Economic and Social Determinants of Violence against Women: A Study based on Demographic Health Survey in India

Introduction

Violence against women is found in all the societies around the world (Mercy, Krug, Dahlberg, & Zwi, 2003; Garcia, Heise, Jansen, Ellsberg, & Watts, 2005; Krantz & Garcia, 2005). Despite many interventions from government around the world, violence against women remains one of the most ubiquitous forms of human rights violations around the globe. Estimates revealed that one in three women around the world had faced violence in their lifetime and the perpetrator is usually a family member or someone known to the women (Heise, Ellsberg & Gottemoeller, 1999). Violence against women is a social problem of enormous magnitude which compromises the women's human rights. Violence against women has its genesis in a set of predefined social-cultural that fosters a sense of superiority among the men. The widespread nature of the violence against women has been addressed by many social researchers in all parts of world as an increasing human rights and public health concern (Ellsberg, Heise, Pena, Agurto, & Winkvist, 2001; Heise, Pitanguy & Germain, 1994) and recognized as a global hidden epidemic by the World Health Organization (WHO, 2002, 2006). Unveiling the different aspects of violence against women reveals that this issue in particular needs to be understood in connection with the human rights discourse. Domestic violence is not only associated with health burdens but also has intergenerational effects as well as sociodemographic consequences of physical and sexual abuse (Garcia & WHO, 2005, Panda & Agarwal, 2005, and Agarwal & Panda, 2007). Women who experience violent acts in their households, the environment that is supposed to be the safest place, not only suffer from health-related issues but also carry the emotional and psychological burden. From a societal perspective, national economies in countries where domestic violence is prevalent experience detrimental effects through a decrease in female labor participation, increasing disability and

medical expenses (Martin, Tsui, Maitra, & Marinshaw, 1999). Women always suffer in silence, suffer from physical and psychological trauma filled with justified terror.

Violence against women in Indian Context:

The Indian traditional set up is male prerogative where violence against women is even justified by women themselves. Not only in India, but women around the world also justify violence against them due to one or other reasons including when male is economy booster in the household (George & Rahangdale, 1999; Morash, Bui & Santiago, 2000), when women think that family harmony is their responsibility and they fail to maintain it (Bui & Morash, 1999; Chow, 1989; Dutton, Orloff, & Hass, 2000; & Huisman, 1996), women shall be submissive to husband (Bui & Morash, 1999; Chin, 1994; & Perilla, 1999), and because husband protect his wife from acculturation, so he has right to batter her (George & Rahangdale, 1999). Mehrotra (1999) opined that in some cases women continued to be battered because they do not know what is going on with them.

 Violence against women in India is deeply rooted in the cultural norms of patriarchy, hierarchy, and multigenerational families, where female obedience and modesty is controlled through abusive behavior and accepted not only by men but also by women; and fundamental to the existence of violence against women is the notion of power (Thapan, 1995). In the cultural context of India, physical and economic exploitation of women can be seen and proved, but it is not easy to fathom the emotional and psychological abuse which a woman endure in her household due to the cultural secrecy prevailing at the household level in the name of preserving the prestige of the family institution. Often condoned in the societies across the globe, violence against women is still being sustained by patriarchal ideologies and thus is very hard to overcome. Krishnaraj (2007) aptly remarks that violence as a coercive instrument to uphold cultural codes of honor may be visible or invisible. In 1997, the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) began a series of studies on domestic violence in India using

population-based surveys. The studies ranged from trends in domestic violence using household data from 346 married women in rural Gujarat (Visaria, 1999); hospital records in Maharashtra (Jaswal, 1999); and court records in Bangalore (Elizabeth,1999). These studies show that domestic violence is widespread in all communities in India irrespective of socio-demographic identities like caste, class, religion, age, and education. A 2005 United Nations Populations fund report on multinational countries showed that approximately two-thirds of married women in India were victims of domestic violence. In addition, the report also asserted that one incident of violence against a woman translates into seven working days that a woman loses. Numerous empirical studies find that a better economic status of women, represented by higher income, more employment, or more substantial dowries, reduces marital violence (Srinivasan and Bedi, 2007).

Understanding the Psychology of Violence against Women

Gender violence is an incredibly complex issue and explaining reasons behind the violence against women and understanding psychology of violence against women can be a cumbersome endeavor. There are various propositions ranging from biological and genetic theories to those which attribute the violence against women as a cause of poverty and other social issues (Ghadially, 2007; Raj, 1991; Kelkar, 1992). Understanding causes of violence against women may include reasons like unequal relations between men and women, male superiority as lies within the cultural norms, early marriage, accepted battering by wife, etc. Existing economic research on spousal violence is primarily based on marital bargaining models. These models predict that an increase in women's economic opportunities, relative to men's, will allow favorable outside options for women and lower their threshold for tolerating abuse within marriage, thereby reducing the incidence of violence (Tauchen, Witte, & Long, 1991). Understand domestic violence cannot be theorized in a single theory, women with better economic opportunities may even suffer more or less violence in some cases. A similar but

slightly different mechanism suggests that a husband may exercise greater violence on a woman with more financial resources, to extract a monetary transfer from her (Bloch & Rao 2002). In this article, we have focused on two hypotheses. The two hypotheses are Household Bargaining Model (HBM) and Male Backlash Model (MBM). In this present study, we examine the relationship between violence and women's economic activity, socio/demographic and partner's characteristics. Here two rival hypothesis account for the incidence of domestic violence against women in India: the household bargaining model (HBM) and male backlash model (MBM) are employed for a better understanding of the predictors of violence against women.

The HBM postulates that when women have more resource, actual resources, potential and income generating activities they can bargain for better outcomes in the household, and they experience less violence. Therefore when HBM is used to understand gender violence, increased economic opportunities for women are expected to be associated with a decreased likelihood of domestic violence. It follows that domestic violence is more likely to occur when women have fewer economic resources. In contrast, the MBM argues that men use violence when they feel disempowered or when they sense that the gender hierarchy is being destabilized in the household, for instance in a situation where the wife is employed while the husband is unemployed. It follows that domestic violence is more likely to occur when women have more economic resources than their husbands.

The objectives of the study are to examine the prevalence of different forms of violence in India and its states by different socio-economic status and to examine the various predictors to explain different types of violence, and theoretical explanation is also used to describe violence against women.

Propositions from Contending Models

In assessing the correlates of gender violence in India, and testing which model—HBM or the MBM—best accounts for gender violence, we advance the following propositions which situate the competing models within the context of economic and socio/demographic variables. The HBM predicts that any potential or actual outside economic opportunities and resources improve the woman's wellbeing in the household. Hence, the HBM suggests that any economic resources and income-generating activity will translate into a lower odds ratio of women experiencing less domestic violence. Additionally, social/demographic factors such as increased years of education, living in an urban area where there are more work opportunities, or if the respondent is the household head, this should also translate into better outcomes as these strengthen a woman's bargaining position; we call this, the narrow version of the HBM. In the narrow version of the MBM, it is the relative income positions of the couple that matter. Hence a situation where the wife makes more money than her husband would imply that the wife is at a higher odds ratio of experiencing violence. We can also extend the MBM—that is, a broader version of the MBM—to economic variables that strengthen a woman's exit options or make her a political actor in the public sphere; in this case, it follows variables that provide women resources and participation in politics will elicit higher odds of violence from the husband. We turn now to an analysis of multivariate logistic results to ascertain the signs and statistical significance of the economic, and social determinants and assess which of the two models best describes gender violence in the household in which contexts in India.

Data and Methodology

Data Source and Sample Selection:

Data for this study were drawn from the fourth round of National Family Health Survey 2015-16 (NFHS-IV) coordinated by International Institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai. This

study is a result of a nationally representative probability sample of all the women of reproductive ages (15-49) with a nationwide sample of women selected from 104377 households. In women questionnaire of NFHS IV, there is a special section on Household relation section (module-11) which covers questions related to violence against women. Out of the total sample of 79729 women selected for the household relation module, 62716 currently married women were chosen for the analysis purpose of this study. We excluded never married, widowed, and separated women from the sample of 79729 women and achieved 62716 sample of ever married women. In women questionnaire, a section of household relation is added which includes the questions of different types of violence by the husband as well as other household members. In this study, we focused on ever-married women of reproductive age, who were administered the household relation module. The NFHS IV administered the module on violence to only one eligible woman from each selected household. The selection was random, and it yielded 62716 eligible respondents. At the start of every interview, informed consent for the surveys was obtained from the respondents and protection of their anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed.

Variables:

*Independent variables***:** Our analysis focuses on three sets of independent variables (a) Women's economic characteristics; (b) Socio-demographic characteristics of the women, and (c) Partner's characteristics. For women's economic variable, earning of women with comparison to partner (Relative income), earn money for own use, occupation and wealth quantile in five categories are taken. For Socio-demographic independent variables, age group of female, place of residence, exposure to media and number of children are considered as independent variables, and for partner's characteristics alcohol consumption, Husband education, spousal age difference and husband occupation are considered as independent variables.

Dependent variables: Our dependent variables are physical, emotional and sexual violence. One more variable is created by adding all these three types of violence named "Any Violence." The NFHS IV collected detailed information about different forms of violence. The domestic violence module used questions constructed from the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1990) to measure physical and sexual violence. To measure physical, sexual, and emotional violence, questions included are: Does/did your husband ever did any of the following things to you in the past 12 months—

Physical Violence

a) Push you, shake you, or throw something at you

b) Twist your arm or pull your hair

c) Slap you

d) Punch you with his fist or with something that could hurt you

e) Kick you, drag you or beat you up

f) Try to choke you or burn you on purpose

g) Threaten or attack you with a knife, gun, or any other weapon

These questions are used to create the index of physical violence

Sexual violence

h) Physically force you to have sexual intercourse with him even when you did not want to

i) Physically force you to perform any other sexual acts you did not want to

j) Force you with threats or in any other way to perform sexual acts you did not want to

These questions are used to create sexual violence

Emotional violence

a) Say or do something to humiliate you in front of others

b) Threaten to hurt you or someone close to you

c) Insult you or make you feel bad about yourself

These questions are combined to create emotional violence.

In this study, three types of violence namely, Physical, Emotional, and Sexual violence is combined to form another variable with the variable name of 'Any violence.' The variable of 'Any violence' shows that a woman is facing at least one type of violence.

Methodology:

Using bi-variate analysis prevalence is calculated for different states of India and among different socio-economic background characteristics. Multivariate regression is also used to understand the predictor of all reasons for violence. To observe this, logistic regression is used in which form of violence is categorized as a dichotomous variable. All the predictors are categorized into economic variable of women, socio-demographic variables, and husband characteristics.

Results

Table 1 shows the prevalence of different types of violence in states of India. The kinds of violence include physical, emotional, and sexual violence. Physical violence is pervasive in the states of Manipur, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Telangana, and TamilNadu where around one in every three women experienced physical violence. Nearly 39 percent of women in Manipur had suffered physical violence. One in every four women in India suffered from physical violence. In 12 of the states, the prevalence of physical violence against women is higher than the national average. In states like Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Nagaland, Goa, and Mizoram, the practice of physical violence against women is decidedly less frequent as compared to other states. Emotional violence is prevalent in the states of Bihar, TamilNadu, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, and Arunachal Pradesh. Nearly one in every 10 women in India suffered from emotional violence. In eight of the states, the prevalence of emotional violence is higher than the national average of near 12 percent. The prevalence of emotional violence is less severe in the states of Sikkim, Himachal Pradesh, Goa, Uttarakhand, and Punjab. Sexual

violence is protruding in the state of Bihar where one in every eight women had experienced sexual violence, followed by the state of Manipur where one in every 10 women had suffered sexual violence. In Tripura, nearly 8 percent of women had suffered sexual violence whereas, in the states of Haryana, West Bengal, and Odisha, nearly 7 percent of women had suffered from sexual violence. In 12 of the states, the prevalence of sexual violence against women is higher than the national average of 6 percent. In the states like Sikkim, Goa, Mizoram, Jammu & Kashmir, and Himachal Pradesh the prevalence of sexual violence is well below the national average. In the state of Sikkim, all the three types of violence are least prevalent.

Table 2 shows the result of the prevalence of different forms of violence by background characteristics of ever-married women of age group 15-49 years. The physical and emotional violence against women increases with the increase in age of women. Nearly 4 percent of ever-married women in the age group 15-19 have suffered from physical violence, whereas almost 2 percent and 1 percent of such women have experienced emotional and sexual violence respectively. Physical and emotional violence against women increases with the increase in number of living children women have. Nearly 7 percent of ever-married who had no child have faced physical violence whereas 4 percent and 2 percent of such women have faces emotional and sexual violence respectively. Nearly 1 in every 10 women, who have five and more children, has faced sexual violence. Wealth plays an imperative role in the discussion course of violence against women. Any form of violence against women decreases with the increase in wealth index of the household. It is not only household wealth index, but relative wealth also has been seen as a compelling factor in determining the violence against women. Nearly 37 percent of poorest ever married women were victims of physical violence whereas only 13 percent of wealthiest women had ever faced physical violence. Similarly, almost 17 percent of ever-married women have suffered emotional violence whereas only 7 percent of wealthiest women have faced such violence. Sexual violence had faced by nearly 1 in every 10

most destitute women whereas only 1 in 33 most affluent women have faced sexual violence. Like wealth index, increasing education level of women per se has negative effect on all forms of violence. Nearly 39 percent of illiterate women have faced physical violence whereas only 9 percent of women with higher education have faced physical violence. Sexual violence has faced by almost 9 percent of illiterate women whereas only 2 percent of women with higher education have suffered sexual violence.

Table 3 is showing the result of logistic regression. In the table, two models have been segregated for a better understanding of the concept of violence against women. In the model I, violence has been categorized as the dependent variable, and only economic variables are taken as independent variables unlike in model II, where along with economic variables, socio-demographic variables and variables of partner's characteristics are also considered as independent variables for comprehensive analysis. In previous studies also the importance of the relationship between being economic distress and intimate partner violence has been established (Benson, Fox, DeMaris, & Van Wyk, 2003; Schuler, Hashemi, Riley, & Akhter, 1996; Macmillan, & Gartner, 1999; Moore, 1997; & Schwartz, 1988). In model I, women who have less earning than partner's earning are less likely to face any form of violence compared to women who earn more than their partner's earning. Those women who earn more than their partner are 1.4 times more likely to face any form of violence as compared to those women who earn nearly same as partner and those women who earn less than their partners are 1.2 times more likely to face any form of violence as compared to those women who earn same as partner. The hypothesis of MBM, which says that men put women in the situation of crisis by employing violence against them when they feel disempowered, is critical here in this context of when women are earning more than their partners. It is clear from the result that women who are earning more than their partner are more likely to experience, backlash effect, which occurs when a husband commits spousal violence as a way of expressing his antipathy toward female

independence (Chin, 2012). The hypothesis of HBM, which suggests that women when having more resources to bargain for better outcomes in the household thus limiting the violence against them, is getting proved when women are earning same as partner as compared to less than partner. Women who are working as a service workers are less likely to face violence than those women who are not working and this can be understood by the theory of exposure reduction which states that when time spent outside the home increases, a women is less exposed to a potential abuser within the home, which leads to decrease in violence against them (Dugan, Nagin, & Rosenfeld, 2003). Increasing wealth is negatively associated with the onset of violence against women in both the models. In model I and II, poorest women are most likely to face any form of violence compared to women in any other categories of wealth index. It is observed that with the increase in wealth from poorest to richest index, women are less likely to face violence, though wealth index is not necessarily a causal factor, it has generally been assumed in the literature that women from the poorest quintiles are at increased risk of domestic violence (Djamba & Kimuna, 2008; Kimuna & Djamba, 2008).

In model II, the analysis has been carried out by taking the three crucial independent variables namely: economic variables, socio-demographic variables, and variables of partner's characteristics. In model II also, like model I, relative earnings of women have the same outcome on the violence against them. The odds of facing any form of violence is nearly 1.3 times higher among the women when they earn more than their partners as compared to women who earn same as partners. The odds of facing violence falls among the women who earn less than their partner as compared to women who earn more than their partners and are nearly 1.1 times higher among the women who earn less than their partners as compared to women who earn same as partners. It is clear from the analysis that HBM and MBM are two most important models in explaining the violence against women and violence against women increases when women earning is more than their partner's earning as outlined by MBM model and violence

against women decreases when the relative income of women is nearly same as of partner's income as compared to women who have less income than partner's income as outlined by HBM model. The result outlined that women in rural areas are 10 percent less likely to face any form of violence as compared to women in urban areas and this can again be attributed to the understanding of MBM model as in urban areas women are more likely to earn higher amount than women in rural areas. The women who do not have any children are less likely to face violence because they are newly married women, and the onset of violence take some time after marriage. With the increasing number of children women are more likely to experience violence, researchers around the world have agreed on this notion and showed that the odds of experiencing violence increases with the number of children a woman has (Ellsberg, Pena, Herrera, Liljestrand, & Winkvist, 2000; Martin et al., 1999).

Partner's characteristics are also very imperative to understanding the dynamics of violence against women. In partner's characteristics four variables namely alcohol consumption, husband's education, spousal age difference, and husband occupation are taken for analysis. Alcohol consumption by women's husbands is one of the critical factors in deciding the violence against women. Women whose husbands consume alcohol are three times more likely to face violence as compared to those women whose husbands do not drink alcohol. When husband's education increases, the chances that women will suffer violence decreases. Level of husband's education plays an imperative role in understanding the violence against women (Malhotra & Mather, 1997). Education of husbands seems to be a protective factor for women against violence.

Table 4 shows the result of logistic regression by different types of violence. In the analysis, three forms of violence namely, physical, emotional, and sexual violence were taken as dependent variables, and economic variables, socio-demographic variables, and variables of partner's characteristics were considered as independent variables. The odds of facing

emotional and sexual violence are 1.5 times higher among the women who earn more than their husband as compared to those women who earn same as husband. Those women who earn less than their partners are 1.1 times more likely to face physical violence, 1.3 times more likely to face emotional violence and 1.2 times more likely to face sexual violence as compared to those women who earn same as their partners. All the three types of violence are more prominent when women earn more than their husband thus promoting the MBM hypothesis where males resort to violence against women when the values of patriarchal setup, as perceived by men, seems to be disturbed by the women. At the same time, those women who earn nearly equal to their husband are in better position to avoid violence against them as compared to those women who earn less than their husband thus promoting HBM model.

In socio-demographic characteristics, age group of women and exposure to media do not have any association with the occurrence of any form of violence against women. The odds of facing emotional and sexual violence is higher among urban women than in rural women. The physical violence is increasing with the increase in number of children because with every additional child the duration of marriage is increasing and as a result of which exposure time is rising. Variables of partner's characteristics also affect the onset of violence against women through two of these variables namely spousal age difference and husband occupation do not have any significant association with physical and emotional violence against women. The odds of facing sexual violence is 1.2 times higher among the women whose husbands are 10 or more years older to them as compared to women whose husbands are younger to them. Women whose husbands consume alcohol are nearly 3.2 times more likely to face physical violence, 2.7 times more likely to face emotional and sexual violence than those women whose husband do not consume alcohol. The rising education of husbands has a negative association with the occurrence of any form of violence, though there is no association between violence against women and husband's primary education.

Table 5 shows the result of the odds ratio of justification of violence against women by women themselves. In the analysis part, we have taken any form of violence women suffered, if justified by women, as a dependent variable and different economic variables as independent variables. Women who earn more than their partners and less than their partners are 1.4 times more likely to justify the violence against them as those women who earn same as their partners. Those women who have money for own use are nearly 28 percent less likely to justify the violence against them than those women who do not have money for own use. The result further showed that women in poorer and middle wealth index are more likely to justify the violence against them than women in the richer and richest wealth index. It signifies that women with poor economic background accept the violence against them because they do not have any escape mechanism whereas women with rich economic background do not justify the violence against them as they have always been in a position to bargain their perpetrator. Wife beating was found to be condoned in traditional societies and regarded mainly as a consequence of a man's right to inflict violence on the spouse, and in India, a man might be justified in beating his wife in certain circumstances (Jejeebhoy, 1998).

Testing of the HBM and MBM hypotheses:

Table 6 shows the summary result of fitting of HBM and MBM for economic variables. Using logistic regression analysis, we found support for Household bargaining Model (HBM) when the dependent variable is aggregate violence (Physical, Emotional, and Sexual Violence) for most of the economic variables except when the women are earning more than their partners where MBM was supported. In case of women experiencing any violence, we found support for Household Bargaining Model for women who are earning same as partner as compared to women earning less than their partners, women who own some money as compared to women who do not own money for their use, and working women as compared to non-working women. It is well understood and also entrenched in this study that increasing wealth index has a

negative relationship with the violence against women. Keeping wealth index factor aside, what is more important and critical in the understanding of violence against women is the relative income of women with their husband. The relative income of women with their husband paved the way for testing the hypothesis of MBM and HBM. It is explored in the study that women relative income also decides the violence against them. If a woman is earning but less than their husband then they are in a situation of bargain where they can avert the onset of violence against them as compared to those women who do not earn. This phenomenon is the hypothesis of Household Bargaining Model (HBM). So if a woman is earning less than their husband they are in a better position to avert the risk of violence against them then than those women who are earning more than their husband. When women earn more than their husbands, then husbands resort to violence against their wives to show their supremacy over their wives and to maintain the patriarchal hierarchy (Macmillan & Gartner, 1999). This phenomenon is the hypothesis of Male Backlash Model (MBM).

Conclusion

Any form of violence is used by more powerful in the households as a method to ensure the obedience of less powerful and therefore power dynamics play a vital role in deciding violence against women. Violence runs along the lines of power in the patriarchal set-up where family acts as a central axis, and the sexual division of labour is the principle that governs the violence against women. The patriarchal ideologies as a cultural norm enforce gender construction which subjugates women and confines women to the domestic fold. Sadistic wife battering is the result of superiority complex a man harbours upon himself in relation to his wife. In the study, it is reiterated that when women challenge the set pattern of power relation in the household by earning more income than their partners, they become subject to violence. It is evident from previous studies that women are both the objects of desire and of control (Thapan, 1995) and when women challenge this patriarchal setup, they often face violence against them.

Generally, an essential part of this power relation dynamics occur as a result of dowry-related issues, but in this study, we have not touched violence against women from the dowry perspective. State-wise prevalence of violence against women indicates that Bihar needs serious intervention as among all the states in Bihar sexual and emotional violence is highest whereas Bihar stands third where women face physical violence followed by Manipur and Andhra Pradesh. Among north-eastern states, nearly 1 in every 10 women in Manipur and Tripura face sexual violence against them. Otherwise, women empowered states (Kishor & Gupta, 2004), these two states needs serious overhauling of sexual violence against women. Education is one of the crucial interventions that will surely lower down violence against women. The result indicates that with a higher level of education among women, the chances of facing any form of violence decreases. Higher wealth index also acts as a barrier to the onset of violence against women.

In this article, for a better understanding of the covariates of violence against women, we have the independent variables as economic variables, socio-demographic variables and variables related to partner's characteristics. Of all the covariates, we focused more on economic variables of women to understand the hypothesis of MBM and HBM. Other than the economic covariates, socio-demographic and partner's characteristics also play an imperative role in violence against women. In partner's characteristics covariates, rising husband's education has a negative relationship with the onset of violence against women whereas alcohol consumption among husbands has a positive relationship with the violence against women. In socio-demographic covariates, number of living children a woman has a positive association with violence against women. This can be attributed to the reason that with the increase in number of children the marriage duration increases and hence the chances of violence increases. Wife battering is justified to what extent is another issue to be looked into through the women's lens. The study found that women themselves justified the battering from their husband no matter

they are earning more than their husbands or less than their husbands. Although when women have money for their own use, they are less likely to justify the violence against them. It is clear that women may be earning more from their husbands but whether that earning stay back with them to utilize as money for their own use is an implicit action. In the study, it is confirmed that women who are earning more than their husbands are more likely to justify violence against them, but those women who have money for their own use are less likely to justify violence against them. This gives rise to the hypothesis that a large chunk of women earning may be extracted from the women by husbands or any other member of households, thus leaving behind very less amount for women to spend for their own use.

Discussion and Policy Implications

Violence against women was not an issue before the arrival of feminist and NGO activists who produces the idea that violence against women is a social evil which must be addressed with the cooperation of the law enforcement and judicial bodies. We are not postulating that violence against women does not occur in India. It does, as everywhere else in the world. Rather we mean that violence against women was not locally recognized as a public issue before activists took Centre stage to pigeonhole the problem of violence against women. It is really an appreciating honour for them to bring this issue into the discussion arena of the political table. Of the various initiatives focusing on the aspect of violence against women, most of them were not very effective in curbing down the menace of violence against women. Where is the issue then? Where are we lacking? The problem, as we perceive, lies within the family set up. When we think about violence that takes place within the family, it becomes hard to intervene because these family matters are seen as private areas where the government cannot directly invade because of the culture of silence over the issue. This is one of the pervasive cultural factors in all over India, and that makes it tough for the government to intervene and avoid the occurrence of violence against women. So, in order to tackle the violence against women government

needs to implement policies indirectly. By implementing policies indirectly we mean, the government should focus on those areas which will bring the women empowerment and autonomy which in turn will undoubtedly lower down the violence against women. Empowerment of women is a necessity for the overall development of society since it expands both the quality and quantity of human resources available for development. One such area is the female work participation. Government shall invest exclusively to promote female labour force. In India, women are confined to the agricultural sector, and there is need to bring them in the white collar jobs. Not only providing them with job opportunities will solve the purpose but also there is need to implement equal work equal pay propaganda in the country as gender discrimination in earning may also play an imperative role in reducing female employment (Desai et al., 2010). So we can rely on increasing female labour force participation to realise the women's earning capability which will act as a proxy indicator in minimizing the violence against them. However, substantial growth in government employment for women seems quite unlikely, so we need to find some other ways also to address this issue. Some other preventive measures and remedies can also be proposed like spreading education among the women, and more so in rural areas. Education will lead to a social awakening that will help women in making themselves protect from exploitations. There is also a need for reorientation of social norms and values, not only in social codes but also in legal codes.

Limitations of the Study

The violence against women may not be reported entirely, and the situation may even be worse than what has been predicted in this research article. The prevalence of violence against women and the extent of its under-reporting is neither well understood nor sufficiently challenged in the Indian context. In fact, violence against women is often tolerated and justified, by men as well as women and this may be one of the reasons for underreporting of violence against

women. Violence against women is universally under-reported (Koss, 1992; McNally et al., 1998).

References

Agarwal, B., & Panda, P. (2007). "Toward freedom from domestic violence: The neglected obvious." *Journal of Human Development*, 8 (3): 359-88.

Benson, M. L., Fox, G. L., DeMaris, A., & Van Wyk, J. (2003). Neighborhood disadvantage, individual economic distress and violence against women in intimate relationships. *Journal of quantitative criminology*, *19* (3), 207-235.

Bloch F, Rao V (2002). Terror as a bargaining instrument: a case study of dowry violence in rural India. *American Economic Review*, 92 (4), 1029–1043.

Bui, H. N., & Morash, M. (1999). Domestic violence in the Vietnamese immigrant community: An exploratory study. *Violence Against Women*, 5 (7), 769-795.

Chin, K. (1994). Out of town brides: International marriage and wife abuse among Chinese immigrants. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 25 (1), 53-69.

Chin, Y. M. (2012). Male backlash, bargaining, or exposure reduction?: women's working status and physical spousal violence in India. *Journal of population Economics*, *25*(1), 175-200.

Chow, E.N.L. (1989). *The feminist movement: Where are all the Asian American women?* In Asian Women United of California (Ed.), Making waves (pp. 362-377). Boston: Beacon.

Desai, S. B., Dubey, A., Joshi, B. L., Sen, M., Shariff, A., & Vanneman, R. (2010). *Human development in India. New York: Oxford University*.

Djamba, Y. K., & Kimuna, S. R. (2008). Intimate partner violence among married women in Kenya. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 43(4), 457-469.

Dugan, L., Nagin, D. S., & Rosenfeld, R., (2003). Exposure reduction or retaliation? The effects of domestic violence resources on intimate-partner homicide. *Law and Society Review*, 37(1), 169–198.

Dutton, M., Orloff, L. E., & Hass, G. A. (2000). Characteristics of help-seeking behaviors, resources, and service needs of battered immigrant Latinas: Legal and policy implications. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law and Policy*, 7, 245-305.

Elizabeth, V. (1999). *Patterns and Trends of Domestic Violence in India: An Examination of Court Records. Bangalore*. Centre for Women and Law, National Law School of India University, 18.

Engle Merry, S. (2009). *Gender violence: A cultural perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ellsberg, M., Pena, R., Herrera, A., Liljestrand, J., & Winkvist, A. (2000). Candies in hell: Women's experience of violence in Nicaragua. *Social Science and Medicine*, 51(11), 1595-1610.

Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., Pena, R., Agurto, S., & Winkvist, A. (2001). Researching domestic violence against women: Methodological and ethical considerations. *Studies in Family Planning*, 32(1), 1-16.

Fernandez, M. (1997). Domestic violence by extended family members in India. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12(3), 433-455.

Garcia-Moreno, C., & World Health Organization. (2005*). Multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women: initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses*: Geneva, Switzerland.

Garcia-Moreno, C., Heise, L., Jansen, H. A., Ellsberg, M., & Watts, C. (2005). Violence against women. *Science*, *310* (5752), 1282-1283.

George, M. S., & Rahangdale, L. (1999). Domestic violence and South Asian women. *North Carolina Medical Journal*, 60 (3), 157-159.

Ghadially, R. (Ed.). (2007). *Urban women in contemporary India: a reader*. Sage.

Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Gottemoeller, M. (1999). Ending violence against women. *Population reports*, *27* (4), 1-1.

Heise, L., Pitanguy, L., & Germain, A. (1994). Violence against women: The hidden health burden. *World Bank Discussion Paper, No 255*, Washington, DC: World Bank.

Huisman, K. A. (1996). Wife battering in Asian American communities: Identifying the service needs of an overlooked segment of the U.S. population. *Violence Against Women*, 2 (3), 260-283.

International Centre for Research on Women. (1999). *A summary report of three studies, promoting women in development project*. Washington, DC.

Jaswal, S. (1999). *Health records and domestic violence in Thane District, Maharashtra: A summary report*. Mumbai, India: Department of Medical and Psychiatric Social Work, Tata Institute of Social Science.

Jejeebhoy, S. J. (1998). Wife-beating in rural India: a husband's right? Evidence from survey data. *Economic and Political weekly*, 33(15), 855-862.

Kelkar, G. (1992). *Violence against women: Perspectives and strategies in India*. Indian Institute of Advanced Studies.

Kimuna, S. R., & Djamba, Y. K. (2008). Gender based violence: Correlates of physical and sexual wife abuse in Kenya. *Journal of Family Violence*, 23(5), 333-342.

Kishor, S., & Gupta, K. (2004). Women's empowerment in India and its states: evidence from the NFHS. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39 (7), 694-712.

Koss, M. P. (1992). The under detection of rape: Methodological choices influence incidence estimates. *Journal of social issues*, *48* (1), 61-75.

Krantz, G., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2005). Violence against women. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, *59* (10), 818-821.

Krishnaraj, M. (2007). Understanding violence against women. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42 (44), 90-91.

Macmillan, R., & Gartner, R. (1999). When she brings home the bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61 (4), 947-958.

Malhotra, A., & Mather, M. (1997). Do schooling and work empower women in developing countries? Gender and domestic decisions in Sri Lanka. *Sociological Forum*, 12 (4), 599-630.

Martin, S. L, Tsui, A. O., Maitra, K., & Marinshaw, R. (1999). Domestic violence in northern India. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 150 (4), 417-426.

McNally, R. J., Metzger, L. J., Lasko, N. B., Clancy, S. A., & Pitman, R. K. (1998). Directed forgetting of trauma cues in adult survivors of childhood sexual abuse with and without posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, *107* (4), 596.

Mehrotra, M. (1999). The social construction of wife abuse: Experiences of Asian Indian women in the United States. *Violence Against Women*, *5* (6), 619-640.

Mercy, J. A., Krug, E. G., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2003). Violence and health: the United States in a global perspective. *American Journal of Public Health*, *93* (2), 256-261.

Moore, A. M. (1997). Intimate violence: Does socioeconomic status matter? In A.P. Cardarelli (Ed.), *Violence between intimate partners: Patterns, causes, and effects*, 90-100. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Morash, M., Bui, M., & Santiago, A. (2000). Gender specific ideology of domestic violence in Mexican origin families. *International Review of Victimology*, 7 (1), 67-91.

Panda, P., & Agarwal, B. (2005). "Marital violence, human development and women's property status in India." *World Development*, 33 (5), 823-50.

Perilla, J. L. (1999). Domestic violence as a human rights issue: The case of immigrant Latinos. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 21 (2), 107-133.

Raj, M. K. (1991). *Women and violence: A country report*. Research Centre for Women's Studies, SNDT Women's University.

Schuler, S. R., Hashemi, S. M., Riley, A. P., & Akhter, S. (1996). Credit programs, patriarchy and men's violence against women in rural Bangladesh. *Social science & medicine*, *43* (12), 1729-1742.

Schwartz, M. D. (1988). Ain't got no class: Universal risk theories of battering. *Contemporary Crises*, *12* (4), 373-392.

Srinivasan S, Bedi AS (2007) Domestic violence and dowry: evidence from a South Indian Village. *World Development*, 35 (5), 857–880.

Tauchen H. V., Witte, A. D., & Long, S. K., (1991). Domestic violence: a non-random affair. *International Economic Review*, 32 (2), 491–511.

Thapan, M. (1995). Images of the Body and Sexuality in Women's Narratives on Oppression in the Home. *Economic and Political Weekly,* 30 (43), 72-80.

Visaria, L. (1999). Violence against women in India: Evidence from rural Gujarat. In B. Burton, N. Duvvury, A. Rajan, & N. Varia (Eds.), *Domestic violence in India: A survey report of three studies* (pp. 9-17). Washington DC: International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW).

World Health Organization. (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Geneva, Switzerland. World Health Organization. (2006). *Gender based violence in the Western Pacific region: A hidden epidemic?*. Geneva, Switzerland.

Table 1. Prevalence of different types of violence in India and its States, NFHS-IV

States	Physical Violence	Emotional Violence	Sexual Violence
Andhra Pradesh	38.1	16.6	5.5
Arunachal Pradesh	22.9	13.2	6.3
Assam	19.9	9.6	4.4
Bihar	37.1	18.2	12.5
Chhattisgarh	29.3	12.8	5.4
Goa	9.0	4.0	0.9
Gujarat	16.9	10.1	3.9
Haryana	27.3	11.0	7.2
Himachal Pradesh	4.2	3.6	1.9
Jammu And Kashmir	6.4	7.0	1.9
Jharkhand	27.8	8.7	6.9
Karnataka	17.2	11.4	6.3
Kerala	11.1	7.6	3.4
Madhya Pradesh	27.4	10.8	6.8
Maharashtra	18.3	8.4	2.1
Manipur	39.3	10.6	10.7
Meghalaya	19.3	8.7	3.3
Mizoram	9.5	6.9	1.7
Nagaland	7.5	7.6	4.5
Odisha	27.2	10.0	7.0
Punjab	16.2	6.4	4.2
Rajasthan	21.0	7.4	3.4
Sikkim	1.2	1.7	0.6
Tamil Nadu	33.7	18.2	6.8
Tripura	23.2	12.2	8.3
Uttar Pradesh	28.8	11.1	6.4
Uttarakhand	10.5	4.3	2.4
West Bengal	28.2	12.3	7.2
Telangana	36.9	17.4	5.6
India	**25.5**	**11.8**	**5.9**

Table 2: Prevalence of different types of violence by background characteristics, NFHS-IV

Background Characteristics	Physical Violence	Emotional Violence	Sexual Violence
Age Group			
15-19	3.9	2.4	1.1
20-24	19.6	8.7	4.9
25-29	28.2	12.7	6.8
30-34	30.7	13.6	7.1
35-39	31.4	14.5	6.9
40-44	31.1	14.7	6.5
45-49	31.6	15.3	6.8
Number of Children			
No children	7.1	4.1	2.0
One children	24.1	12.7	6.2
Two children	29.7	13.1	5.9
Three children	35.7	15.6	8.2
Four children	38.9	16.9	9.3
Five and more	40.0	17.2	10.0
Wealth Index			
poorest	36.9	16.5	9.9
poorer	31.5	14.1	7.0
middle	27.3	12.8	6.1
richer	22.1	9.9	4.4
richest	13.1	6.8	2.9
Education Level			
No education	39.1	17.9	9.1
Primary	34.2	14.8	7.8
secondary	19.6	9.3	4.4
higher	8.8	4.6	2.1
Total	**25.5**	**11.8**	**5.9**

Table 3: Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression by any form of violence, India, NFHS-IV

Background Variables	Any violence	
	Model- I	**Model-II**
Economic Variables		
Earning		
Same as partner®		
More than partner	1.394***(1.261 1.542)	1.341***(1.207 1.49)
Less than partner	1.224***(1.126 1.33)	1.137***(1.042 1.241)
Money of own use		
No®		
Yes	0.953 (0.889 1.021)	0.968 (0.9 1.041)
Occupation		
Not working®		
Service worker	0.569***(0.468 0.693)	0.609***(0.491 0.755)
Agriculture worker	0.868 (0.727 1.036)	0.868 (0.714 1.055)
Skilled & unskilled worker	0.978 (0.814 1.174)	0.916 (0.748 1.121)
Wealth Index		
Poorest®		
Poorer	0.793***(0.723 0.869)	0.858***(0.773 0.952)
Middle	0.654***(0.593 0.721)	0.739***(0.657 0.832)
Richer	0.551***(0.495 0.614)	0.645***(0.563 0.74)
Richest	0.263***(0.228 0.302)	0.361***(0.302 0.432)
Socio/Demographic characteristics		
Age groups		
15-19®		
20-24		1.336 (0.934 1.912)
25-29		1.098 (0.771 1.562)
30-34		1.101 (0.772 1.569)
35-39		1.079 (0.756 1.541)
40-44		1.125 (0.785 1.612)
45-49		1.147 (0.798 1.648)
Place of residence		
Urban®		
Rural		0.906**(0.823 0.997)
Exposure to media		
No®		
Almost daily		1.079 (0.966 1.204)
Sometimes and once in a week		1.069 (0.966 1.183)
Number of children		
No children®		
One child		1.099 (0.924 1.307)
Two children		1.526***(1.3 1.791)
Three children		1.594***(1.348 1.885)
Four children		1.71***(1.419 2.06)

Five and more		1.65***(1.35 2.017)

Partner's characteristics	
Alcohol consumption	
No®	
Yes	3.104***(2.891 3.333)
Husband education	
No education®	
Primary	0.989 (0.89 1.098)
Secondary	0.868***(0.79 0.953)
Higher	0.695***(0.586 0.825)
SPAD	
Partner lower age	
1 to 4 yrs. ®	1.077 (0.926 1.251)
5 to 9 yrs.	1.098 (0.942 1.28)
10 or more yrs.	1.121 (0.943 1.333)
Husband Occupation	
Not Working®	
Service worker	1.003 (0.821 1.225)
Agriculture worker	0.921 (0.77 1.101)
Skilled & unskilled worker	0.962 (0.801 1.157)

Const.	**1.013 (0.834 1.23)**	**0.389***(0.25 0.606)**

****p ≤ 0.001. ***p ≤ 0.01. **p ≤ 0.05. *p ≤ 0.10

Table 4: Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression by different types of violence, India, NFHS-IV

Background Variables	Physical violence	Emotional violence	Sexual violence
Economic Variables			
Earning			
Same as partner®			
More than partner	1.297***(1.165 1.443)	1.504***(1.256 1.802)	1.536***(1.343 1.756)
Less than partner	1.113**(1.018 1.217)	1.365***(1.169 1.594)	1.21***(1.078 1.358)
Money of own use			
No®			
Yes	0.988 (0.917 1.063)	0.952 (0.845 1.072)	0.964 (0.88 1.056)
Occupation			
Not working®			
Service worker	0.688***(0.551 0.86)	0.693**(0.494 0.972)	0.619***(0.476 0.806)
Agriculture worker	0.99 (0.81 1.209)	0.675***(0.503 0.907)	0.756**(0.6 0.953)
Skilled & unskilled worker	1.015 (0.824 1.25)	0.773 (0.568 1.052)	0.748**(0.587 0.953)
Wealth Index			
Poorest®			
Poorer	0.853***(0.768 0.948)	0.798***(0.676 0.941)	0.886*(0.779 1.008)
Middle	0.71***(0.63 0.801)	0.855 (0.707 1.034)	0.852**(0.735 0.987)
Richer	0.652***(0.567 0.75)	0.733***(0.582 0.923)	0.694***(0.582 0.828)
Richest	0.345***(0.286 0.416)	0.561***(0.407 0.773)	0.501***(0.395 0.635)
Socio/Demographic characteristics			
Age groups			
15-19®			
20-24	1.309 (0.903 1.899)	1.004 (0.577 1.745)	0.895 (0.58 1.382)
25-29	1.052 (0.73 1.518)	0.872 (0.505 1.505)	0.802 (0.523 1.229)
30-34	1.112 (0.77 1.605)	0.641 (0.37 1.113)	0.809 (0.527 1.242)
35-39	1.077 (0.744 1.558)	0.653 (0.375 1.137)	0.816 (0.53 1.256)
40-44	1.16 (0.799 1.684)	0.593*(0.338 1.039)	0.773 (0.499 1.195)
45-49	1.152 (0.791 1.676)	0.593*(0.336 1.044)	0.845 (0.545 1.31)
Place of residence			
Urban®			
Rural	0.931 (0.844 1.027)	0.871*(0.742 1.022)	0.834***(0.739 0.941)
Exposure to media			
No®			
Almost daily	1.08 (0.966 1.208)	0.992 (0.83 1.185)	1.116 (0.973 1.281)

Sometimes and once in a week	1.065 (0.961 1.18)	1.019 (0.867 1.196)	1.035 (0.912 1.174)
Number of children			
No children®			
One child	1.178*(0.983 1.412)	1.026 (0.767 1.373)	1.017 (0.815 1.269)
Two children	1.634***(1.383 1.932)	1.189 (0.909 1.555)	1.132 (0.923 1.387)
Three children	1.754***(1.474 2.088)	1.407**(1.066 1.858)	1.184 (0.958 1.464)
Four children	1.801***(1.485 2.183)	1.365**(1.002 1.859)	1.239*(0.98 1.566)
Five and more	1.617***(1.315 1.989)	1.711***(1.238 2.365)	1.141 (0.886 1.47)

Partner's characteristics			
Alcohol consumption			
No®			
Yes	3.181***(2.96 3.419)	2.75***(2.435 3.106)	2.701***(2.465 2.96)
Husband education			
No education®			
Primary	0.999 (0.899 1.11)	1.001 (0.851 1.177)	1.001 (0.881 1.138)
Secondary	0.85***(0.773 0.935)	0.813***(0.698 0.946)	0.889**(0.791 1)
Higher	0.692***(0.579 0.827)	0.494***(0.353 0.691)	0.658***(0.52 0.833)
SPAD			
Partner lower age®			
1 to 4 yrs.	1.102 (0.944 1.287)	0.892 (0.697 1.141)	1.065 (0.874 1.298)
5 to 9 yrs.	1.109 (0.947 1.298)	0.937 (0.729 1.205)	1.205*(0.986 1.473)
10 or more yrs.	1.098 (0.919 1.312)	1.042 (0.786 1.381)	1.228*(0.982 1.537)
Husband Occupation			
Not Working®			
Service worker	0.944 (0.769 1.159)	0.89 (0.646 1.226)	0.887 (0.694 1.134)
Agriculture worker	0.876 (0.731 1.051)	0.898 (0.682 1.182)	0.803**(0.648 0.995)
Skilled & unskilled worker	0.954 (0.791 1.149)	0.736**(0.553 0.98)	0.846 (0.679 1.054)
Const.	**0.278***(0.176 0.438)	**0.138***(0.069 0.273)	**0.225***(0.131 0.385)

****p ≤ 0.001. ***p ≤ 0.01. **p ≤ 0.05. *p ≤ 0.10

Table 5: Odds Ratios of Logistic Regression by any form of violence when women justify violence against them, India, NFHS-IV

Economic Variables	Any violence
Earning	
Same as partner®	
More than partner	1.395***(1.265 1.538)
Less than partner	1.378***(1.271 1.494)
Money of own use	
No®	
Yes	0.724***(0.676 0.774)
Occupation	
Not working®	
Service worker	0.845*(0.699 1.021)
Agriculture worker	1.146 (0.963 1.364)
Skilled & unskilled worker	0.978 (0.816 1.171)
Wealth Index	
Poorest®	
Poorer	1.121**(1.022 1.229)
Middle	1.218***(1.105 1.341)
Richer	1.013 (0.912 1.126)
Richest	0.535***(0.471 0.608)
Const.	**0.816**(0.674 0.988)**

****p ≤ 0.001. ***p ≤ 0.01. **p ≤ 0.05. *p ≤ 0.10

Table 6: Summary of Significant Variables' Support for Contending Models

Economic Variables	Physical violence	Emotional violence	Sexual violence	Any violence
Same as partner	HBM	HBM	HBM	HBM
More than partner	MBM	MBM	MBM	MBM
Less than partner	HBM	HBM	HBM	HBM
Money of own use	HBM	HBM	HBM	HBM
Working	HBM	HBM	HBM	HBM