Journal of Psychiatry
Psychotherapy & Communication

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf

Narrative Clinical Review

Abstract—Emotional abuse in intimate relationships is defined clinically by a repeated pattern, not by a single harsh exchange or a psychiatric diagnosis in either partner. Relevant conduct includes degradation, intimidation, isolation, surveillance, persistent distortion or denial of observable events, threats, and control over money, movement, care, sexuality, or social contact. Such patterns can restrict choice and contribute to fear, self-doubt, sleep disturbance, depression, anxiety, trauma symptoms, somatic complaints, and impaired functioning without visible injury. This narrative clinical review synthesizes research and guidance available through 28 February 2025. It distinguishes coercive control from conflict and poor communication, reviews epidemiological and measurement limitations, and proposes a pattern–impact–context formulation that separates safety assessment from diagnosis. Emotional abuse is a relational exposure rather than a discrete mental disorder, and its consequences should not be reduced to post-traumatic stress disorder. First-line care should be private, validating, autonomy-supportive, and linked to practical resources and individualized safety planning. Treatment should address diagnosed conditions, agency, social reconnection, and material constraints without making separation or reconciliation a therapeutic requirement. Communication remains clinically important, but skills training cannot remedy coercion when disagreement is punished. Joint work requires prior private assessment and should not proceed while fear, retaliation, or surveillance make open speech unsafe. The review proposes expanded safe choice—the patient's growing ability to seek care, use resources, maintain relationships, and make decisions without retaliation—as a clinically meaningful recovery endpoint.

Index Terms—emotional abuse, psychological intimate partner violence, coercive control, safety planning, trauma-informed care, therapeutic alliance, communication

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf, M.D., LL.M., is a psychotherapist in private practice in Dublin, Ireland. Correspondence: jonathanhaverkampf@gmail.com. Website: www.jonathanhaverkampf.com.

I. INTRODUCTION

Emotional abuse is difficult to name because it often uses ordinary elements of intimate life: words, silence, money, care, sex, digital contact, and knowledge of a partner's vulnerabilities. The clinical question is not whether partners ever criticize each other or communicate poorly, but whether conduct repeatedly degrades, frightens, isolates, monitors, or controls one partner and whether resistance carries a credible cost. Surveillance of messages, threats involving children or immigration status, deliberate sleep disruption, financial restriction, public humiliation, and persistent denial of observable events may operate together even when no single incident appears decisive. CDC surveillance definitions accordingly distinguish psychological aggression and coercive control from physical and sexual violence while recognizing that these forms can co-occur (Breiding et al., 2015).

The clinical effects are equally easy to misread. Patients may present with panic, depressed mood, impaired concentration, pain, insomnia, substance use, missed appointments, or apparent indecision. These difficulties may be treated as isolated disorders or attributed to personality even when a threatening relationship is maintaining distress and restricting action. The converse error is also possible: insulting or selfish behavior alone does not establish coercive control, justify diagnosing an absent partner, or determine what the patient should do. Clinical formulation requires a careful reconstruction of pattern, meaning, impact, context, and safety, with a clear distinction between reported events, observation, and interpretation.

This review treats communication and the relational context of care as clinically consequential, but not inherently therapeutic. Validation from a clinician, friend, or family member may reduce isolation and support choice; a directive or controlling response may reproduce the central injury. Greater openness with an abusive partner is not automatically beneficial. When disagreement is punished, power—not communication skill—is the limiting factor. The aim is a formulation that supports safety, accurate diagnosis, and

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

recovery while keeping responsibility for abusive conduct with the person who uses it.

Core clinical propositions

- Assess patterned conduct, impact, and constrained choice; no single adjective or screen score establishes abuse.
- Treat psychiatric symptoms on their own criteria; emotional abuse is a relationship exposure, not a diagnosis.
- Validate and offer options without making departure, disclosure, or police contact a condition of care.
- Use communication interventions only when open speech is sufficiently safe; skills cannot neutralize coercive control.
- Judge recovery by symptoms, functioning, and expanded safe choice while addressing safety, material barriers, and social connection.

II. SCOPE AND REVIEW METHOD

This narrative clinical review examines emotional or psychological abuse by a current or former intimate partner, including coercive control, intimidation, degradation, isolation, monitoring, and related economic or reproductive restrictions when they form part of the clinical pattern. It does not equate ordinary conflict, mutual dissatisfaction, infidelity, emotional unavailability, or a single regretted argument with abuse. Nor does the absence of physical assault imply that emotional abuse is minor. Patient and partner are used for clinical clarity; survivor is used when emphasizing lived experience and agency. Although much of the evidence concerns women harmed by male partners, the assessment principles apply across genders and sexual orientations, with attention to differences in prevalence, threat, discrimination, and access to services.

A purposive search was completed through 28 February 2025. Search concepts included psychological intimate partner violence, coercive control, mental-health outcomes, disclosure, screening, advocacy, safety planning, and treatment. Selection gave priority to guidance from WHO, CDC, NICE, USPSTF, and SAMHSA; systematic reviews and meta-analyses; longitudinal studies; and controlled intervention trials. Because this was a narrative rather than a systematic review, no pooled effect estimate or exhaustive study count was undertaken. The synthesis cannot resolve definitional heterogeneity or the under-representation of men, LGBTQ+ people, disabled people, migrants, and patients outside specialist services. Clinicians should check guidance against current local law, policy, and services.

Evidence is strongest for associations between intimate partner violence as a broad category and mental-health burden, and for principles of first-line response. Evidence that isolates psychological abuse from physical or sexual violence remains less developed. Cross-sectional shelter studies may clarify symptom patterns but cannot establish causation in an individual case. Treatment studies often combine forms of violence and measure depression or safety-related outcomes rather than cessation of coercion. These limitations do not justify dismissing a disclosure; they require calibrated claims and precise documentation.

III. DEFINING THE PATTERN: ABUSE, COERCIVE CONTROL, AND CONFLICT

Psychological aggression includes expressive aggression, insults, humiliation, and coercive control, but measurement categories do not determine clinical meaning by themselves (Breiding et al., 2015). Frequency matters, together with intent, context, fear, entrapment, and consequence. Repeated messages that a partner is incompetent may be enforced through control of money and transport. Threats may concern direct harm, suicide, disclosure of private information, housing, deportation, pets, children, or professional reputation. Digital monitoring can extend the partner's presence into consultations and periods of apparent separation. Intimidation may alternate with affection, apology, or practical care; intermittent kindness does not negate a controlling pattern.

The concept of coercive control shifts attention from incident counts to liberty and everyday decision-making. Myhill (2015) showed that surveys may miss patterned control when acts are counted without their cumulative effects. Qualitative research likewise describes credible fear in the absence of physical assault (Crossman et al., 2016). The concept still requires restraint. Clinicians should ask what happened, how often, what followed resistance, and which choices became more difficult before applying a label. The same act can carry different meanings across contexts, but cultural explanation should not be used to excuse threats, enforced isolation, or deprivation.

Conflict differs because disagreement remains possible without systematic punishment or loss of autonomy. Communication may be poor on both sides while power remains sufficiently shared for repair. Emotional abuse can include arguments, but intensity alone is not decisive. The defining pattern is one in which one partner's preferences become rules and the other's speech, movement, relationships, or confidence in judgment are progressively constrained. Harsh speech may be bidirectional while fear remains asymmetric. Counting who shouted on a given day cannot replace assessment of intimidation, injury, resource control, sexual coercion, stalking, and the consequences of saying no.

A practical way to make the pattern clinically specific is to ask about rules, exceptions, and consequences. Who decides whom the patient sees, which purchases require permission, when the phone must be answered, and what follows a refusal? Then ask how the patient anticipates the partner's reaction and how that anticipation changes behavior. This turns a global description such as ‘walking on eggshells’ into observable constraints without requiring the patient to adopt a legal label. It also keeps attention on liberty and credible

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

sanctions rather than isolated examples of kindness or provocation (Myhill, 2015; Crossman et al., 2016).

Uncertainty should be documented without equating it with disbelief. Early care may rely on the patient's account, which can change as safety and recall improve. Unless conducting a forensic evaluation, the clinician's task is not to decide whether a legal definition has been met, but to recognize possible harm, assess health and safety, and connect the patient with appropriate support.

Table 1. Distinguishing relationship conflict from a coercive pattern

Feature	Conflict or poor communication	Possible coercive control	Clinical implication
Disagreement	Both partners can disagree and later revisit the issue	Disagreement triggers threats, surveillance, deprivation, or retaliation	Ask what follows resistance
Power	Influence varies, but basic choices remain available	One partner controls resources, movement, care, or social contact	Map constrained choices and dependencies
Fear	Distress may be high without credible punishment	One partner anticipates consequences and self-censors	Assess fear, escalation, and safe contact
Communication	Skills and repair may improve reciprocity	Open disclosure may be used for retaliation	Do not prescribe openness before safety
Pattern	Episodes are situational and open to mutual repair	Acts accumulate across settings and persist despite stated boundaries	Use a timeline, not an incident tally

IV. EPIDEMIOLOGY AND THE LIMITS OF COUNTING

Intimate partner violence is common, but prevalence estimates depend on definitions, sampling, reference period, gender, and the use of behaviorally specific questions. The WHO report on 2018 prevalence estimates, published in 2021, documented a substantial global burden of physical or sexual partner violence but did not make those figures interchangeable with psychological abuse (World Health Organization, 2021). The 2015 US National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey measured psychological aggression and coercive control separately, illustrating both the frequency of these experiences and the importance of reporting forms distinctly (Smith et al., 2018). Population estimates should inform, not determine, an individual clinical formulation.

Prevalence of emotional abuse is especially sensitive to thresholds. A survey that counts a single insult measures something different from one that requires repetition, fear, or restricted liberty. Myhill (2015) demonstrated that the operationalization of coercive control changes who is identified and which gendered patterns become visible. Service samples introduce further selection: people in shelters, legal proceedings, or mental-health care may face greater danger, comorbidity, or loss of resources than community respondents. Under-disclosure may reflect fear, shame, digital monitoring, financial dependence, concern for children, previous dismissive responses, or simply not using the language of abuse.

The clinical conclusion is straightforward. Psychological abuse is not rare, is poorly captured by physical-injury statistics, and can occur alone or alongside physical, sexual, economic, or stalking behaviors. Clinicians should be prepared to recognize it without equating all rude conduct or relationship dissatisfaction with abuse, and without overlooking men, nonbinary people, people in same-sex relationships, older adults, or disabled patients. Population research informs the assessment; the patient's pattern and its consequences remain the unit of clinical analysis.

V. SYMPTOM PATTERNS WITHOUT A SINGLE SYNDROME

Meta-analytic and longitudinal research links intimate partner violence with depression, anxiety, post-traumatic symptoms, substance problems, and suicide attempts, although much of this literature combines psychological, physical, and sexual exposure. Trevillion et al. (2012) found substantial associations between domestic violence and mental disorders across studies, and Devries et al. (2013) reported longitudinal associations with incident depressive symptoms and suicide attempts. Lagdon et al. (2014) described a broad mental-health burden among adult victims. A later systematic review focused on psychological violence found strong associations with PTSD, depression, and anxiety but rated the certainty of evidence as low because of design and measurement limitations (Dokkedahl et al., 2022). These findings justify active assessment; they do not establish causation in an individual case or require any particular diagnosis.

Psychological abuse can evoke a persistent threat response without meeting criteria for PTSD. A patient may monitor tone, footsteps, phone notifications, money, or the partner's mood; sleep lightly; rehearse explanations; avoid friends; or lose confidence in memory and judgment. Depression may reflect entrapment and loss as well as a depressive disorder. Panic may cluster around contact, separation, court dates, or anticipated confrontation. Somatic symptoms, chronic pain, gastrointestinal distress, sexual difficulties, and fatigue may predominate. Substance use may serve as short-term relief, a social adaptation, or a separate disorder. Symptoms can continue after separation because stalking, litigation, economic dependence, parenting contact, conditioned fear, and social loss continue.

A 2021 shelter cohort focused on psychological violence reported substantial PTSD and complex-PTSD symptom

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

burden, but its cross-sectional design and selected population limit generalization (Dokkedahl et al., 2021). ICD-11 complex PTSD may help organize affect dysregulation, negative self-concept, and relationship difficulties when the full diagnostic criteria are assessed rather than inferred from exposure alone (Cloitre et al., 2018). Some patients remain psychologically well or recover without specialist therapy. Resilience does not make the conduct harmless, just as severe symptoms do not provide forensic proof of a particular act.

Repeated contradiction or ridicule may leave a patient uncertain about both events and the legitimacy of personal reactions. That uncertainty can be clinically important without establishing a diagnosis or proving deliberate manipulation. The account may remain incomplete, yet care for fear, sleep loss, depression, or restricted functioning need not wait for certainty about every detail. Documenting the patient's degree of confidence and the context of recall is more informative than pressing for premature certainty. This approach reduces the risk that assessment repeats the demand to defend every perception before receiving help.

Function often provides the clearest link between experience and care. Ask about concentration, work, finances, parenting, sleep, health appointments, movement, digital privacy, sexual autonomy, and contact with supportive people. A patient who appears indecisive may be deciding under surveillance or without reliable control of money and transport. Naming those constraints can prevent a practical problem from being miscast as a motivational or personality problem.

VI. DIAGNOSIS AND DIFFERENTIAL FORMULATION

Emotional abuse is not itself a DSM mental disorder. Diagnosis should identify current syndromes, impairment, risk, medical contributors, and comorbidity, while the relationship exposure is documented separately (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Differential assessment may include PTSD or another trauma- and stressor-related disorder, major depression, anxiety disorders, adjustment disorder, insomnia, substance-use disorders, dissociative symptoms, somatic conditions, traumatic brain injury after physical assault, medication effects, endocrine or neurological illness, and grief. Suicidal thinking, psychosis, mania, intoxication, withdrawal, and cognitive change require direct assessment in their own right rather than being absorbed into a trauma narrative.

Relationship distress, high-conflict separation, and emotional abuse may overlap but are not synonymous. Clinicians should not diagnose an absent partner with narcissistic, antisocial, borderline, or other personality pathology from the patient's account. Such labels rarely improve immediate safety and may divert attention from observable conduct. Nor should the patient's prior diagnoses discredit the report. Anxiety, trauma symptoms, neurodivergence, psychosis, or substance use can affect perception and communication, but they do not make abuse impossible. Corroboration may matter in a legal process; compassionate clinical care need not await it.

Temporal formulation asks what preceded symptoms, what changes with contact or distance, and what persists across contexts. Improvement away from the partner may support a relationship-linked hypothesis but is not a diagnostic test. Deterioration after separation may reflect escalation, stalking, housing loss, isolation, or court proceedings rather than disprove the formulation. Competing explanations should be documented and revised as evidence changes. A defensible summary might state that the patient reports a repeated controlling pattern associated with fear and functional impairment; a depressive disorder is present; PTSD criteria are not currently met; and safety and specialist support require assessment.

Keeping diagnosis and exposure separate protects the patient from an impossible demand to prove abuse by becoming ill enough. Safety, support, and practical care may be indicated even in the absence of a psychiatric diagnosis. Conversely, a diagnosis of PTSD does not establish who acted, which legal definition applies, or what the patient should decide about the relationship.

VII. ASSESSMENT AS PATTERN, IMPACT, AND CONTEXT

Inquiry should take place privately, without the partner, and only when privacy is genuine. A patient may be unable to answer safely if a partner is in the waiting room, monitors the patient portal, controls transport, serves as interpreter, or can access records. Explain confidentiality and its limits before asking. Use behaviorally specific, nonjudgmental language: ask whether the partner has frightened, humiliated, isolated, monitored, threatened, controlled money or care, pressured sex, damaged property, or punished disagreement. Begin broadly, then use the patient's own words. A checklist may prompt inquiry but should not become a verdict.

Build a timeline of conduct, fear, symptoms, function, and resources. Ask what happens when the patient says no, seeks help, sees friends, spends money, attends care, or tries to leave. Assess physical violence, strangulation, sexual coercion, stalking, weapons, threats to kill, threats of suicide used as leverage, harm to children or pets, escalating frequency, and separation-related risk. Emotional abuse may be the presenting concern while another danger emerges. Disclosure may be gradual; a complete chronology is not required in one visit.

Impact extends beyond symptom severity. Identify lost relationships, interrupted education or work, debt, housing

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

instability, reproductive consequences, digital exposure, immigration dependency, disability-related care, and barriers to medication or appointments. Ask what the patient has already done to stay safe; strategies that appear inconsistent from outside may be adaptive under constraint. Leaving and returning may reflect danger, finances, attachment, parenting, housing, hope, or surveillance rather than lack of insight. The WHO clinical handbook directs clinicians to listen, inquire about needs, validate, enhance safety, and support rather than take over decisions (World Health Organization, 2014).

Assessment becomes more informative when symptoms and context are measured separately. A reduction in anxiety after several days away may clarify the contribution of immediate threat; persistent symptoms may point to conditioned fear, depression, sleep disruption, or a separate disorder. Neither pattern proves or disproves abuse. Renewed contact with friends may represent meaningful recovery even if a symptom score changes little. Follow-up should therefore revisit conduct, safety, function, and symptoms rather than treating one scale as the entire outcome. This temporal approach generates provisional hypotheses that can be tested and revised without overstating causation.

Assessment should end with an actionable next step. Confirm when and how contact is safe, whether messages or printed materials could be discovered, which services are acceptable, and what follow-up is feasible. Document the source of each statement, observed findings, clinical interpretation, options offered, and the patient's choices. Avoid placing detailed abuse narratives in records accessible to a controlling partner without first considering risk and applicable legal requirements.

Table 2. A pattern–impact–context formulation

Domain	Evidence to clarify	Why it changes care
Pattern	Acts, frequency, escalation, retaliation, and what follows refusal	Distinguishes accumulating control from an isolated dispute
Impact	Fear, symptoms, function, social connection, money, care, and autonomy	Links exposure to clinical and practical needs without requiring a single diagnosis
Context	Children, disability, immigration, culture, housing, work, technology, and prior help-seeking	Identifies leverage, barriers, and protective resources
Safety	Violence, stalking, strangulation, sexual coercion, weapons, threats, separation, and self-harm	Determines urgency and specialist pathways
Patient priorities	What matters now, acceptable options, safe contact, and readiness	Keeps planning collaborative and avoids replacing one form of control with another

VIII. SAFETY, SAFEGUARDING, AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Safety planning is an ongoing process, not a form or a guarantee that harm can be prevented. Immediate danger, injury, sexual assault, strangulation, stalking, threats involving weapons, homicidal intent, suicidal crisis, risk to children or dependent adults, and inability to meet basic needs require urgent action consistent with local law and services. Emotional abuse can coexist with these risks even when the patient initially reports no physical violence. Ask directly and calmly. Do not require the patient to confront the partner, collect evidence, or announce departure before receiving help.

Mandatory reporting duties vary by jurisdiction, age, disability, profession, and the involvement of children or vulnerable adults. Clinicians should know the applicable duties, explain the limits of confidentiality, and disclose only necessary information through appropriate channels. Unexpected reporting may reproduce a loss of control and increase danger. When a report is required, involve the patient in the process where lawful, explain likely next steps, and plan for the period after notification. When reporting is not required, respect a competent adult's decisions while keeping support available.

Digital and record safety requires specific attention. Appointment reminders, portal notes, billing statements, location sharing, search histories, and downloaded safety plans can reveal help-seeking. Generic advice to clear browsing history may be unsafe or technically incomplete. Ask what the partner can access and seek specialist advice. Koziol-McLain et al. (2018) found that a web-based decision aid could support safety-related decision-making, but no digital tool is safe for every patient or a substitute for local services and clinical judgment.

Advocacy can assist with safety, housing, benefits, legal information, and social support, but effects vary by setting and outcome. A Cochrane review found possible benefits alongside substantial uncertainty (Rivas et al., 2015). Plans should identify realistic resources, contingencies, safe contacts, access to medication and documents, and arrangements for children or pets where relevant. They should also acknowledge that the partner—not the patient—controls whether abusive conduct occurs.

IX. COMMUNICATION WITHIN THE RELATIONSHIP

Communication matters, but its clinical value depends on what the relationship permits. In a reciprocal relationship, naming feelings, making specific requests, listening, pausing, and repairing misunderstandings can reduce conflict. Under coercive control, the same openness may reveal vulnerabilities, intentions, contacts, or plans that can later be used against the patient. Indirect speech, rapid agreement, withholding information, or changes in an account may reflect

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

adaptation to surveillance and anticipated consequences. Treating these behaviors as a simple communication deficit can misidentify adaptation as pathology.

Emotional abuse can also alter communication with oneself. Repeated contradiction, ridicule, or blame may erode confidence in perception until internal questions echo the partner's judgments. Therapy can help separate observed events from imposed meanings: what was said, what followed, what the patient concluded, and which alternative interpretation best fits the available evidence. The purpose is not to prove every memory, but to restore the capacity to recognize fear, preference, anger, care, and boundaries without requiring the partner's permission.

Restoring internal clarity must not create a new surveillance risk. Journals, symptom diaries, safety plans, patient portals, and therapy worksheets may be discovered or monitored; ask before recommending or sending them. Some patients may prefer brief in-session summaries, a neutral reminder agreed in advance, or no written material. The aim is not a perfect record but a way for the patient to notice preferences, bodily cues, and boundaries while retaining control of the record. Silence, delay, and selective disclosure may therefore be purposeful rather than avoidance that should immediately be challenged.

Communication with supportive others can restore perspective and practical options, but disclosure is not uniformly beneficial. Dworkin et al. (2019) found that negative social reactions to interpersonal-violence disclosure were associated with worse psychopathology, particularly reactions that were controlling, distracting, or that treated survivors differently. Friends and family may pressure the patient to leave, reconcile, report, forgive, or disclose more. Helpful support listens, asks what is needed, offers concrete assistance, respects information about risk, and remains available without making agreement the price of the relationship.

Communication supports recovery when it improves accurate self-appraisal, choice, and safe connection. It can maintain harm when it is monitored, coerced, dismissive, or used to shift responsibility. The aim is not maximal disclosure, but communication with oneself, clinicians, and selected supporters that is sufficiently safe, purposeful, and under the patient's control.

X. FIRST-LINE CLINICAL RESPONSE AND THE THERAPEUTIC ALLIANCE

The initial response can influence whether a patient returns for care. WHO guidance recommends immediate, practical, woman-centred support rather than compulsory disclosure or directive rescue (World Health Organization, 2013, 2014). The clinician listens without interrogation, validates that the reported conduct matters and is not the patient's fault, asks about needs and danger, offers information, and supports decisions. Validation does not require certainty about facts that have not been assessed. It can be precise: the described threats and monitoring are concerning; intimidation is unacceptable; help is available; and the patient remains the decision-maker within safety and legal limits.

The alliance may be especially fragile when help, concern, or expertise has previously served as a vehicle for control. Explain why questions are being asked, seek permission where possible, offer choices about pace, and distinguish clinical records from legal findings. Keep commitments about follow-up and confidentiality. When a clinician disagrees with a decision, identify the specific risk while preserving connection: ‘I am worried because the threats have escalated; I will not withdraw care because you are not ready to act.’ Trauma-informed care emphasizes safety, trustworthiness, collaboration, empowerment, and attention to culture and gender (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2014).

Alliance also depends on repair when care has felt disbelieving or directive. If a clinician minimized a concern, used an unsafe contact channel, or pressed for an action the patient did not choose, acknowledging the error and changing the plan may be more trustworthy than defending good intentions. Before closing a visit, agree who will do what, what will enter the record, how results or referrals will be communicated, and what happens if contact is missed. These small acts of predictability turn trauma-informed principles into observable practice and reduce the extent to which engagement depends on compliance with the clinician's preferred decision (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2014).

Routine enquiry is useful only when privacy, training, response pathways, and continuity are available. The USPSTF recommended screening women of reproductive age and referral to ongoing support, while its evidence review noted limitations in direct evidence and intervention outcomes (Feltner et al., 2018; US Preventive Services Task Force, 2018). A positive screen followed by a hurried leaflet, unsafe documentation, or no referral may be ineffective or harmful. A negative screen does not close the subject when clinical indicators persist.

A cluster-randomized trial of screening and brief counselling in primary care found no basis for assuming that screening alone improves outcomes; effects were nuanced and context-dependent (Hegarty et al., 2013). The implication is not to stop asking. Identification and response should be treated as a care system comprising private inquiry, competent first-line support, links to specialist services, safe records, and follow-up.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

XI. TREATMENT, RECOVERY, AND SOCIAL RECONNECTION

Treatment begins with the patient's priorities and current circumstances. Depression, PTSD, anxiety, insomnia, substance use, pain, and other disorders should receive evidence-based care adapted to ongoing threat and practical access. Symptom improvement should not be expected to stop the partner's conduct, and safety planning should not substitute for psychotherapy when a treatable disorder is present. Parallel tracks are often required: safety and advocacy; medical and psychiatric care; practical support; and psychological work on fear, shame, self-blame, avoidance, grief, agency, and relationships.

Short-term psychosocial interventions for survivors of intimate partner violence show benefits on some outcomes, but heterogeneity and study quality limit general conclusions (Arroyo et al., 2017). Ogbe et al. (2020) likewise found wide variation in the components and effects of interventions targeting social support or mental health. Treatment choice should therefore reflect the diagnosed condition, patient preference, safety, therapist competence, and burdens such as childcare, transport, cost, and surveillance. Trauma-focused treatment may be appropriate when PTSD is present and the patient can participate safely; it is not required for every person exposed to abuse.

Recovery may begin before, during, or after relationship change and need not follow a linear course. Relevant outcomes include reduced fear and symptoms, restored sleep and concentration, safer access to money and care, renewed relationships, return to work or education, sexual autonomy, confidence in judgment, and a wider range of choices. Medication can treat a disorder but cannot correct coercion. Therapy may strengthen agency but cannot create housing or legal protection. Stating these limits prevents the patient from being blamed when a well-delivered intervention cannot change an unsafe environment.

Clinical goals should be patient-defined and observable: sleeping through the night, attending an appointment without interference, resuming contact with one trusted person, managing panic during necessary parenting contact, or making an informed housing decision. Such goals connect symptom treatment with lived freedom without implying that leaving is the only valid outcome. They also reveal when psychotherapy is being asked to solve a material problem. When surveillance prevents attendance or debt prevents relocation, advocacy and practical support may be the active ingredients of care. This review proposes expanded safe choice—the demonstrable ability to seek care, use resources, maintain relationships, and make decisions without retaliation—as a clinically meaningful recovery marker. Progress is better judged by this expansion than by agreement with a prescribed relationship decision (Rivas et al., 2015; Ogbe et al., 2020).

Social reconnection may be therapeutic because isolation is both a tactic and a consequence of abuse. Reconnection should be selective and consent-based. One reliable person who responds without control may matter more than broad disclosure. Group or peer support may reduce isolation for some patients, whereas others need privacy or culturally specific services. Ask which relationships feel safe, what support would be useful, and which contact might increase risk.

Treatment progress should be reviewed against both symptoms and context. Apparent nonresponse may reflect continued surveillance, court proceedings, sleep deprivation, interference with medication, or escalating contact. Conversely, improved mood does not establish safety. Periodic formulation review should ask what has changed in the relationship, the patient's resources and risks, the therapeutic alliance, and the chosen goals.

Table 3. Parallel treatment tracks

Track	Primary target	Common error	Review marker
Safety and advocacy	Danger, housing, legal information, benefits, digital and child-related safety	Treating departure as the only successful outcome	Options and contingencies become more usable
Condition-specific care	Depression, PTSD, anxiety, sleep, substance use, pain, and medical needs	Explaining every symptom by abuse or ignoring the context	Symptoms and function improve without unsafe demands
Agency and meaning	Self-trust, shame, grief, boundaries, values, and decisions	Replacing the partner's control with clinician direction	The patient can identify preferences and make informed choices
Relationship and social repair	Safe connection, disclosure decisions, parenting, and supportive relationships	Assuming more disclosure is always better	Support expands without retaliation or loss of autonomy

XII. PARTNER INVOLVEMENT, COUPLE WORK, AND CLINICAL BOUNDARIES

Couple-based communication treatment assumes enough safety for both partners to describe experience, disagree, and use new skills without retaliation. That assumption must be assessed privately rather than inferred from attendance or verbal agreement. When one partner is afraid, monitored, threatened, or materially controlled, joint sessions may expose safety plans, distribute blame, and create consequences after the appointment. Do not invite the partner into an assessment merely to verify the account. If the partner already attends, establish a safe and routine way to speak with the patient alone.

Poor communication can coexist with abuse, but treating the former does not neutralize the latter. Mutualizing language—‘the couple's cycle’ or ‘both need to communicate better’—may obscure asymmetric responsibility. A partner who uses

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

abuse is responsible for stopping it. The patient may still choose communication strategies to reduce immediate risk, set boundaries, coordinate parenting, or end contact; these are pragmatic actions, not shared responsibility for the abuse. Joint work may become appropriate only after specialist assessment indicates that fear and coercion are absent or resolved and that each partner can speak freely.

Individual therapy also requires clear boundaries. Unless explicitly occupying another role, the therapist is not an investigator, legal representative, or covert strategist. Letters for court, employment, immigration, or benefits should state the clinician's sources, observations, competence, and limits. Records should not be represented as proof of abuse. Clinicians can remain neutral about facts they do not know while being unequivocal about safety, dignity, and the unacceptability of threats or coercion.

If both partners seek separate treatment within one service, confidentiality and role conflicts should be addressed before sensitive disclosure. Information should not pass between clinicians or records simply because it concerns the same relationship. Clear boundaries strengthen the therapeutic relationship by showing what it can safely hold and what requires specialist legal or safeguarding advice.

XIII. EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DOCUMENTATION

Available options are shaped by more than motivation. Poverty, disability, racism, homophobia, transphobia, immigration rules, rural distance, caregiving, inaccessible shelters, criminalization, and distrust of institutions can make standard advice unsafe or impossible. An LGBTQ+ patient may fear being outed; a disabled patient may depend on the partner for personal care; a migrant may face threats about status; a man may anticipate disbelief or find no suitable service. Clinicians should ask which systems are protective, unavailable, or themselves risky rather than assume that one pathway fits all.

Documentation should be factual, proportionate, and safe. Use the patient's words for key reported conduct, distinguish report from observation, describe injuries and mental state, record assessments and options offered, and avoid pejorative conclusions about either partner. Copy-forward can turn an early hypothesis into false certainty. Patient portals, shared insurance, subpoenas, and mandatory-disclosure rules may expose notes. Discuss these constraints where possible and follow local policy. Record clinically necessary information, but do not collect intimate detail without a clear care purpose.

Specialist domestic-abuse services offer expertise that general clinicians may not have. NICE recommends coordinated multi-agency responses and training rather than isolated professional action (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2014). Coordination still requires consent and role clarity. A large network can become another source of repeated storytelling and contradictory advice unless one professional helps the patient understand who does what, what information is shared, and how decisions are made.

XIV. LIMITATIONS AND RESEARCH NEEDS

The evidence base is limited by inconsistent definitions, cross-sectional designs, self-report, overlapping forms of violence, and samples drawn disproportionately from women in heterosexual relationships and from specialist services. Measures of psychological aggression may combine isolated low-severity acts with sustained coercion, while legal definitions vary. Mental-health outcomes may influence recall, help-seeking, or exposure, and unmeasured adversity may affect both. Associations should not be recast as simple causal effects.

Intervention studies need clearer descriptions of the abuse pattern, ongoing contact, safety outcomes, social and economic constraints, adverse effects, and participant diversity. Screening trials should report what follows identification, not only whether a question was asked. Treatment research should distinguish four outcomes: reduction in psychiatric symptoms, increased agency and support, improved safety, and change in partner violence. These outcomes are related but not equivalent. Patient-defined outcomes and qualitative accounts can explain why an intervention changes a scale score without changing lived safety.

Communication requires empirical study rather than broad prescription. Research should examine which clinician responses reduce disengagement, how negative social reactions can be prevented, when digital tools are safe, and how the therapeutic alliance functions under ongoing surveillance or material dependence. It should also identify when relationship work becomes possible and how coercion can be recognized without pathologizing ordinary conflict.

Longitudinal designs should preserve timing: whether control continues, changes after separation, or interacts with housing loss, litigation, parenting contact, and treatment. Studies should report both benefit and unintended exposure, including whether a message, referral, or joint session increased surveillance or retaliation. This would make relational mechanisms clinically interpretable without claiming that communication alone causes either abuse or recovery.

XV. CONCLUSION

Emotional abuse in an intimate relationship is best understood as a patterned relational exposure that can restrict choice and harm health without visible injury. Its clinical significance depends on conduct, repetition, fear, retaliation, cumulative impact, and context—not on a single insult, a

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

screen score, or a psychiatric label. Population research supports broad associations with depression, anxiety, trauma symptoms, suicidality, and impaired functioning, but individual diagnosis still requires ordinary differential assessment. Emotional abuse should neither be minimized nor made to explain every symptom.

Clinical care should begin with private inquiry and a pattern–impact–context formulation, followed by direct risk assessment, first-line validation, safe documentation, access to specialist options, and planned follow-up. Safety work and condition-specific treatment often need to proceed in parallel. Clinicians can support agency without directing the relationship decision and can continue care when the patient chooses differently. Recovery may include symptom improvement, restored self-trust, social reconnection, material stability, and greater freedom to make safe choices.

Communication is a central but conditional mechanism. Communication with oneself, a clinician, and chosen supporters can restore accurate self-understanding and connection. Communication with the partner is therapeutic only when disagreement is safe enough to be genuine. When openness is punished, prescribing more communication mistakes a power problem for a skills deficit. Relationship intervention must therefore follow the structure of the relationship, not merely the content of its arguments.

XVI. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES

Conflicts of interest—The author developed and writes about Communication-Focused Therapy (CFT). In this article, CFT is presented as a formulation perspective, not as a substitute for established assessment, evidence-based treatment, or independent replication. The author reports no other conflicts of interest.

Funding—The author received no specific funding for this work.

Author contributions—Christian Jonathan Haverkampf is the sole author and was responsible for the conception, literature review, analysis, manuscript preparation, and approval of the final version.

Patient material—No identifiable patient material is included. Any brief examples are generic composites used to illustrate clinical reasoning and are not case reports.

XVII. REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596

Arroyo, K., Lundahl, B., Butters, R., Vanderloo, M., & Wood, D. S. (2017). Short-term interventions for survivors of intimate partner violence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 18(2), 155–171. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838015602736

Breiding, M. J., Basile, K. C., Smith, S. G., Black, M. C., & Mahendra, R. R. (2015). Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements, version 2.0. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/31292

Cloitre, M., Shevlin, M., Brewin, C. R., Bisson, J. I., Roberts, N. P., Maercker, A., Karatzias, T., & Hyland, P. (2018). The International Trauma Questionnaire: Development of a self-report measure of ICD-11 PTSD and complex PTSD. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 138(6), 536–546. https://doi.org/10.1111/acps.12956

Crossman, K. A., Hardesty, J. L., & Raffaelli, M. (2016). “He could scare me without laying a hand on me”: Mothers' experiences of nonviolent coercive control during marriage and after separation. Violence Against Women, 22(4), 454–473. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215604744

Devries, K. M., Mak, J. Y. T., Bacchus, L. J., Child, J. C., Falder, G., Petzold, M., Astbury, J., & Watts, C. H. (2013). Intimate partner violence and incident depressive symptoms and suicide attempts: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. PLOS Medicine, 10(5), e1001439. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001439

Dokkedahl, S., Rønde Kristensen, T., Murphy, S., & Elklit, A. (2021). The complex trauma of psychological violence: Cross-sectional findings from a cohort of four Danish women shelters. European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 12(1), 1863580. https://doi.org/10.1080/20008198.2020.1863580

Dokkedahl, S. B., Kirubakaran, R., Bech-Hansen, D., Kristensen, T. R., & Elklit, A. (2022). The psychological subtype of intimate partner violence and its effect on mental health: A systematic review with meta-analyses. Systematic Reviews, 11(1), Article 163. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-022-02025-z

Dworkin, E. R., Brill, C. D., & Ullman, S. E. (2019). Social reactions to disclosure of interpersonal violence and psychopathology: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clinical Psychology Review, 72, 101750. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2019.101750

Feltner, C., Wallace, I., Berkman, N., Kistler, C. E., Middleton, J. C., Barclay, C., Higginbotham, L., Green, J. T., & Jonas, D. E. (2018). Screening for intimate partner violence, elder abuse, and abuse of vulnerable adults: Evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. JAMA, 320(16), 1688–1701. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.13212

Hegarty, K., O'Doherty, L., Taft, A., Chondros, P., Brown, S., Valpied, J., Astbury, J., Taket, A., Gold, L., Feder, G., & Gunn, J. (2013). Screening and counselling in the primary care setting for women who have experienced intimate partner violence (WEAVE): A cluster randomised controlled trial. The Lancet, 382(9888), 249–258. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60052-5

Koziol-McLain, J., Vandal, A. C., Wilson, D., Nada-Raja, S., Dobbs, T., McLean, C., Sisk, R., Eden, K. B., & Glass, N. E. (2018). Efficacy of a web-based safety decision aid for women experiencing intimate partner violence: Randomized controlled trial. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 20(1), e8. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8617

Lagdon, S., Armour, C., & Stringer, M. (2014). Adult experience of mental health outcomes as a result of intimate partner violence victimisation: A systematic review. European Journal of

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships: Recognition and Trauma-Informed Care. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Mar 31;14(1):11-20

Psychotraumatology, 5(1), 24794. https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.24794

Myhill, A. (2015). Measuring coercive control: What can we learn from national population surveys? Violence Against Women, 21(3), 355–375. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801214568032

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2014). Domestic violence and abuse: Multi-agency working (PH50). https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph50

Ogbe, E., Harmon, S., Van den Bergh, R., & Degomme, O. (2020). A systematic review of intimate partner violence interventions focused on improving social support and/or mental health outcomes of survivors. PLOS ONE, 15(6), e0235177. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235177

Rivas, C., Ramsay, J., Sadowski, L., Davidson, L. L., Dunne, D., Eldridge, S., Hegarty, K., Taft, A., & Feder, G. (2015). Advocacy interventions to reduce or eliminate violence and promote the physical and psychosocial well-being of women who experience intimate partner abuse. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2015(12), CD005043. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD005043.pub3

Smith, S. G., Zhang, X., Basile, K. C., Merrick, M. T., Wang, J., Kresnow, M.-J., & Chen, J. (2018). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2015 data brief—updated release. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/60893

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2014). Trauma-informed care in behavioral health services (Treatment Improvement Protocol 57; HHS Publication No. SMA 14-4816). https://library.samhsa.gov/product/tip-57-trauma-informed-care-behavioral-health-services/sma14-4816

Trevillion, K., Oram, S., Feder, G., & Howard, L. M. (2012). Experiences of domestic violence and mental disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLOS ONE, 7(12), e51740. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0051740

US Preventive Services Task Force. (2018). Screening for intimate partner violence, elder abuse, and abuse of vulnerable adults: US Preventive Services Task Force final recommendation statement. JAMA, 320(16), 1678–1687. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.14741

World Health Organization. (2013). Responding to intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women: WHO clinical and policy guidelines. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241548595

World Health Organization. (2014). Health care for women subjected to intimate partner violence or sexual violence: A clinical handbook. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-RHR-14.26

World Health Organization. (2021). Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240022256