevention and Control [NCIPC], 2003). Moreover, based on an analysis of the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) the NCIPC (2003) has estimated that 4.5 million assaults occur annually. Although these numbers are alarming, researchers believe that violence against women is underestimated because victims may underreport intimate partner violence on surveys (Bachman & Salzman, 1995; Straus & Gelles, 1990).

Data further indicate that intimate partner violence has serious workplace implications. According to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), between 1992 and 1996, an average of 18,000 people were assaulted by an intimate partner at work each year (Warchol, 1998). Women were 5 times more likely than men to be attacked at work by a current or former intimate partner (Bachman, 1994). Nearly 20% of all women fatally injured in the workplace were attacked by an intimate partner (Brownell, 1996). Research further purports that employees are almost as likely to be victimized at work by an intimate partner as by a coworker and female employees killed on the job are actually more likely to be killed by a partner than by a coworker (Warchol, 1998).

The consequences of intimate partner violence have major ramifications for the victimized employee (individual-level consequences) and the workplace where the victim is employed (organizational-level consequence). For instance, in one research study (Swanberg,

KEY POINTS OF THE RESEARCH REVIEW

- Job interference tactics used by male abusers generally fall into two primary categories: work disruption and on-the-job stalking and harassment.
- The consequences of job interference tactics have significant ramifications for victimized employees (individual-level consequences) and the places where they work (organizational-level consequences).
- Studies on the effect of intimate partner violence on victims' employment may be categorized into two types: empirical studies of the relationship between experiencing intimate partner violence and employment patterns; and empirical studies identifying and documenting the extent to which abusers' actions interfere with victims' ability to work and perform on the job.
- The reasons associated with whether and why women decide to tell someone at work about the abuse may depend on prevailing personal or organizational attitudes about intimate partner violence, the extent to which partner violence affects work performance, and the subsequent availability of workplace supports.
- Organizational consequences associated with intimate partner violence may result in higher production, health care, administration, and liability costs.
- Organizational responses to intimate partner violence when it traverses the boundaries of women's jobs appear to be unique to each organization. The stigma associated with partner violence may influence some employers' decisions, whereas other organizations consider partner violence a form of workplace violence.
- Limited extant research suggests that workplace supports provided to victimized employees may have positive short-term effects on employment outcomes.

Macke, & Logan, 2005), among employed women who recently filed domestic violence orders within the previous 12 months, 57% had been harassed on the phone by an abusive partner and 40% had been harassed in person or on the phone while on the job. Leone, M. Johnson, Cohan, and Lloyd (2004), using a random sample of low-income women ($N = 563$), found that as the physical violence increased in an intimate relationship, so did the likelihood that the victim would miss work. The short-term consequences of intimate partner violence on employment may result in increased absenteeism, reduced productivity, or job loss (Leone et al.,

2004; Raphael, 1996; Riger, Raja, & Camacho, 2002; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Tolman & Rosen, 2001), and long-term consequences may result in inconsistent work histories, underemployment, and reduced actual and potential earnings (Brush, 2003; Tolman & Raphael, 2000). It has been estimated that in total, victims lose $18 million annually in earnings (Greenfeld et al., 1998) and nearly $1 billion in lifetime earnings (NCIPC, 2003) because of missed work, job loss, and inability to maintain consistent employment. Leaving a good paying job for safety reasons or encountering difficulties securing meaningful work further complicates the economic hardships that women encounter when leaving an abusive relationship (see Sullivan, Basta, Tan, & Davidson, 1992; Sullivan, Campbell, Angelique, Eby, & Davidson, 1994).

At the organizational level, intimate partner violence results in significant costs to the employers in the form of decreased production and increased medical and liability costs (M. Bell et al., 2002; Wisner, Gilmer, Saltzman, & Zink, 1999). The Bureau of National Affairs (1990) has estimated that employers spend $3 billion to $5 billion dollars annually on consequences related to partner violence spilling over into the workplace. Expenditures include lost productivity, employee turnover, and health-care-related costs. Separating out the costs of lost productivity from paid work and household labor from the medical costs associated with partner violence, the NCIPC (2003) has estimated that partner violence costs nearly $1 billion in lost productivity. Considering the costs to individuals and organizations, workplaces need to recognize intimate partner violence as an employee issue, to establish workplace policies and procedures that will assist employees who may be experiencing partner violence, and to prevent or reduce the negative consequences when it does spill over into the workplace.

In the past decade, public policy, organizational psychologists, and management scholars have been instrumental in raising the awareness of this issue and its implications for women's financial security and for workplaces (Duffy, Scott, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Petty & Kosch, 2001; Tolman & Raphael, 2000; Violence Against Women Act [VAWA], 1994, 2000). However, only a limited number of studies in the scientific literature focus on the consequences of intimate partner violence on victims' employment and the places where they work. To maximize partner violence victims' economic security by reducing the risks associated with the negative affects of partner violence on women's labor force participation and on workplaces, the first step is to clearly understand the consequences of intimate partner violence on female victims' employment and on employers. To this end, this article examines the literature on intimate partner violence and employment. The article focuses on how violence against women affects women in their roles as paid employees and the places in which they work. After the Method section, intimate partner violence is defined and its consequences briefly summarized. The types of job interference tactics used by batterers are reviewed, proceeded by a review of the employee-level consequences of intimate partner violence, including its consequences on victims' employment patterns and job outcomes. The contexts associated with whether employees disclose their situation to someone at work are also discussed. Finally, the article reviews the organizational consequences of violence against women, including a discussion of employers' responses to the situation. Based on a review of the literature, future research directions and workplace implications are discussed.

METHOD

The literature on the relationship between intimate partner violence, employed victims, and workplaces were identified and collected using a variety of means. Multiple searches were conducted using the Academic Search Premier Engine, which includes access to nearly 4,200 journals covering the social sciences, humanities, general science, multicultural studies, and education. Three thousand of the journals in Academic Search Premier are peer reviewed, and some journals in the database go back as far as 1964. Key word searches using "domestic violence" and "employment," "domestic violence" and "work," "intimate partner violence" and "employment," and "intimate partner vio-

lence" and "work" were conducted. Books pertaining to intimate partner violence were reviewed for chapters focused on workplaces or employment. Books pertaining to workplace violence were reviewed for chapters focused on intimate partner violence as a form of workplace violence. Reference lists from articles pertaining to intimate partner and work were reviewed for relevant articles. In the end, articles and book chapters that primarily focused on the intersection between partner violence and employment were included in this review. In addition, investigators contacted scholars, requesting copies of relevant papers presented at academic conferences. Statistical information was drawn from federal Web sites, including the Department of Justice, Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Labor. In total, this literature review assimilates 96 articles, book chapters, and reports dating from 1981 to 2004 that are specific to partner violence and women's employment. Other references cited in the text were used for contextual purposes.

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Definitions

Working definitions of intimate partner violence vary from study to study. For this article's purpose, the definition of intimate partner violence was adopted from the CDC's definition, which is based on research conducted by Saltzman, Fanslow, McMahon, & Shelley (1999). As defined by the CDC, intimate partner violence is actual or threatened physical or sexual violence or psychological and emotional abuse directed toward a spouse, ex-spouse, current or former boyfriend or girlfriend, or current or former dating partner. Intimate partners may be heterosexual or of the same sex. Terms used to describe intimate partner violence are domestic abuse, spouse abuse, partner violence, rape, and battering, among others. Although it is recognized that female intimate partner violence against male intimates and same-sex intimate partner violence exist, for the purpose of

this article, intimate partner violence is specifically referring to male intimate partner violence against female intimates.

Extensive research pertaining to violence against women indicates that partner violence has deleterious effects on victims' physical and mental health (for a review, see Campbell, 2002; Campbell et al., 2002; Plitcha, 1996). The short- and long-term physical consequences of intimate partner violence include bruises, broken bones, loss of menstruation, bladder infection, concussions, migraine headaches, memory loss, and difficulty concentrating. Psychological consequences of intimate partner violence include heightened rates of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, drug and alcohol abuse, posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, and anxiety (Campbell, 2002; Campbell et al., 2002; Plitcha, 1996). Moreover, 41% of violent attacks by intimate partners that cause injury require medical attention, compared to 20% of stranger attacks involving injury (Bachman & Salzman, 1995).

Interference Tactics: Batterers' Effect on Employment

Exerting control over victim's employment or job opportunities is a form of victimization used by batterers' to intimidate their partners (MacMillan & Gartner, 1999). Studies have estimated that 36% to 75% of employed intimate partner violence victims were bothered by their abusive partners while at work (Shepard & Pence, 1988; Swanberg et al., 2005; Taylor & Barusch, 2004). For instance, Shepard and Spence (1988) conducted an exploratory quantitative study to examine the effect of intimate partner violence on women's work and ability to work. An employment survey was administered during two separate occasions to 71 women attending battered women support groups. The survey included a series of questions pertaining to employment status, effect of abuse on job performance, and the ability to obtain and maintain employment. Results indicated that 57% of respondents were harassed by phone or in person by their abusers while at work, with 21% stating that it occurred frequently. Similarly, another study focusing on the effects of intimate partner violence and

women's employment using a sample of women (*N* = 758) who received domestic violence orders (DVOs) in the Commonwealth of the Kentucky found that almost half reported sometime job interference tactics, including showing up at respondents' workplace or calling her incessantly (Swanberg et al., 2005). Job interference tactics identified in the literature reviewed fall into two primary categories: work disruption and on-the-job stalking and harassment. The following section reviews the three forms of interference tactics.

Work Disruption

Work disruption consists primarily of actions that prevent the victim from reaching the workplace either on time or at all; as such, these actions predominantly take place in the home or off the workplace premises. The studies that focus on this topic reported a variety of work disruption behaviors (see, e.g., Brandwein, 2000; Brush, 2000, 2001; Libbus, Sable, Huneke, & Anger, 1999; Raphael, 1995, 1996; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Taylor & Barusch, 2004). In particular, results from a national, 12-site welfare-to-work quantitative evaluation indicated that participants' abusers disrupted employment efforts by depriving victim of sleep; refusing to care for children while participant went to work; hiding or destroying clothing, books, or car keys; inflicting physical injury on participant prior to work; turning off the alarm clock; cutting off participants' hair; preventing her from going to work; or creating an embarrassing or threatening situation at participants' work (Raphael, 1995, 1996). Among women in three domestic violence shelters located in urban settings, 46% of their partners prohibited them from getting a job (Riger, Ahrens, Blickenstaff, & Camacho, 1998). Qualitative studies reported similar findings. Brandwein (2000) conducted a qualitative study of 24 ethnically diverse battered women receiving public assistance in two regionally disparate states. The study collected its focus group sample of women from mental health programs, domestic violence shelters, and welfare-to-work programs during a 3-year period. Respondents reported such sabotage tactics as hiding clothes, not showing up to care for young children, or beating women prior to work, thereby preventing her from reporting to her job. Moe and M. Bell's (2004) qualitative study of women residing in domestic violence shelters (*N* = 19) suggests similar themes. The sample was diverse with respects to race, ethnicity, age, education, socioeconomic status, and occupation. In particular, 20% of the sample reported being poor or homeless, 53% as low income or working class, and 21% as middle class. Physical ramifications of the abuse (bruises, cuts, ripped clothing) was a primary way that abusers disrupted women's employment. For instance, one respondent, who had worked in various full-time jobs, reported that her work history was "sporadic because he had no problem beating me up. I could not move on so I would have to call in and say I could not make it" (Moe & M. Bell, 2004, p. 40). In an investigation of the effects of partner violence on Black and White women's employment, Brush (2001) discovered that "poor White and Black women face somewhat different efforts by men to control behavior . . . directly efforts to control or punish women for seeking work outside the house seemed more characteristic of the experiences of White women" (p. 83).

On-the-Job Stalking and Harassment

Stalking is generally defined as the unwelcome and repeated harassing or threatening behavior directed at one individual (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1997; Westrum & Fremouw, 1998). Examples of stalking behavior include following a person, appearing outside a person's home or place of business, leaving written messages or objects, or vandalizing a person's property. Analysis of the NVAWS reveals that 81% of women who were stalked by an intimate also reported physical assault by that same partner, and 31% also reported sexual assault by that partner (National Institute of Justice & Centers for Disease Control, 1998). Lifetime prevalence rates suggest that between 5% and 8% of women will be stalked at some time in their life (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998, 2000). Recent prevalence (within the past 12 months) rates suggest that between 0.5% and 1.0% of women suffer at

the hands of a stalker (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998, 2000).

Although the formal definition of stalking includes harassing behaviors, we have explicitly identified both types of job interference behaviors within this one category because the research examining the intersection of intimate partner violence and employment often describes on-the-job stalking behaviors separately from on-the-job harassment behaviors. For instance, examples of stalking incidences identified in the literature included perpetrator looking into the window of the workplace, perpetrator waiting for the victim at the end of the workday, or perpetrator waiting for victim along her commuting route (Raphael, 1996; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). On-the-job harassing incidents were identified as events whereby the perpetrator physically appeared on the workplace premises or when the perpetrator made telephone calls to victims, their coworkers, or supervisors.

Workplaces are popular places to hassle victims among perpetrators because the work location often remains unchanged even when the residence has changed (i.e., when women leave their partners), and they know where their partners or former partners are located during certain time periods (Chenier, 1998; Libbus et al., 1999). In the literature reviewed, the prevalence of on-the job stalking ranged from 35% to 52% (Raphael, 1996; Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Tolman & Rosen, 2001). Swanberg et al.'s (2005) previously described study revealed that 35% of the employed or recently employed victims of intimate partner violence had been stalked by their abusive partner within the past year. Raphael's (1996) study of a dozen welfare-to-work programs, also previously described, identified stalking as a frequent interference tactic used by batterers. Similar patterns emerged in Swanberg and Logan's (2005) qualitative study of employed or recently employed victims of partner violence. Using a cross-section sample of women (N = 34) residing in the community, in shelters, or in drug treatment programs, the authors interviewed and conducted focus groups during a 6-month period to better understand how partner victimization affected their job and to determine the context surrounding the decision pertaining to disclosure. Fifty-two percent of participants reported specifically being stalked at work. A few participants stated that partners' stalking behaviors created more stress and anxiety than harassing at her at work because the former behavior is "so unpredictable." This finding is not surprising because the creation of elevated stress and anxiety is common among stalking victims (Schell, 2003). Finally, an employer-based survey of 46 Canadian corporations shed a slightly different perspective on stalking in the workplace (Schell, 2003). The cross-section study took place from January 1995 through January 2000, during which time 46 firms were randomly selected from 1,782 corporations listed in a Canadian-based human resource directory to participate in a survey focused on the prevalence of stalking and sexual harassment among employees. Eight of the 46 firms reported stalking incidents in their organizations. In total, 19 stalking incidents were reported to human resource professionals in the 5-year span of the study. A spouse or boyfriend perpetrated 32% of report stalking cases.

The prevalence of on-the-job harassment ranged from 8% to 75% (see, e.g., Brush, 2000, 2002; Friedman & Couper, 1987; Stanley, 1992; Swanberg et al., 2005; Taylor & Barusch, 2004; Tolman & Rosen, 2001). On-the-job harassment behaviors included appearing at work, disallowing employed victims to complete work functions (Brush, 2002; Friedman & Couper, 1987; Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Taylor & Barusch, 2004), or making frequent telephone calls to victims, coworkers, or supervisors (Brush, 2000; Friedman & Couper, 1987; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). For instance, one study conducted by the Victim Services Unit in New York surveyed employed or recently employed intimate partner victims (N = 50) to better understand how violent partners interfere with women's work (Friedman & Couper, 1987). Seventy-five percent of respondents reported that their abusive partner harassed them on the job either in person or on the phone during the previous 12 months. Comparable findings were reported by Stanley's (1992) study of women victimized by their partners and receiving services from a domestic violence

intervention service agency (*N* = 118) in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Among the sample of employed or recently employed respondents (*n* = 82), 70% were telephoned excessively while at work. Swanberg et al. (2005), in their previously mentioned study, reported that in the previous 12 months, 40% of respondents were harassed in person by an intimate partner, 34% had been threatened at work, and 24% reported that an intimate partner bothered their coworkers on the job. Similar results emerged from an in-depth, descriptive study of long-term welfare recipients (Browne, Salomon, & Bassuk, 1999). Through a random sampling selection process using a population of women who had received public assistance for at least 36 months, women (*N* = 285) were interviewed in person to identify the barriers to employment. Among this sample, 42% had been harassed at work during the previous year.

Other research investigations indicated that on-the-job harassment occurred less frequently. Using the first wave of the Women's Employment Study, a three-wave study of welfare recipients in an urban Michigan county, Tolman and Rosen (2001) examined the prevalence of domestic violence and its association with health, mental health, and economic well-being. The sample (*N* = 753) were all recipients of welfare in February 1997, racially mixed single mothers between the ages of 18 and 54, and residents of the one Michigan county. Lifetime prevalence of on-the-job harassment was 23% and recent prevalence 6%. Similarly, Lloyd's (1997) analysis of data from a random household survey designed to determine the effects of domestic violence on the labor force participation (*N* = 824) of women living in a low-income Chicago neighborhood revealed comparable results. Among the sample of female respondents (employed and unemployed) who were or had been in a adult relationship with a man (*n* = 802), 8.7% of the sample reported on-the-job harassment by phone and 7.8% reported on the job harassment in person during their lifetime. In another study (Brush, 2000), among 122 women enrolled in a 4-week job-training program, 21% percent of participants were threatened or harassed at work by phone or in person. The significantly lower percentages of on-the-job

harassment in these studies may be partly explained by the sample selection criteria.

Victimized Employee-Level Consequences of Partner Violence

The consequences of job sabotage tactics have significant ramifications for victimized employees (individual-level consequences) and the workplaces where they are employed (organizational-level consequences). This section of the article discusses the individual-level consequence of intimate partner violence spilling over into the workplace and then examines responses that victims take to manage the situation at work.

Information gleaned from the limited small studies suggests that 66% to 96% of employed victims of partner violence report that employment was disrupted in some way because of the partner victimization (Friedman & Couper, 1987; Stanley, 1992; Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Tolman & Rosen, 2001). For example, in a previously described study by Swanberg et al. (2005), 71% of respondents were unable to concentrate at work because of partner victimization within the past year and 63% were unable to perform on the job to the best of their ability within the past year. Forty-six of respondents went home sick because they were too upset about the partner victimization during the previous 12 months. Stanley (1992) and Friedman and Couper (1987) reported similar findings. Respectively, 96% of employed victims of partner violence reported that their jobs were somehow affected by the victimization, including missing work, a decreased ability to concentrate at work, and being reprimanded by employers for problems resulting from abuse.

Yet the research pertaining to the relationship between partner violence and employment, including victims' employment patterns, is complex. Studies focusing on the effect of intimate partner violence on victims' employment falls into two general categories: empirical studies of the relationship between experiencing intimate partner violence and employment patterns; and empirical studies identifying and documenting the extent to which abusers' action interfere

with victims' ability to work and perform on the job.

Intimate Partner Violence and Employment Patterns

The studies focusing on the relationship between partner violence and employment patterns are inconclusive; that is, it is difficult to determine at this time the effect that intimate partner violence has on short-term and long-term job stability, employability, and earnings (for a review, see Riger & Staggs, 2004; Tolman & Raphael, 2000). In their comprehensive literature review of research on welfare and domestic violence, Tolman and Raphael (2000) reported that some victims of partner violence struggle to be employed, others manage to obtain employment but fail to maintain it, and still others cannot obtain employment at all. Thus, the authors conclude that partner violence does interfere with employment but does not necessarily prevent it. That is, data suggest that partner violence does not affect employment status; rather, it affects the victim's ability to sustain consistent employment for long periods of time. Danziger, Corcoran, Danziger, and Heflin (2000), in their review of the literature pertaining to welfare reform and employment, suggested that individual factors such as domestic violence were not significantly associated with employment. But rather the combination of a multitude of factors was predictive of the probability of employment.

Two analyses of one cross-sectional sample (N = 824) of women in a randomly selected household survey in a low-income area of Chicago report no evidence to suggest that victims of partner violence are employed at different rates than their nonvictim counterparts (Lloyd, 1997; Lloyd & Taluc, 1999). More specifically, Lloyd's (1997) analysis indicated that women who experienced partner violence were as likely to be employed as women who had not experienced such victimization. However, her findings further imply that victims of partner violence were more likely to have been unemployed in the past and that partner violence may depress socioeconomic status and occupational attainment over time. Correspondingly, using the same data set, Lloyd and Taluc's (1999) multivariate analyses found additional evidence to suggest that, "although women who experienced male violence were as likely to be currently employed as those who did not, they were more likely to have been unemployed in the past . . . and to have higher rates of welfare receipt" (p. 370). Meisel, Chandler, and Rienzi (2003), using a sample of women receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) in California (N = 632), found that women with battering partners were less likely to be employed, but if women were working, they worked the same amount of hours as women without battering partners.

Another study provides additional evidence to suggest that the long-term relationship between partner violence and women's employment is complex. Data from a longitudinal study of an ethnically diverse group of extremely poor women (N = 285) were analyzed to determine the relationship between partner violence and work over a period of time (Browne et al., 1999). Controlling for demographic, psychosocial, and health factors, Browne, et al. (1999) found that "women who were victimized by male intimate partners during the previous year had only one third the odds of maintaining employment for at least 30 hours per week for 6 months or more during the subsequent year as compared to women without victimization experiences" (p. 417). Furthermore, the authors reported that the effect was even greater for women working 40 hours or more per week. Specifically, women working full-time who had been recently victimized (within the past year) were only about 20% as likely to work full-time for 6 months or more the following year, compared to nonvictimized women.

Longitudinal research further underscores the complexity associated with partner victimization and employment. Honeycutt, Marshall, and Weston's (2001) study of victimization among low-income women receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children or food stamps (N = 836) failed to reveal a direct relationship between victimization and employment. Victimization itself did not prevent women from working. Rather, multiple regression analyses reveal a more complex relationship; abuse by past partners was related to current employment only among White women,

whereas partner victimization (current or past) did not have any effect on Black women's employment. Votruba-Drzal, Lohman, and Chase-Lansdale's (2002) investigation of the association between welfare, employment transition, and domestic abuse among 2,128 participants suggest that women who remain on welfare (and unemployed) are subject to higher rates of abuse, whereas women who successfully transition into work experience have fewer incidences of partner violence. Partner violence in this study was not associated with obtaining work, but rather the prevalence of partner violence was more predictive of long-term employment. Riger, Staggs, and Schewe's (2004) findings from the first three waves of a panel study of welfare reform in Illinois ($N = 962$) imply that a lifetime of partner violence was not significantly associated with work stability.

Intimate Partner Violence and Employee Outcome Consequences

Although it is difficult to draw persuasive and strong conclusions about the relationship between intimate partner violence and long-term employment because of the limited studies conducted to date on employed partner violence victims, studies that identify and document the extent to which abusers' actions interfere with victims' ability to work and perform on the job appear to be more conclusive. Overall, the research seems to be in agreement that compared to nonvictims, victims of partner violence are more likely to report lower productivity, higher absenteeism rates, more frequent tardiness, and higher job turnover rates and job losses (Raphael, 1996; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Tolman & Rosen, 2001). The following section reviews the research literature pertaining to the following four negative job-related consequences of partner violence: reduced productivity, increase absenteeism, increased tardiness, and job loss.

Productivity. Using absenteeism, tardiness, and the ability to concentrate as proxy measures for productivity, several cross-section studies report that the partner violence victims' productivity was compromised by partners' victimization (Brush, 2000, 2002; Raphael, 1996; Stanley,

1992; Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Swanberg et al. (2005) found that 71% of employed or recently employed women reported that they were unable to concentrate at work because of the abuse. Twenty-three percent were unable to concentrate on a daily basis and 17.5% on a weekly basis. Sixty-three percent were unable to perform on the job to the best of their ability during the previous year; 8% of the sample were affected daily and 9% were affected weekly. Likewise, Swanberg and Logan's (2005) study reported that more than half of the participants interviewed were unable to concentrate in the past year because of partner victimization. In one case, the woman eventually lost her job despite her determination to stay focused at work. The lack of concentration may result from before-work circumstances, on-the-job harassment, phone harassment, stalking, or depression resulting from the abuse (Friedman, Tucker, Neville, & Imperial, 1996; Raphael, 1996; Stanley, 1992; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). As an example, Stanley's (1992) study of 82 battered employed women, who were enrolled in domestic-violence-related treatment services, reported that 70% of participants were too distracted by the violence to perform well at work. Data also suggest that partner violence victims' inability to concentrate is strongly associated with their fear of the perpetrator (Raphael, 1996; Swanberg & Logan, 2005).

Absenteeism. Partner violence victims also have significant absenteeism rates (Brush, 2002; H. Johnson, 1995; Sable, Libbus, Huneke, & Anger, 1999; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Swanberg et al., 2005). Research found that between 23% and 54% of employed partner violence victims reported being absent from work because of the abuse, with between 4% and 6% reporting that this happened frequently (Allard, Albelda, Collen, & Cosenza, 1997; Friedman & Couper, 1987; Raphael, 1996; Sable et al, 1999; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Stanley, 1992; Taylor & Barusch, 2004; Tolman & Rosen, 2001). Friedman and Couper (1987) found that 54% of their employed, victimized female sample had missed an average of 3 days of work per month because of injuries, shame, depression, or attending ap-

pointments with lawyers or law enforcement for issues directly related to the partner violence. Taylor and Barusch (2004) reported that 36% of women receiving public assistance had to stay home from work because of domestic violence. Swanberg et al. (2005) found that 25% of employed or recently employed women applying for domestic violence orders called in sick to work during the previous 12 months because they were "too upset to go in," with 4% calling in weekly and 11% calling in at least monthly.

Other evidence suggesting that intimate partner violence interferes with women's steady job attendance includes a cross-section study ($N = 734$) of women receiving public welfare in Massachusetts (Allard et al., 1997). This research study found that women were more likely to be absent from work if their partner/boyfriend preferred that they not be employed. In addition, women reported having to work early (Brush, 2002; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Brush's (2002) examination of women receiving welfare recipients and enrolled in "work-first" activities in a Pittsburgh program site reported that 27% had to leave work early because of issues surrounding partner violence. The culmination of similar findings led Raphael and Tolman (1997) to conclude that victims with a partner who does not want them to be employed were more likely to miss work or report late.

Tardiness. Employed intimate partner violence victims also experience significant tardiness rates (Friedman & Couper, 1987; Raphael, 1996; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). The studies conducted to date, using a sample of employed partner violence victims, which are both small and limited in scope, suggest that 50% to 65% of partner violence victims reported being late for work or leaving work early because of the victimization (see, e.g., Friedman & Couper, 1987; Raphael, 1996; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Specifically, Friedman and Couper (1987) found that almost two thirds of respondents reported that they were late to work because of the abuse; specific reasons included being too exhausted after the violent incidents occurring the night before,

needing extra time to don make up to cover the bruises, and waiting for pain medication to take effect. Moreover, 20% of the sample was late for work because their partners tried to prevent them from going to work by engaging in a variety of pre-work tactics. Raphael (1996) found that 13% of the victims who reported being late to work also reported that this type of tardiness occurred frequently. Similarly, Swanberg and Logan (2005) found that nearly two thirds of participants reported to work late frequently because of batterers' pre-work tactics. Reported reasons for tardiness in the last two studies included batterer turning off alarm clock, women being too exhausted after violent or aggressive incidents the night before, batterer physically restraining women from leaving for work, batterer hiding her car keys, and batterer refusing at the last minute to assist with child care.

Job loss and turnover rates. Cross-sectional studies indicate that 5% to 27% of victims reported a job loss as a direct result of the partner violence (Riger et al., 2002; Romero, Chavkin, Wise, & Smith, 2003; Sable et al, 1999; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Stanley, 1992; Swanberg & Logan, 2005) and, in some cases, partner violence victims experience higher job turnover rates than nonvictims (Lloyd, 1997; Lloyd & Taluc, 1999; Romero et al., 2003; Zachary, 2000). Romero et al.'s (2003) longitudinal study of low-income mothers of children with chronic illness ($N = 504$) found that women with victimization histories were more than twice as likely to lose a job because of health issues than nonvictimized women: 26% versus 10%, respectively. Shepard and Pence (1988) reported that 24% of their sample of employed victimized women lost a job in the past year as a direct result of the abuse. Similarly, 30% of participants in another study, described earlier, reported that the abuse had caused them to lose a job (Stanley, 1992). Swanberg et al. (2005) found that 27% of respondents quit a job in the past year because of intimate partner violence, and 12% reported that they lost a job or failed a class because of partner victimization. And, finally, a descriptive study of female Aid to Family with Dependent Children recipients ($N = 404$) living in Kansas City, Missouri, revealed that 5% had lost a job as a

direct result of the intimate partner violence (Sable et al., 1999).

Reasons women quit their jobs include feeling shame associated with the victimization situation, fear for their own and their children's safety, embarrassment associated with abusers' continued on-the-job harassment, unreliability of child care, children's health issues, or because abuser forced them to resign (Moe & M. Bell, 2004; Riger et al., 2002; Romero et al., 2003; Sable et al., 1999; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). More specifically, Moe and M. Bell (2004) found that battered women sometimes quit a job because the physical injuries sustained from abusers' assaults were too severe to continue working or they feared for their life, and to avoid future victimization, they had to leave their jobs. One woman in the qualitative study, prior to being raped by her boyfriend, had been successfully attending school and balancing motherhood with three jobs. However, she ultimately had to quit all three of her jobs and move cross-country by bus to flee from her abusive boyfriend. Riger et al. (2002) reported similar findings. Using life narrative interviews with 57 women recruited from three urban domestic violence shelters, Riger and her colleagues set out to understand the multilayered impact that intimate partner violence has on its victims' lives. With respects to employment, many of the respondents stated that they were unable to complete their education or hold a job because of the physical evidence of the partner violence. Physical injuries prevented women from going to work, and sometimes women were asked to resign because of a visible injury.

Regardless of the reason, be it termination or resignation, intimate partner violence victims lose their jobs because of the abuse. The high job turnover rates noted in the previously mentioned studies may explain the more frequent spells of unemployment experienced by victims in studies such as Lloyd and Taluc's (1999). In addition, for some women the lack of consistent, long-standing employment may also in part explain the lower relative personal income of partner violence victims as compared to nonvictims (Lloyd & Taluc, 1999). Nonetheless, job loss either by resignation or termination by employers for behaviors related to partner victim-

ization is likely to compromise women's economic security, leading some women to turn to public assistance for financial assistance (Allard et al., 1997; Moe & M. Bell, 2004; Tolman & Raphael, 2000). Research has documented the importance of financial independence in overcoming violent relationships (Campbell, Rose, Kub, & Nedd, 1998; Gelles, 1976; Lloyd, 1997; Moe & M. Bell, 2004; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Strube & Barbour, 1984), yet for some women leaving a job to secure safety may lead to another form of insecurity—economic insecurity. As an example, Moe and M. P. Bell (2004) found in their qualitative study that several women quit high-paying jobs to secure safety for themselves and their family. Oftentimes, some women had to rely on TANF, and other women took lower-paying jobs in new communities.

Employee Responses to Partner Violence: Disclosure—To Tell or Not to Tell

A body of research literature suggests that employees with social supports at work, be it a coworker or supervisor, are more likely to be "happy workers" and to have longer job tenures than employees without social supports (see T. D. Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000, for review; Bond et al., 1998; Galinsky & Bond, 1998). Specific to intimate partner violence, social support can provide coping resources that can mitigate the effects of threatening events and experiences (Thoits, 1986). Moreover, research suggests that victimized women with high levels of perceived social support are more likely to disclose to nonfamily members (Rhodes & McKenzie, 1998; Yoshioka, Gilbert, El-Bassel, & Baig-Amin, 2003) and, in combination with other protective factors such as employment, good health, and self-esteem, report lower levels of anxiety and depression (Carlson, McNutt, Choi, & Rose, 2002). Yet, in many cases, the stigma associated with intimate partner violence silences many of its victims and isolates them from support networks on the job. As such, this may prevent employed intimate partner violence victims from telling anyone at work about their situation (Lemon, 2001; Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Swanberg & Van Kempen, in press).

Lemon (2001), in a legal argument for employment rights of domestic violence victims, posited that employed victims of intimate partner violence often remain silent at work because they fear losing their job. Empirical studies concur with this claim. For instance, 33% of employed or recently employed women victims who recently filed a domestic violence order against their partners did not tell their employer (Swanberg et al., 2005). Some of the reasons why respondents remained silent at work about their home situation included victims' embarrassment about the situation, victims not wanting to be stigmatized, victims felt it was a personal issue not to be discussed at work, co-workers were partners' friends, partner worked in the same workplace and she feared if she told someone at work and her partner found this out, the violence would escalate. Similar results were found in Swanberg and Van Kempen (in press). Using cross-sectional data collected from a workplace violence survey distributed to all employees at one organization located in the southeastern region of the United States (N = 868), authors investigated the prevalence of intimate partner violence at one job site and the contexts associated with disclosure. Among the sample of employees with recent intimate partner violence histories (n = 34) 56% did not inform someone at work about the partner victimization. Reasons for not disclosing fell into three main categories: (a) victims felt partner violence was a personal issue and should not be brought into the workplace (64%), (b) they felt embarrassed and/or ashamed (32%), and (c) they did not feel people at work could be trusted (3%). In a related qualitative study pertaining to battered women's perceptions and experiences of disclosing their partner victimization histories to case managers (N = 10), women identified several factors that influenced their decision to disclose (Busch & Wolfer, 2002). Perceptions about potential negative consequences of disclosure, diminished perceptions of choice about whether to disclose or not, and intuitive feelings about their case managers affected women's decision about how and what to tell their case managers. Finally, Lemon (2001) suggested four other reasons why victims may be reluctant to come forward about their abuse-related situa-

tion, namely, (a) that the batterer may seek revenge if he discovers that she revealed information to the employer; (b) that he may be responsible for the abuse; (c) that the batterer, whom the victim may care about, will be harmed; and (d) that the employer may not care about or have time for the abuse-related problems" (p. 830).

Although issues of privacy and fear of job loss concern some employed victims of partner violence, other victims found informing someone at work to be a useful strategy (Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Swanberg & Van Kempen, in press). The following section reviews three studies that specifically explored the context associated with whether employed victims opt to tell someone at work about their situation.

In the first study previously described, 66% of employed or recently employed (N = 518) women who filed for domestic violence orders in the Commonwealth of Kentucky reported telling someone at work about the partner violence at home (Swanberg et al., 2005). Among the respondents who told someone at work (n = 331), 59% told their immediate supervisor, 46% informed a coworker or fellow student, 6% told a supervisor that was not their immediate supervisor, and fewer than 1% informed a human resources professional, an employee assistance professional, or security. Some of the reasons employees told someone at work included providing reasons for why respondent quit her job, called in sick or appeared upset at work, needing someone to confide in, explaining physical evidence of abuse, needing to inform someone that she feared for safety, and wanting to explain poor work performance to prevent being fired.

Similar results emerged from the second study, also described earlier in this article (Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Forty-six percent of respondents informed supervisors or managers and 43% informed a coworker about their victimization situation, despite women's concerns about the reactions and subsequent actions that might transpire. Safety concerns, needing time off, or wanting to explain workplace absences were reasons that influenced employees to tell someone at work. Respondents also opted to

TABLE 1: Corporate Attitudes Pertaining to Partner Violence

- 57% of senior corporate executives believe partner violence is a major social problem
- 33% of senior corporate executives believe partner violence has a negative impact on their companies' bottom line
- 40% of senior corporate executives reported that they were personally aware of employees and other individuals affected by partner violence
- 66% of senior corporate executives believe that their organization's financial performance would benefit from addressing partner violence within the organization
- 47% of senior corporate executives believe that partner violence has a negative impact on their organization's productivity
- 44% of senior corporate executives believe that partner violence increases the health care costs of the organization
- 94% of security directors from 248 companies across 27 states ranked partner violence as "high" on the scale of security problems
- 78% of human resource professionals polled by *Personnel Journal* said domestic violence is a workplace issue

SOURCE: Family Violence Prevention Fund (2003).

disclose because they assumed people "figured out what was going on." The third study echoes findings from the first two research investigations (Swanberg & Van Kempen, in press). Forty-four percent of employed victims of intimate partner violence informed someone at work about their home situation. Victims disclosed to coworkers (64%), immediate supervisors (29%), non-immediate supervisors (21%), or other people within the workplace (14%). Reasons why respondents informed someone at work included the need for advice/support (26%), support from friends (23.5%), expressing feelings to someone (18%), legal protection or for safety purposes (15%), informing supervisor of reason for seeming "stressed out" (12%), and telling supervisor before someone else did (5.5%).

The limited available research pertaining to disclosure implies that a victim's decision to disclose or not disclose in the workplace may be dependent on the possible prevailing personal and/or organizational attitudes about intimate partner violence, the extent to which the intimate partner violence impacts their work performance, and the subsequent availability of workplace supports. Furthermore, as will be discussed later in this article, the limited research to date suggests an overall positive experience with disclosing victimization to someone at work.

Organizational-Level Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence and Employer Responses

Until recently, intimate partner violence has been a social problem that has virtually been ig-
nored by workplaces (Duffy et al., 2005; Friedman et al., 1996; P. R. Johnson & Indvik, 1999; Petty & Kosch, 2001). Within the past decade, some organizations have become more aware of intimate partner violence as a social problem and its associated economic and social costs and consequences to workplaces. As a result, some firms have taken action to combat this social issue at the workplace level. Data suggest that 10,000 to 60,000 intimate partner violence incidents are perpetrated within the workplace each year (Bachman, 1994; Warchol, 1998). As noted in the information compiled from several studies pertaining to employer views of intimate partner violence by the Family Violence Prevention Fund (2003), there is an awareness of the problem but not a consensus on the workplace consequences associated with the social problem (see Table 1). There also appears to be a lack of information about how to keep victims and others safe at the workplace when violence spills over into the workplace.

The organizational consequences associated with intimate partner violence, when it is either ignored as a personnel issue or disregarded as a work-related issue, have the possibility of costing employers enormous sums of money (Bureau of National Affairs, 1990). In contrast, when the social issue is addressed as a workplace issue, the social and economic costs can be significantly reduced (Friedman et al., 1996; Pereira, 1995; Petty & Kosch, 2001). Identifying and quantifying these costs is a critical first step in convincing organizations that intimate partner violence has major social and economic consequences for workplaces and that action is needed to eradicate its radiating effects (Duffy et al., 2005). The following section reviews the

limited literature on the four types of organizational costs associated with intimate partner violence: production, medical, administrative, and liability costs; and it reviews the current knowledge about employers' responses to intimate partner violence.

Organizational Costs

When partner violence spills over into the workplace, in addition to affecting the primary target, negative consequences are likely to transfer to secondary victims (M. Bell, Moe, & Schweinle, 2002; Brownell, 1996; Kinney, 1995; Riger et al., 2002; Zachary, 2000). Secondary victims are individuals who are not the intended target of the aggressive or violent episode but rather are accidentally injured or harmed by it. In the workplace, this might include coworkers or supervisors of the primary target, customers, or other individuals who happen to be in the work area at the time of the partner violence episode. Secondary victims may be traumatized or harmed by witnessing an event or suffering from physical assault. As a result, they may suffer similar negative effects including physical and psychological health problems (M. Bell et al., 2002; Brownell, 1996; Duffy et al., 2005; Kinney, 1995). In turn, these health effects may result in similar consequences as experienced by the primary victims' reduced productivity, increased tardiness, and increased turnover/job loss. Regardless of its victims, intimate partner violence has significant costs to workplaces, employees, customers, and other bystanders. The foremost organizational costs incurred because of partner violence include production costs, medical costs, administrative costs, and liability costs (P. R. Johnson & Indvik, 1999; Reynolds, 1997; VAWA, 1998; Zachary, 2000).

Production costs. As was noted earlier, primary and secondary victims of partner violence often display lowered productivity within the organization as a direct result of intimate partner violence (M. Bell et al., 2002; Brownell, 1996; East, 1999; H. Johnson, 1995; Kinney, 1995; Raphael, 1996; Zachary, 2000). More than half of intimate partner violence victims miss 3 or more workdays per month (Zachary, 2000). Lowered productivity may result from partner violence

victims' use of work time to secure resources or make phone calls prohibited at home (Wilson, 1997). Such lowered productivity at the individual level results in an overall lowered productivity of the company, involving a lowered quality and/or quantity of organizational output (Brownell, 1996; Chenier, 1998; P. R. Johnson & Indvik, 1999; Zachary, 2000).

Medical costs. The second prominent cost increase experienced by organizations because of partner violence occurs in the area of medical expenses. Primary and secondary victims of partner violence experience negative physical and psychological effects of such abuse much more so than the general population (see Campbell et al., 2002; Plitcha, 1996, for review). As a result, the physical and mental health effects faced by intimate partner violence victims result in increased employee benefit costs, increased health insurance premiums, and increased sick leave expenditures (M. Bell et al., 2002; Brownell, 1996; Chenier, 1998; Greenfeld et al., 1998; P. R. Johnson & Indvik, 1999; Reynolds, 1997; Wisner et al., 1999; Zachary, 2000). An analysis of the NCVS[2] conducted by Greenfeld et al. (1998) indicates that partner violence victims incur $24 million annually in medical expenses, much of which again is borne by employers. Wisner et al.'s (1999) analysis of the computerized cost data for 126 identified victims of intimate partner violence in a large health plan in two Minnesota cities found that $1,775 more was spent on each intimate partner violence victim annually as compared to a random sample of female health plan enrollees. This cost differential can be accounted for by more hospitalizations, higher general clinic use, higher mental health services use, and more out-of-plan referrals for intimate partner violence victims as compared to their nonvictim counterparts (Wisner et al., 1999).

Administrative and liability costs. Increased absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover of primary and secondary victims result in increased administrative costs for the organization (M. Bell et al., 2002; Brownell, 1996; Chenier, 1998; P. R. Johnson & Indvik, 1999; Reynolds, 1997; Zachary, 2000). These administrative costs in-

clude leave or transfer costs, separation costs, and replacement costs (i.e., hiring and training costs) (M. Bell et al., 2002).

Legal liability is also an important consideration for organizations managing the repercussions of partner violence. Employers are obligated to protect employees at work from "recognized hazards that are causing or are likely to cause death or serious harm . . . . to employees," as is stipulated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) General Duty Clause (Chenier, 1998; P. R. Johnson & Indvik, 1999; Petty & Kosch, 2001). According to Petty and Kosch (2001), "employers are obligated to do everything reasonably necessary to protect the life, safety, and health of employees" (p. 461). This suggests that once an employer has been informed of a potential partner-violence-related risk situation, they may be held liable if reasonable steps were not taken to protect the safety of the employees. If the organization was aware of an impending danger yet did not take steps to prevent it, OSHA may fine the organization between $25,000 and $70,000 for serious health hazard (Petty & Kosch, 2001). Additional costs borne by employers as a result of partner violence include increased security costs, increased workers' compensation costs, increased legal costs, lost business, damaged reputation, and damaged property (M. Bell et al., 2002; Chenier, 1998; P. R. Johnson & Indvik, 1999).

Employer Responses

The previous cost assessments associated with partner violence expose the possible fiscal liability that organizations are likely to incur if and when intimate partner violence is disregarded as a workplace concern. Although more than half of business executives recognize intimate partner violence as a workplace issue with significant organizational costs, research suggests that few organizations have taken an active stance against intimate partner violence or have developed formal policies for dealing with it (P. R. Johnson & Indvik, 1999). Among the few organizations that have taken the issue seriously, the *Wall Street Journal* (1995) suggested that a concern to "keep talent, reduce absenteeism, and avoid liability" has been moving orga-

nizations to take action against domestic abuse (Pereira, 1995, p. B1). For instance, corporations including Liz Claiborne, Polaroid Corporation, and CoreStates Financial Corporation have developed a set of company-wide personnel and management policies and support services specifically tailored to victims of partner violence (Friedman et al., 1996). As a result, they have set an example for other businesses to follow (Friedman et al., 1996; Pereira, 1995; Petty & Kosch, 2001).

Although some firms are working to reduce the risk of intimate partner violence when it carries over into the workplace by creating prevention and protection programs, the limited number of studies on the issue also suggests that employers sometime respond to intimate partner violence incidents by terminating the primary victim (M. Bell et al., 2002; Browne et al., 1999; Shepard & Pence, 1988; Stanley, 1992). For instance, Shepard and Pence (1988) found that 44% of their sample of battered women ($N = 71$) had been reprimanded or fired by their employer for excessive absences, tardiness, and poor productivity. Likewise, 12% to 56% of employed partner violence victims experienced such consequences in their lifetime (Friedman & Couper, 1987; Lloyd, 1997; Raphael, 1996). Furthermore, although participants did not identify termination as the reason for job loss, Browne et al. (1999) reported that only one third of women in their study were able to maintain a job for 6 months or more the year following a partner violence incident. Findings suggest that there is no one "typical" way that an organization responds to intimate partner violence as a workplace problem. Although the stigma associated with intimate partner violence might drive the decisions of some employers, research suggests that others recognize intimate partner violence as a workplace problem comparable to other forms of violence that emerge within work settings, and thus actions need to be taken to keep employees and customers safe.

Workplace Supports

During the past two decades, some organizations have introduced workplace policies and procedures, often referred to as "family-friendly policies," to assist employees in man-

aging work and family responsibilities (Galinsky & Bond, 1998). "Family-friendly" supports generally take the form of either informal or formal policies or programs. Examples of informal workplace supports might include a supervisor/coworker offering a listening ear or allowing occasional flexibility with starting and quitting times. Examples of formal workplace supports include Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), flexible schedule arrangements, and management training programs pertaining to work/family issues (Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Swanberg & Van Kempen, in press). Although research has reported positive individual and organizational outcomes with the adoption of family-friendly workplace practices (T. D. Allen et al., 2000, for review; Bond et al., 1998; Galinsky & Bond, 1998), few research studies have investigated intimate partner violence spillover into the workplace as a work/family issue. That is, very few studies have investigated the relationship between intimate partner violence at work, workplace supports, and employee outcomes. Extant research on this topic suggests that rather than immediately terminating an employee on learning about her victimization, organizations have other options including offering formal and/or informal supports as a strategy to assist employees (Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Swanberg & Van Kempen, in press).

Three studies were identified that specifically examine whether organizations provide any form of workplace support to employed victims of intimate partner violence. Specifically, two of three studies (Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Van Kempen, in press) included questions in the survey instrument pertaining to the types of workplace supports received and the level of satisfaction with the workplace supports. Among the 331 respondents (employed or recently employed women who filed for a domestic violence order) who told someone at work (Swanberg et al., 2005), the majority received either informal or formal supports from coworkers or supervisors. Examples of informal supports received included a "listening ear" (90%), assistance from coworkers during break times (62%), screening intrusive telephone calls from the abusive partner (46.5%), assistance with creating a security plan should partner threaten to come to the workplace (44%), general information about where to go for help with violence at home (32%), escorting the victim to her car at the end of the work shift (27%), and coworkers helping with out-of-work responsibilities (36%). Formal supports offered by workplaces and used by respondents included supervisor-approved schedule flexibility to attend to personal matters (73%), workload flexibility when preoccupied with personal matters (49.5%), referral to counseling (15%), and an information brochure describing domestic violence services in the community (9%). Overall, 85% of respondents were satisfied with the support they received from people at their workplace. Moreover, 72% of respondents reported that the support helped them to keep their job, and 84% of women reported that having a job helped them to cope with the violence at home.

Data suggest similar findings in the second study, which inquired about types of supports received and level of satisfaction with the supports (Swanberg & Van Kempen, in press). Among the respondents who disclosed to someone at work ($n = 15$), the most commonly offered support was a listening ear (87%), followed by break time spent with coworkers (53%), coworker assisting with personal matters (53%), information about resources (53%), a referral to a counselor (40%), schedule flexibility (40%), an informational brochure (27%), workload flexibility (20%), help making a security plan in case batterer showed up at workplace (13%), escort to car (13%), and phone call screening (7%). Overall, all employees who disclosed partner violence to someone in the workplace (27%) were extremely satisfied, and 73% were satisfied with the supports offered to them. In addition, 73% of participants reported that the workplace supports helped them stay employed, and 87% reported that having a job helped them cope with the intimate partner violence.

In contrast, another study reported less positive findings. Stanley's (1992) study cited earlier indicated that only 20% of the research participants had been offered any assistance by their employer. The quality of the assistance, as re-

TABLE 2: Formal Employer Supports

Prevention	Protection	Intervention
• Partner violence education programs for supervisors: helping supervisors recognize warning signs and enhancing familiarity with community partner violence resources • Partner violence education programs for employees encouraging disclosure • Partner violence education for security personnel.	• Leave time without penalty so employee can keep court appointments or go to safe shelters • Flexible work hours • Workplace transfers • Alter work schedule to confuse perpetrator • Relocation of victim's work station • Temporarily altering job responsibilities/adjusting expectations • Observation of protection/restraining orders • Provision of legal assistance • Provision of a cell phone • Phone call screenings • Silent alarms at victim's work station • Providing photo of perpetrator to security personnel to spot intruder • Security camera • Security escort to vehicle • Priority parking near building • Enhanced parking lot lighting	• Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs) staffed with partner violence professionals • Counseling services through EAPs • Resource referrals to outside partner violence services • Assistance with safety planning • Emergency funds for crisis situations

SOURCE: Bell et al. (2002), Brownell (1996), Family Violence Prevention Fund (2003), Johnson & Indvik (1999), Kinney (1995), Reynolds (1997).

ported by research participants, was either value laden or simplistic in nature, as evidenced by such comments as "Why don't you just leave him?" The limited research available suggests that receiving both informal and formal workplace supports is valued and consequently promotes loyalty among employed victims. Yet given the extremely small sample size and study limitations, conclusions must be drawn with caution.

Nonetheless, drawing on organizational research within the employee assistance field, Brownell (1996) recommended that employers maximize workplace safety by instituting a range of formal employer policies specific to partner violence. Brownell offered a broader definition of workplace supports. She categorized possible formal workplace supports as prevention, protection, or intervention services. Examples of such services are provided in Table 2.

Prevention-focused formal supports, such as security personnel, are often already in place within medium and larger firms to assume the responsibility of handling workplace violence incidents (Schell, 2003). However, security personnel may need to be trained on how to manage partner violence when it spills over into the

workplace, or new personnel may need to be hired to provide prevention and intervention supports (Brownell, 1996). Protection-focused formal supports such as flexible work arrangements, screening phone calls, or providing leave with job security are workplace policies designed to keep employees safe and to keep them working, whether it be at an alternate job site or an alternate work schedule. The third type of formal workplace support includes programs such as EAPs. EAPs, in particular, are especially effective in assisting employees who are experiencing partner violence (Chenier, 1998). More specifically, EAPs can benefit employees while also resulting in economic savings for the employer by increasing productivity, decreasing absenteeism, and strengthening morale (Chenier, 1998). The U.S. Department of Labor concluded that every dollar invested in EAPs resulted in a savings of $5 to $16 (Chenier, 1998).

Although several companies, such as Polaroid, Liz Claiborne, and Marshall's (Brownell, 1996), have been pioneers in providing such formal workplace supports to their employees, there is no research indicating the outcomes of such supports. Though it is speculated that such supports may enhance victims' ability to main-

tain employment, empirical evidence is lacking. This clearly constitutes an area for further research.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this article is to examine the literature on violence against women and employment. Specifically, the literature review discussed research pertaining to the (a) types of job interference tactics used by abusers, (b) employee-level consequences of partner violence, (c) victimized employee responses to intimate partner violence, (d) organizational-level consequences of partner violence, and (e) employer responses to intimate partner violence. The association between victimization and employment is complex (see Key Points of the Research Review). The research to date suggests that intimate partner violence does not prevent victims from working; however, it does prevent victims from maintaining long-term stable jobs because women may need to leave jobs for safety reasons. Job interference tactics used by abusers fall into three types of actions: sabotage, stalking, and on-the-job harassment. As a result of these behaviors, some victims of partner violence struggle to be employed, others manage to obtain employment but fail to maintain it, whereas still others cannot obtain employment at all. Employers spend an estimated $3 billion to $5 billion yearly on costs associated with partner violence, including increased production, medical, administrative, and liability costs. Employer responses to partner violence have been mixed. That is, key organizational administrators have traditionally not viewed intimate partner violence as an issue needing organizational attention, despite the organizational costs associated with the social problem. The varied responses to victimization disclosure at work include job termination as well as the provision of informal and/or formal supports. Limited extant research suggests that workplace supports have positive short-term effects on employment outcomes. Despite the potential for positive outcomes resulting from disclosure, research suggests that not all partner violence victims feel comfortable informing someone at work, as they fear being fired or

they feel the problem is manageable on their own. The following section sets an agenda for further research and practice interventions regarding victimization and employment.

IMPLICATIONS: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Research: Developing a Better Understanding of the Relationships Between Intimate Partner Violence and Employment

Although research has revealed the complex nature of the intersection between intimate partner violence and employment, extant literature continues to be plagued by limitations and caveats. These shortcomings as well as future research directions are discussed below.

Research Limitations

One of the primary limitations of the studies reviewed is that many are cross-sectional in nature and do not take into account temporal factors such as the relationship between violent outbursts and poor work performance (Browne et al., 1999). The one longitudinal study conducted to date (Browne et al., 1999) demonstrated a relationship between severe partner violence and job instability. Additional longitudinal studies are needed to further build on this finding. Another limitation of this review is that many of the studies of intimate partner violence and employment rely on small samples. As such, it is difficult to draw general conclusions from the findings. Thus, future research on this topic warrants studies with large samples and rigorous methods.

A third limitation of intimate partner violence and employment studies is that many investigations are conducted using low-income samples. As such, in many of the studies, employment outcome variables were strictly about job attainment or job tenure. However, there may be other employment and economic factors that are strongly related to partner violence. For instance, what are the long-term economic effects of job instability resulting from partner violence? Or for women who are able to maintain stable employment despite experiencing part-

ner violence, what effects do the consequences associated with the abuse have on performance reviews and promotional opportunities?

Future Research Directions

From the perspective of the employed victim, longitudinal research focusing on the complex nuances associated with partner violence and employment is long overdue for three primary reasons. First, authors concur with Browne et al. (1999); Corcoran, Danziger, Kalil, and Seefeldt (2000); Riger et al., 1998; and Riger and Staggs (2004) that future research is needed that follows partner violence victims over time, specifically documenting temporal relationships between violent episodes and employment factors. As Danziger and Seefeldt (2002) noted, "studies [pertaining to domestic violence] that take a snapshot of individuals at one point in time cannot address the extent to which barriers [to work] persist over time and the possible effect of such persistent barriers on consistent employment" (p. 77). Furthermore, H. Bell (2003) suggested that for some women, there is a very complicated cyclical relationship between abusive behavior, employment, and unemployment. A more precise assessment between partners' violent behaviors and employment behaviors will allow for more effective clinical interventions with victims and batterers, and it will allow for accurate workplace interventions aimed to prevent and protect people in the workplace. Second, longitudinal research should include a focus on victims of partner violence who manage to stay employed for longer periods of time, as such research will help determine what individual and workplace factors might contribute to stable employment. And third, a richer and more comprehensive understanding of the effects of partner violence on employment could be gathered if research samples included victims across economic brackets, occupational levels, and all age groups.

From the perspective of the workplace, further research is needed in three areas. First, the reviewed research demonstrates that partner violence has a significant impact on the workplace; however, there is limited information on the employee prevalence of partner violence

and its effects on employment and job performance. More specifically, information is lacking about the overall prevalence of intimate partner violence among the general workforce. Measuring how this social ill affects the overall employed population could assist in building a strong rationale for employer involvement in addressing this issue. Furthermore, although outside the parameters of this article, workplaces may incur costs related to perpetrators (Leone et al., 2004; Rothman, 2002). For instance, Rothman (2002) reported that organizations incurred costs because of the absence of employed perpetrators as a result of time in jail, court, counseling, and meeting with probation officers. Moreover, Barling and Rosenbaum (1986) and Melzer (2002) suggested that a stressful work climate may contribute to partner violence. Thus, to understand the full effects of intimate partner violence on partner-victimized women and on organizations, it is necessary to study the effects of perpetrators' actions on organizations. In addition to the lack of information pertaining to the incidence of partner violence in the general employed population, there is also a lack of information pertaining to the effects of intimate partner violence on organizations, including its effects when it spills over into the workplace. Duffy et al. (2005) suggested that

> developing a better understanding of how intimate partner violence affects organizations and employees in the workplace should lead to more effective organizational interventions that will minimize costs and contribute to the overall efforts at reducing intimate partner violence's devastating consequences. (p. 14)

Second, although OSHA has set out guiding regulations pertaining to workplace violence and the handling of partner violence when it spills over into the workplace, very little research has been conducted on employers' knowledge of the consequences that intimate partner violence may have on the workplace, attitudes and perceptions about partner violence, and actions taken once partner-violence spillover situations become apparent within the workplace. Furthermore, no information could be found about the prevalence of employers

that implement intimate partner violence management and staff education/training programs. In addition, the reviewed literature implies that the stigma associated with intimate partner violence sometimes prevents victims from seeking assistance at the workplace. If employees felt more comfortable coming forward about their domestic situations and coworkers and managers understood how to manage the information, then the workplace might become a safer place to seek assistance. Thus, further research is needed to understand intimate partner violence from a workplace perspective, specifically focusing on employers' knowledge and attitudes about partner violence and the actions taken when it spills over into the workplace.

Third, assuming other longitudinal data confirms Browne et al.'s (1999) findings that partner violence does not prevent employment but rather affects job stability, further investigation into the strategies employers could use to help victims of partner violence stay employed for longer periods of time is warranted. For instance, research within the interdisciplinary field of work and family suggests that workplace supports (i.e., supervisor support, flexible work schedules, alternate work hours) are associated with reduced job turnover, reduced tardiness, and increased job satisfaction (Bond et al., 1998; see T. D. Allen et al., 2000 for review). As such, considering Swanberg and colleagues' (Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Swanberg & Van Kempen, in press) research and borrowing from research within the field of work and family, it seems plausible that workplace supports may also have positive work outcomes for victims of intimate partner violence. Thus, an intervention study focusing on the relationship between workplace supports and job outcomes among victims of partner violence is another important area of inquiry.

Practice: Applying Current Knowledge to Community and Workplace Practice

Assisting Employed Victims of Intimate Partner Violence

Research findings clearly suggest that intimate partner abuse is not isolated to the home. As such, social service workers can possible

play a role in helping victims manage the demands of work while also staying safe. For instance, social service workers might integrate into their counseling interventions with employed victims of partner violence (if they have not already) a variety of topics pertaining to work. In fact, a study pertaining to the needs and the prioritization of help-seeking behaviors among survivors of partner violence 6 months after leaving a shelter ($N = 143$) found that survivors reported that 60% wanted assistance with issues pertaining to employment and 63% accessed community-based employment services (N. Allen, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2004). Partner violence counselors and advocates may help victims extend their safety plans to include workplaces (Petty & Kosch, 2001), and they may assist survivors in finding employment (N. Allen et al., 2004). Counselors could also play a role in helping victims strategize whether to tell someone at work about their abusive situation and how. Research findings (Lemon, 2001; Swanberg et al., 2005; Swanberg & Logan, 2005) reveal that partner violence victims might be reluctant to tell someone at work about their situation for a variety of reasons. Yet two studies imply that when victims asked for help from coworkers or supervisors, positive outcomes resulted. Thus, assisting employed victims in carefully considering the pros and cons of disclosing this information to an employer could be enormously beneficial. Furthermore, social service workers, with the victim's permission, could act as an intermediary between the victim and the employer (Lemon, 2001). That is, a counselor or victim's advocate could speak to the employee's supervisor, educating him or her about partner violence and the employee's situation, as well as collaboratively creating a plan that aims to keep the employee and workplace safe while also allowing the employee to continue working.

Workplace Applications[3]

Within the workplace, there are several steps that employers can take depending on the organization's size, commitment to the issue, and resources. Ideally, workplace partner violence policies should focus on prevention, protection, and assistance (Friedman et al., 1996; Hoffman

& Baron, 2001; Petty & Kosch, 2001). Petty and Kosch (2001) recommended that workplace violence policies include two key components: (a) a zero-tolerance policy for any type of violent behavior, including partner violence; and (b) a procedure for confidential reporting of violence-related matters. This policy can be expanded to include workplace partner violence by explicitly identifying partner-violence-related behaviors that are prohibited at the workplace and on its property and the specific procedures that will be taken if such actions are discovered. As well, the policy should create a set of clear and simple steps that should be taken by managers, supervisors, security personnel, and coworkers if partner violence incidents spill over into the workplace. It is recommended that all employees should be made aware of workplace partner violence policies and procedures and that the information should be distributed and displayed in anonymous locations.

Given the shame and stigma associated with partner violence, demystifying the disgrace associated with this social problem might encourage employees to come forward and to consequently reduce or eliminate the risk of partner violence spilling over into the workplace. Strategies used by some companies to address this issue include requiring all employees to attend general information sessions on partner violence that provide information about community resources, distributing information materials about partner violence and where to seek help, and posting materials in public and private places. Furthermore, Friedman et al. (1996) recommended that partner violence be incorporated into all training seminars, including office safety and employee health or employee benefits training, as a way to destigmatize the issue.

Numerous publications on workplace violence strongly recommend that employers require managers and supervisors to participate in workplace violence prevention training programs (Hoffman & Baron, 2001; Lemon, 2001; Petty & Kosch, 2001). It is recommended that the workplace violence prevention programs include a component specifically about workplace intimate partner violence. Recommended topics include recognizing partner-violence-re-

lated symptoms among employees, employee confidentiality, organizational procedures for handling partner violence incidents, OSHA's general duty-to-warn clause, EAPs, community resources available to help employees, and workplace policies and practices that are available to accommodate victims' needs (leaves of absences, flexible work hours, Family Medical Leave Act).

Finally, specific personnel policies can be created to protect intimate partner violence victims (Akukwe, 1998; Friedman et al., 1996; Petty & Kosch, 2001). Policies might include paid time off, extended leave of absence, workplace relocation policies, flexible work hours that may allow victims to apply for court orders or seek new housing arrangements, or the provision of escort services to and from employee's car (see Implications for Practice, Policy, and Research).

CONCLUSION

Intimate partner violence has significant social and economic consequences for victims and the organizations at which they work. The literature reviewed suggests that intimate partner violence has a significant effect on employed victims' day-to-day work life, yet the long-term consequences are still unclear. Moreover, intimate partner violence has serious economic consequences for employers, especially when individuals feel stigmatized and are therefore inhibited from disclosing the abuse to someone at work or when intimate partner violence is not recognized as a workplace problem. To fully comprehend the social, psychological, and economic costs of intimate partner violence on employees' work performance and its costs when it spills over into victims' jobs and the places they work, further research is needed. Yet there is enough information to suggest that increasing people's awareness about the consequences of intimate partner violence on women's employment and the organizations in which they work might help reduce the economic and social costs of this issue. Likewise, expanding social services to include topics related to workplace safety planning could possibly assist victims of intimate partner violence in keeping their job.

There are several limitations to this article. First, there may be other factors that are associated with the intersection of intimate partner violence and employment that were not included in this article because of the fact that this topic is a fairly new area of inquiry. Second, because this area of research inquiry is new, there were limited empirical studies from which to draw. In some instances, the same articles were used to illuminate key topic areas. Third, despite an exhaustive search, it is likely that not all of the relevant research studies were included in this review. Even with these limitations, this article provides an overview and a synthesis of the expanding body of literature focused on victimization, employment, and organizational consequences. In addition, the review provides a framework that can be used to further the research in this area, and to enhance the comprehensiveness of workplace and social service interventions.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE, POLICY, & RESEARCH

Research

From the perspective of the employed victim, longitudinal research designs inclusive of the following three issues may help to further understand and address this social problem:

- assess the temporal relationships between violent episodes and employment factors;
- determine the strategies and coping skills used by short- and long-term employed partner violence victims;
- include economically diverse samples that cut across various occupational and age categories.

From the perspective of the employer, further research is needed in three areas.

- More information is needed about the prevalence of partner violence among the U.S. workforce and about the economic, social, and psychological costs of partner violence when it intersects with the workplace.
- Further research pertaining to employers' knowledge and attitudes about partner violence is needed as well as the actions taken when partner violence interferes with workplace operations.
- Further research into the strategies employers have established to help victims of partner violence maintain employment for longer periods of time could serve as examples for other employers.

Practice

- Social service workers could play a key role in helping employed victims manage the demands of work while also staying safe by integrating into counseling sessions issues pertaining to work.
- Social service workers could also help victims extend safety plans to include workplaces and help victims strategize about whether to and how to tell someone at work about the abuse.
- With the victim's permission, social service workers could act as an intermediary between the victim and the workplace.

Workplace Policy

- Organizations could perhaps establish "workplace partner violence" policies that specifically focus on prevention, protection, and assistance.
- Prevention policies could focus on zero tolerance for any type of violent behavior, including partner violence.
- Protection policies could establish procedures for confidentially reporting violence-related matters and supervisor and employee training that educates people about partner violence and resources available to assist people experiencing such issues.
- Personnel policies can be created to protect partner violence victims. Such policies might include paid time off, extended leave of absence, flex-time, or workplace relocation policies.

NOTES

1. This is a national telephone survey on violence against women conducted in the United States from November 1995 to May 1996.

2. This is a survey maintained by the Department of Justice that gathers data on criminal victimization from a national sample of household respondents.

3. For the purpose of this article, authors specifically address workplace partner violence policies that should be included within broader workplace violence policies.

REFERENCES

Akukwe, C. (1998). The potential impact of the 1996 welfare reforms on intimate partner violence. *Family Community Health*, *20*(4), 54-62.

Allard, M. A., Albelda, R., Collen, M. E., & Cosenza, C. (1997). *In harm's way? Domestic violence, AFDC receipt, and welfare reform in Massachusetts*. Boston: University of Massachusetts, McCormack Institute, and Center for Survey Research.

Allen, N., Bybee, D., & Sullivan, C. (2004). Battered women's multiple needs. *Violence Against Women*, *10*(9), 1015-1035.

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*(2), 278-308.

Bachman, R. (1994). *Violence and theft in the workplace*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bachman, R., & Salzman, L. E. (1995). *Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mold*. New York: Free Press.

Bailyn, L., Drago, R., & Kochan, T. (2001). *Integrating work and family life: A holistic approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Sloan School of Management.

Barling, J., & Rosenbaum, A. (1986). Work stressors and wife abuse. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 346-348.

Barnett, R. (1999). A new work-life model for the twenty-first century. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *562*(0), 32-46.

Bell, H. (2003). Cycles within cycles. *Violence Against Women*, *9*(10), 1245-1262.

Bell, M., Moe, A., & Schweinle, W. (2002). Partner violence and work: Not just a domestic issue. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, pp. 1-27.

Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., & Swanberg, J. (1998). *The 1997 National Study Of The Changing Workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Brandwein, R. A. (2000). Toward real welfare reform: The voices of battered women. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work*, *15*(2), 224.

Browne, A., Salomon, A., & Bassuk, S. S. (1999). The impact of recent partner violence on poor women's capacity to maintain work. *Violence Against Women*, *5*(4), 393.

Brownell, P. (1996). Domestic violence in the workplace: An emergent issue. *Crisis Intervention*, *3*, 129-141.

Brush, L. (2000). Battering, traumatic stress, and welfare-to-work transition. *Violence Against Women*, *6*(10), 1039-1065.

Brush, L. (2001). Poverty, battering, race and welfare reform: Black-White differences in women's welfare-to-work transitions. *Journal of Poverty*, *5*(1), 67-89.

Brush, L. (2002). Work-related abuse: A replication, new items and persistent questions. *Violence and Victims*, *17*(6), 743-757.

Brush, L. (2003). Effects of work on hitting and hurting. *Violence Against Women*, *9*(10), 1213-1230.

Bureau of National Affairs. (1990). *Violence and stress: The work/family connection* (Special Report No. 32). Washington, DC: Author.

Busch, N., & Wolfer, T. (2002). Battered women speak out. *Violence Against Women*, *5*(8), 566-584.

Campbell, J. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *Lancet*, *359*(9314), 1331-1337.

Campbell, J., Jones, A., Dienemann, J., Kub, J., Schollenberger, J., O'Campo, P., et al. (2002). Intimate partner violence and physical health consequences. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *162*(10), 1157-1164.

Campbell, J., Rose, L., Kub, J., & Nedd, D. (1998). Voices of strength and resistance: A contextual and longitudinal analysis of women's responses to battering. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *743*(1).

Carlson, B., McNutt, L., Choi, D., & Rose, I. (2002). Intimate partner abuse and mental health. *Violence Against Women*, *8*(6), 720-745.

Chenier, E. (1998). The workplace: A battleground for violence. *Public Personnel Management*, *27*(3), 557-568.

Corcoran, M., Danziger, S., Kalil, A., & Seefeldt, K. (2000). How welfare reform is affecting women's work. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 241-269.

Danziger, S., Corcoran, M., Danziger, S., & Heflin, C. (2000). Work, income and material hardship after welfare reform. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, *34*(1), 6-30.

Danziger, S., & Seefeldt, K. (2002). Barriers to employment and the "hard to serve": Implications for services, sanctions and time limits. *Focus*, *22*(1), 76-81.

Duffy, M. K., Scott, K. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2005). The radiating effects of intimate partner violence on occupational stress and well-being. *Research in Occupational Stress and Well-Being*, *4*, 30-57.

East, J. F. (1999). Hidden barriers to success for women in welfare reform. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, *80*(3), 295-305.

Family Violence Prevention Fund. (2003). *Workplace impact: Fact sheet*. Retrieved from http://www.fvpf.org/workplace/facts.html

Friedman, L. N., Tucker, S. B., Neville, P. R., & Imperial, M. (1996). The impact of domestic violence on the workplace. In G. R. VandenBos & E. Q. Bulatao (Eds.), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp. 153-161). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Friedman, L. N., & Couper, S. (1987). *The cost of domestic violence: A preliminary investigation of the financial costs of domestic violence*. New York: Victim Services.

Frone, M., Russell, M., & Cooper, L. (1994). Relationship between job and family satisfaction: Causal or noncausal covariation? *Journal of Management*, *20*(3), 565-579.

Galinsky, E., & Bond, J. T. (1998). *The 1998 Business Work-Life Study: A sourcebook*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Gelles, R. J. (1976). Abused wives: Why do they stay? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *38*, 659-668.

Googins, B. (1991). Work/family conflicts: Private lives-public responses. New York: Auburn House.

Greenfeld, L. A., Rand, M. R., Craven, D., Klaus, P. A., Perkins, C. A., & Ringel, C. (1998). Violence by intimates: Analysis of data on crimes by current or former spouses, boyfriends, and girlfriends. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Hoffman, S., & Baron, S. A. (2001). Stalkers, stalking, and violence in the workplace setting. In J. A. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection* (pp. 139-159). Washington, DC: CRC Press.

Honeycutt, T., Marshall, L., & Weston, R. (2001). Toward ethnically specific models of employment, public assistance, and victimization. *Violence Against Women*, *7*(2), 126-140.

Johnson, H. (1995). The truth about white-collar domestic violence. *Working Woman*, *20*(3), 55.

Johnson, P. R., & Indvik, J. (1999). The organizational benefits of assisting domestically abused employees. *Public Personnel Management*, *28*(3), 365-374.

Kinney, J. A. (1995). When domestic violence strikes the workplace. *HRMagazine*, *40*(8), 74.

Lemon, N. (2001). *Domestic violence law* (pp. 792-837). St. Paul, MN: West Group.

Leone, J., Johnson, M., Cohan, C., & Lloyd, S. (2004). Consequences of male partner violence on low-income minority women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *66*, 472-490.

Libbus, M. K., Sable, M., Huneke, D., & Anger, K. (1999). Domestic violence and implications for welfare-to-work: A qualitative investigation. *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, *14*(4), 1-15.

Lloyd, S. (1997). The effects of domestic violence on women's employment. *Law & Policy*, *19*(2), 139-167.

Lloyd, S., & Taluc, N. (1999). The effects of male violence on female employment. *Violence Against Women*, *5*(4), 370-392.

MacMillan, R., & Gartner, R. (1999, November). When she brings home the bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 947-958.

Meisel, J., Chandler, D., & Rienzi, B. (2003). Domestic violence prevalence and effects on employment in two California TANF populations. *Violence Against Women*, *10*(9), 961-990.

Melzer, S. (2002). Gender, work and intimate violence: Men's occupational violence spillover and compensatory violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *64*, 820-832.

Moe, A., & Bell, M. (2004). Abject economics: The effects of battering and violence on women's work and employability. *Violence Against Women*, *10*(1), 29-55.

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2003). *Costs of intimate partner violence against women in the United States*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

National Institute of Justice & Centers for Disease Control. (1998, April). *Research in brief. Stalking in America: findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: Author.

Pereira, J. (1995, March 2). Employers confront domestic abuse. *Wall Street Journal*, pp. B-1.

Petty, R. A., & Kosch, L. M. (2001). Workplace violence and unwanted pursuit: From an employer's perspective. In J. A. Davis (Ed.), *Stalking crimes and victim protection* (pp. 459-485). Washington, DC: CRC Press.

Plitcha, S. B. (1996). Violence and abuse: Implications for women's health. In M. M. Falik & K. S. Collins (Eds.), *Women's health: The Commonwealth Fund Survey* (pp. 237-270). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Raphael, J. (1995). *Domestic violence: Telling the untold welfare-to-work story*. Chicago: Taylor Institute.

Raphael, J. (1996). *Prisoners of abuse: Domestic violence and welfare receipt*. Chicago: Taylor Institute.

Raphael, J., & Tolman, R. M. (1997). *Trapped by poverty/trapped by abuse: New evidence documenting the relationship between domestic violence and welfare*. Chicago: Taylor Institute and the University of Michigan Research Development Center on Poverty, Risk, and Mental Health.

Reynolds, L. (1997). Fighting domestic violence in the workplace. *HRFocus*, *74*(11), 8.

Rhodes, N., & McKenzie, E. (1998). Why do battered women stay: Three decades of research. *Aggressive Violent Behavior*, *3*(4), 391-406.

Riger, S., Ahrens, C., Blickenstaff, A., & Camacho, J. (1998). *Obstacles to employment of welfare recipients with abusive partners*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Riger, S., Raja, S., & Camacho, J. (2002). The radiating impact of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *17*(2), 184-205.

Riger, S., & Staggs, S. (2004). Welfare reform, domestic violence, and employment. *Violence Against Women*, *10*(9), 961-990.

Riger, S., Staggs, S., & Schewe, P. (2004). *Intimate partner violence as an obstacle to employment among mothers affected by welfare reform*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Romero, D., Chavkin, W., Wise, P., & Smith, L. (2003). Low-income mothers' experience with poor health, hardship, work and violence. *Violence Against Women*, *10*(9), 1231-1244.

Rothman, E. (2002, July). *Batterers in the workplace*. Paper presented at the University of New Hampshire Family Violence Conference, Durham, NH.

Sable, M., Libbus, K., Huneke, D., & Anger, K. (1999). Domestic violence among AFDC recipients: Implica-

tions for welfare-to-work programs. *Affilia*, *14*(2), 199-216.

Saltzman, L. E., Fanslow, J. L., McMahon, P. M., & Shelley, G. A. (1999). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.

Schell, B. (2003). The prevalence of sexual harassment, stalking, and false victimization syndrome cases and related human resource management policies in a cross-section of Canadian companies from January 1995 through January 2000. *Journal of Family Violence*, *18*(6), 351-360.

Shepard, M., & Pence, E. (1988). The effect of battering on the employment status of women. *Affilia*, *3*(2), 55-61.

Stanley, C. (1992). *Workplace efficiency: The effect of family violence on work performance*. Tulsa, OK: Domestic violence Intervention Services.

Straus, M., & Gelles, R. J. (1990). *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishing.

Strube, M. J., & Barbour, L. S. (1984). Factors related to the decision to leave an abusive relationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *46*(4), 837-844.

Sullivan, C., Basta, J., Tan, C., & Davidson, W. (1992). After the crisis: A needs assessment of women leaving a domestic violence shelter. *Violence and Victims*, *7*(3), 267-274.

Sullivan, C., Campbell, R., Angelique, H., Eby, K., & Davidson, W. (1994). An advocacy intervention program for women with abusive partners: Six month follow-up. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *11*, 101-122.

Swanberg, J. (2004). Illuminating gendered organization assumptions: An important step in creating a family-friendly organization. A case study. *Community, Work & Family*, *7*(1), 3-28.

Swanberg, J., & Logan, T. (2005, January). The effects of intimate partner violence on women's labor force attachment: Experiences of women living in rural and urban Kentucky. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *10*(1), 3-17.

Swanberg, J., Macke, C., & Logan, T. (2005). *Intimate partner violence, women, and work: A descriptive look at work interference tactics, coping with violence on the job, and informal workplace support*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

Swanberg, J., & Van Kempen, C. (in press). The intersection between intimate partner violence and the workplace: Consequences, disclosure rates and employer supports. *Affilia*.

Taylor, M. J., & Barusch, A. S. (2004). Personal, family, and multiple barriers of long-term welfare recipients, *Social Work*, *49*(2), 175-183.

Tenbrunsel, A., Brett, J., Moaz, E., Stroh, L., & Reilly, A. (1995). Dynamic and static work-family relationships. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *63*(3), 233-246.

Thoits, P. (1986). Social support as coping assistance. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *54*, 416-423.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1997). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Denver, CO: Center for Policy Research.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Tolman, R. M., & Raphael, J. (2000). A review of research on welfare and domestic violence. *Journal of Social Issues*, *56*(4), 655-682.

Tolman, R. M., & Rosen, D. (2001). Domestic violence in the lives of women receiving welfare: Mental health, substance dependence, and economic well-being. *Violence Against Women*, *7*(2), 141-158.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (2004). Retrieved from http://www.dol.gov/wb/faq38.htm

Violence Against Women Act of 1994. (1994). Retrieved from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/vawo/laws/vawa/vawa.htm

Violence Against Women Act, HR3514 & S2110 U.S.C.A. Title 7, Sec. 701. (1998). Retrieved from http://www.now.org/issues/violence/vawa/title7.pdf

Violence Against Women Act of 2000. (2000). Retrieved from http://www.acadv.org/vawabillsummary.html

Votruba-Drzal, E., Lohman, B., & Chase-Lansdale, P. L. (2002). *Violence in intimate relationships as women transition from welfare to work*. Evanston: IL: Northwestern University, Institute for Policy Research.

Warchol, G. (1998). *Workplace violence, 1992-1996*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Westrum, D., & Fremouw, W. J. (1998). Stalking behavior: A literature review and suggested functional analytic assessment technology. *Aggression and Violence Behavior*, *3*, 255.

Williams, J. (2000). *Unbending gender: Why work and family conflict and what to do about it*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, K. J. (1997). *When violence begins at home: A comprehensive guide to understanding and ending domestic abuse*. Alameda, CA: Hunter House.

Wisner, C. L., Gilmer, T. P., Saltzman, L. E., & Zink, T. M. (1999). Intimate partner violence against women: Do victims cost health plans more? *Journal of Family Practice*, *48*(6), 439-443.

Yoshioka, M., Gilbert, L., El-Bassel, N., & Baig-Amin, M. (2003). Social support and disclosure of abuse: Comparing South Asian and Hispanic battered women. *Journal of Family Violence*, *18*(3), 171-180.

Zachary, M.-K. (2000). Labor law for supervisors: Domestic violence as a workplace issue. *Supervision*, *61*(4), 23-26.

Jennifer E. Swanberg, Ph.D., is assistant professor at the College of Social Work, University of Kentucky. Her research focuses on the relationships between work, family, and organizational effectiveness, especially among under-studied populations including low-wage workers, victims of intimate partner violence, informal caregivers, and workers employed in nonprofit public organizations. She has published in journals such as Work, Family and Community, Nonprofit Management & Leadership, Journal of Economic and Family Issues, Family Issues, *and* Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. *Her research has been funded by the Ford Foundation, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. She has lectured and published reports on creating work environments supportive of employees' work, personal, and family needs. She has appeared as a work-family expert on national television and radio including MSNBC, CNN, NPR, BBC, CBC, and numerous radio stations throughout the United States.*

T. K. Logan, Ph.D., is currently an associate professor in the Department of Behavioral Science at the University of Kentucky, with appointments in the Center on Drug and Alcohol Research. She has been funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) and has completed several drug court program evaluations as well as studies focused on intimate partner violence and divorce; intimate partner violence and custody outcomes; stalking victimization and perpetration; health and mental health status, barriers, and service use among women; HIV risk behavior; and health, mental health, substance use, and victimization among rural and urban women. She is also senior author on several books focused on victimization, mental health, and substance abuse among women and is coauthoring an evaluation text.

Caroline Macke, MSW, is pursuing a doctoral degree in social work at the University of Kentucky. While working as a research assistant for Jennifer E. Swanberg, her research activities have focused predominantly on domestic violence and employment. She is also interested in attachment theory, particularly as it pertains to violent relationships. She obtained her MSW from the University of Kentucky. Before coming to the University of Kentucky, she was a student at Thomas More College, where she received a bachelor's degree in economics, business, and international studies as well as an associate's degree in political science.