**RESPONDING TO VICTIM-SURVIVORS OF ECONOMIC ABUSE**

Employing the heuristic device of institutional logics, this study explores the extent to which employees at three state welfare organizations have begun to integrate economic abuse as grounds for supporting victim-survivors. Analyzing a series of 48 interviews with employees of these organizations along the four dimensions of institutional logic – sources of authority, occupational identity, sources of legitimacy, and the normative base – the study revealed both the barriers to and support for a view of economic abuse that encompasses the strategies and values advocated by feminist NGOs.

We found that the ingeachsabout shared by clients, ensuring a and ingan occupational identity by which victim-them appropriate supportConsistent with the prevailing logic, only wclients are, albeit, Thus, within the dominant institutional logics, employees are instructed to act in a way that is committed to survivors of intimate partner abuse, while, concurrently, preserving organizational practices that indicate that the state accepts no responsibility for making it possible for survivors to live independently from their abusive partners.

Despite finding evidence that the dominant institutional logics have increased in strength such that many employees need not acknowledge economic abuse as a state of emergency, nor consider victim-survivors as being entitled to solutions, we also heard affirmations of a transition away from the dominant logic. In fact, many of the interviewees expressed an increased awareness of economic abuse and acted to mobilize resources for victim-survivors from within their existing operational routines. Further study would benefit from an investigation of whether an employee’s position within in the organization’s occupational hierarchy influences the likelihood – perhaps by establishing an autonomous space for action that diverges from organizational guidelines – of embracing such an emerging institutional logic.

Finally, we proposed several approaches by which the emerging institutional logic around economic abuse may be advanced from within the dominant institutional logic. Despite the vigor and persistence of messaging around economic abuse by feminist NGOs in various media, a prevailing critique of such NGOs is that they are weak collaborators at risk of losing their feminist nature (Kantola 2010; Krizsán and Roggeband 2021). Our interviews suggeststhat there are ways to advance the interests – and safety – of the victim-survivors of economic abuse without waiting for new legislation and in ways consistent with the dominant institutional logic operating in each of the welfare organizations. This more dynamic, temporal approach acknowledges both the barriers to a more just provision of services derived from the neo-liberal refusal to extend resources to women in need while concurrently giving meaning to the ongoing projects of feminist NGOs. Their work must not be left unfinished. The next steps surely require feminist solidarity and concerted efforts to materialize.

 This study makes three important contributions. First, it contributes to the institutional logics perspective by illuminating the extent to which this heuristic can reveal both dominant and emerging logics and the power of both to influence the lives of welfare organization clients (Cloutier et al. 2013). Second, the findings reported here expand our understanding of how welfare organizations respond to economic abuse. Finally, using the institutional logic perspective, we shed light on the likely societal impact of feminist NGOs that for years have been raising awareness about the implications of economic abuse on the lives of women.