

*Aisha Jalil*  
*Rubeena Zakar*  
*Shazia Qureshi*

## **PHYSICAL WIFE ABUSE IN RURAL SINDH, PAKISTAN: PREVALENCE, PROTECTIVE AND RISK FACTORS**

This research paper evaluates the prevalence of lifetime and current physical wife abuse; and its association with resources, dependence of women on marriage, family characteristics and household decision making. A cross-sectional survey is conducted among 151 currently married women of reproductive age residing in 2 villages of MirpurKhas, Sindh, Pakistan. Household financial resources are negatively associated with physical wife abuse. Socio-economic dependence of women on marriage increases the chances of experiencing physical wife abuse. Higher the household decision making in the hands of respondent or respondent and husband jointly; the lower the risk of physical wife abuse. The respondent's isolated from natal kin and residing with in-laws are more likely to experience physical wife abuse. Results indicate that the dependence on marriage is a risk factor, while the respondents who never attempt to leave violent husband even temporarily and household ownership are protective factor against physical wife abuse.

The domestic violence refers to any kind of psychological, physical, financial, emotional and sexual violence that may be perpetrated against any family member, by a person domestically powerful socially, physically or perhaps financially (Holden. 2003, p. 155; Jewkes, Penn-Kekana, & Levin, 2001). According to United States Department of Justice (2007) the

physical abuse may be defined as the acts of: “hitting, slapping, shoving, grabbing, pinching, biting and hair pulling.” Also denying partner’s right to medical care after physical abuse and imposing drug or alcohol intake may also be regarded as physical abuse. Wife beating and its resulting injuries are regarded as physical wife abuse in this paper (Hoffman, Demo & Edwards, 1994).

The socio-economic factors that may contribute to the incidence of physical wife abuse are defined as the risk factors and socio-economic factors that safeguard against physical wife abuse are the protective factors of physical wife abuse (Kishore & Johnson, 2004, p. 27). The risk and protective factors of physical wife abuse found in developing societies are perhaps different from the ones found in western contexts (Baker, Gregware & Cassidy, 1999). Therefore, diverse preventive strategies and theories of violence against women are required for understanding physical wife abuse in conservative and patriarchal societies, unlike the models and theories valid for the developed countries. For example, the education and employment are considered important protective factors against physical violence against women in developed countries (Krishnan, Subbiah, Khanum, Chandra, & Padian, 2012, p. 347; Sen, 1999).

Despite physical wife abuse is globally prevalent; scholars have majorly studied it in developed societies (Baker, Gregware, & Cassidy, 1999; Bowker, 1985; Kishore & Johnson, 2004, p. 11; UNICEF, 2000, p.4). Several studies from developing countries revealed that education and employment may not necessarily bring women empowerment in developing countries rather the male dominant ideologies should be addressed to reduce the risk of physical wife abuse (Atkinson, Greenstein, & Lang, 2005; Malhotra & Mather, 1997).

The statistics for the prevalence of physical violence against married women range from 20% to 50% in different countries (UNICEF, 2000, pp.4). In Pakistan, prevalence of physical wife abuse in Karachi is found to be 34% by Fikree &

Bhatti (1999), 57% in urban areas is found by Ali (2011). Another study revealed that 31.5% women experienced physical intimate partner violence in two cities of Pakistan, Lahore and Sialkot (Zakar, R., Zakar, M. Z., Mikolajczyk, & Kramer, 2012). Almost half of the pregnant women are either physically or emotionally abused by their husbands and in-laws (Farid, Saleem, Kareem & Hatcher, 2008). There is a dearth of published researches seeing prevalence of physical wife abuse in rural Pakistan. Perhaps the trends found by the researchers in urban settings of Pakistan may entirely be different from ones in rural areas.

Numerous researches are based on the analysis of physical wife abuse in association with financial household resources, socio-economic dependence of women on marriage, family characteristics and decision making (Yount, 2005). The household financial resources are considered as the most influential factor of physical wife abuse by many scholars (Goode, 1971; Jejeebhoy & Cook, 1997; Koenig et al., 2003; Smith, 1990). Dependency on marriage is taken as to have fewer options of social support and insufficient financial resources to help women cope with violent husband (Gelles, 1976; Islam et al., 2004; Kalmuss & Straus, 1982; Schuler, et al., 2008; Shaikh, 2003). Studies on women's dependence on marriage found diverse socio-economic factors associated with current and lifetime physical wife abuse (Yount, 2005; Gelles, 1976). Researchers have found that younger age places women at relatively higher risk for intimate partner violence in developed countries (Parish et al., 2004; Ruiz-Perez et al., 2006; Xiao et al., 2005). Besides, the old aged husbands are less likely to beat wives and the number of sons was found to be inversely related to the physical wife abuse (Coates, Rogers, Brewer & Schoonmaker, 2010).

The family characteristics and its organization may also impede or expedite physical wife abuse (Yount, 2005, p. 579). The education and employment of the women are found to be important factors that increase their power in the domestic decision making, choices and reduces the risks of physical abuse

by husbands (Kabeer, 1999). The women who live with their mothers-in-laws are more prone to suffer beating from their husbands than others in developing countries (Krishnan, Subbiah, Khanum, Chandra & Padian, 2012; Schuler, 2008; Shaikh, 2003). Moore (1995) reported that the women living near natal family are better able to negotiate conflicts in marital home. Also, the women living near to the natal kin may control mobility, decision making and finances of their marital home (Bloom, Wypij & Das Gupta, 2001). The household decision making in the hands of husband increases the risk of physical wife abuse (Coates, et al., 2010).

Inconsistencies in the findings of various researches is perhaps due to the variations in samples, research methodology, instruments and acceptability of physical wife abuse across cultures (Anderson, 1997; Kalmuss & Straus, 1982; MacMillan & Gartner, 1999). In the societies characterized by extended family system, patri-local residence and low social distance; several features of family organization may cause physical wife abuse (Warner et al., 1986). The empirical literature suggests that women's age, education and household income may be controlled for statistical analysis (Kishor & Johnson, 2004; Zakar et al., 2012).

The present research evaluates the association of household financial resources, socio-economic dependence of women on marriage, family characteristics and household decision-making with lifetime and recent episodes of physical wife abuse among 151 married women of Digri, MirpurKhas District, Sindh province, Pakistan. The aim of this research is to test if: (a) the lower household financial resources are the risk factors of physical wife abuse, (b) higher socio- economic dependence of women on marriage is a risk factor of the physical wife abuse, (c) the household decision making in the hands of respondent or shared equally by the respondent and husband is a protective factor of physical wife abuse, (d) endogamous marriage, love and arrange with consent marriage, wife living with or at lower proximity from her natal kin are protective

factors of physical wife abuse, (e) attitudes of respondents about beating and divorce.

## METHOD

### Procedure

The present research is carried out in two randomly selected villages of city Digri situated in the district Mirpurkhas, Sindh Province of Pakistan. Multistage sampling method is used to randomly select the 2 villages from Digri. The sample size is determined using Prevalence formula. Keeping in view the financial constraints and time limitation, the sample size is kept small.

$$N = z^2 p (1-p) / d^2$$

Where,

N=required sample size

P= expected proportion of Physical Wife Abuse

1-p= probability of failure

D= degree of precision

$$N = 1.96^2 (0.1)(0.9) / 0.05^2$$

$$N = 138.3$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Non response rate (estimated)} &= 10\% \\ &= 138 * 10\% \\ &= 14 \end{aligned}$$

N= sample size + non response rate

$$N = 152$$

$$\therefore \text{Number of interviews from 2 village} = 152 / 2 = 76$$

### Study Instrument

The first section of the questionnaire comprised on questions regarding socio-demographics of respondents: age, religion, education years, occupation and place of residence. The husband characteristics included: husband's education, occupation, parallel occupation, number of other sources of income, monthly income and property ownership. The marriage

related questions are: age at marriage, marriage duration, and marriage type. The financial resources of the household are analyzed using the approximate household income, household building ownership and number of household items. The list included 7 household items namely: television, mobile phone, motor bike, car, AC, refrigerator, room cooler (NIPS, 2007; WHO, 2001, Annex 4, p. 131). The instrument is modified keeping in view the socio-cultural attributes of research setting.

The socio-economic dependence on marriage related questions are taken from women's questionnaire, section 4 and 11 of WHO (2001) report on Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against women and Yount (2005). The physical wife abuse is inspected using violent behaviors and injuries scale (CTS2) of Strauss (1996) and section 7-8 of women's questionnaire of World Health Organization (2001). Social support is measured using section 9 in women's questionnaire of World Health Organization (2001). The household decision making scale of Leon and Foreit (2009) comprised on three questions regarding household decisions regarding major purchases, daily household needs related purchases and decision regarding to whom and when to meet the relatives. The endogamous marriage, natal – respondent proximity, respondent living with in-laws and marriage type are taken as the family characteristics (WHO, 2001, women's questionnaire; Yount, 2005).

Variables: number of household items, household land or building ownership and approximate household monthly income capture the household financial resources. The number of children, number of dependent children, property ownership of respondents, ownership of productive assets, possession of cash savings, number of education years, respondent's income, age and the availability of social support are the variables that measure the women's socio-economic dependence on marriage. The family characteristics variables include: endogamous marriage, marriage type, proximity with natal family and residing with marital kin.

## **RESULTS**

The SPSS version 1.7 is used for performing the statistical analysis of this study. The dependent variables are dichotomous that is based on two response categories while the independent variables have categories not more than three. Binary logistic regression and multivariate regression analysis is done with and without controlling for the age, education and household income of respondent.

### **Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

The analysis of socio-demographics in Table I reveals that the randomly selected sample comprised on 84% Muslim and 16% are Hindus and Baha'i. Women of ages below 29 are few. The number of children ranged from 0 to 15 per women. Average number of children per woman is 4. See the Table II for marriage, husband and family characteristics of respondents. The respondent's income sources other than the husband are the earnings of children, self-employed business, job or private property. The other sources of income of respondent are not inclusive of the husband income rather the sources other than respondent's occupation and husband income are accounted in this category. See table III for husband and wife's financial resources.

The average household income is 38,000 PRs and most of the respondents have 2000 PRs monthly household income. The minimum household income is 1000 while the highest amount was 400000. There are no rented and mortgaged household buildings. Respondents have rent free and owned household buildings where most of them are living in rent free houses either owned by the landlord or by the government. (See Table IV)

### **Attitudes of respondents about beating and divorce**

Most of the respondents have negative attitude towards divorce. The respondents not suffering battering revealed more positive attitude towards divorce if the husband beats his wife regularly. Only 15% agreed to the question that whether divorce should take place at all. While 14% of the respondents agreed

that divorce should take place if the husband regularly beats his wife. In answers regarding not terminating violent and unhappy relationship, respondents associated divorce with the respect of her family and stigmatization attached to divorce. A respondent who suffered severe physical abuse said:

A woman should not seek divorce at all. Where would she go taking divorce! Rest of the society will be not better than this home. Woman cannot survive alone in society even if she earns. For security and respectful movement she needs the support of man so should stay here considering it a decision of fate.

Another *bheel* respondent said:

After taking divorce, a woman would go to her parents who will not let her stay with them for long time if they are like us (poor), they will make her marry again, the new husband would be like the previous one. Life would be worse than before.

In fact, 80% of the respondents experiencing physical wife abuse (in sum 46 experienced beating out of 151 respondents) in their lifetime reported a decrease in beating by their husbands over time. Some of them gave reasons for this decrease as: children have grown up and are financially independent. They can stand against their father. Husband has grown old. On questioning that wife beating is wide spread, some of the respondents laughed and told that they have argument with their husbands but they don't beat them. One of them said: we don't do anything that would make our husband angry so he never beats. The neighbors were approached to confirm. They confirmed what was told by particular respondents.

### **Prevalence of Current and Lifetime Physical Wife Abuse**

The current physical wife abuse is found to be 17% and lifetime physical wife abuse is 32.5% among the married women of reproductive age in the rural areas of Digri. 17% regarded the occurrence of physical abuse to be few times and 3.3% reported

its incidence many times in past 12 months. The 11% respondents reported experiencing lifetime beating by their husbands many times while 27% experienced it few times. 18% respondents experienced less violent behaviors by their husbands in past 12 months while 32% had such experiences in their lifetime. 25% faced severe violent behaviors in their lifetime.

### **Risk and Protective Factors of Physical Wife Abuse**

The binary logistic regression analysis of variables depicting hypothesis 1 showed significance of household ownership in lifetime PWA with p value .007 and OR=2.769 (see Table V for the odd ratios of binary logistic regression analysis). The variables of socio economic dependence on marriage indicated that the women with children less than or equals to 5 and less number of dependent children have lower risk of physical wife abuse in past 12 months and lifetime PWA. Not possessing a source of personal income by wife is found to be a protective factor with odds ratio less than 1 in the lifetime PWA.

Moreover, the education of the respondent is found significant in past 12 months while insignificant in the lifetime experience of physical violence. The variables indicating social support for respondents showed that the presence of shelter and safe place to go in case of leaving violent husband forever is found to be significant in lifetime physical abuse with OR=28.000, 95% CI= 3.810 - 205.791 (see Table V). The results of multivariate analysis indicated significance of ownership of household land with p value = .049, and OR= 2.190. The safe place to go is insignificant in binary logistic regression for current PWA but is found significant in multivariate regression analysis with p value = .040 and OR = 4.356.

The binary logistic regression analysis and multivariate regression analysis are also performed controlling for the variables for respondent's education, household income and age. The higher number of dependent children is found to be a significant risk factor for current PWA with p value= .008, CI 95% = 1.397-.891 and AOR= 3.525. Productive assets are found

to be a significant risk factor for both dependent variables with odds ratio below 1. Safe place to go leaving violent husband or shelter or protective home is significant for current and lifetime physical wife abuse. The variable not attempting to leave the husband is also significant protective factor in both cases. (See Table VI)

The multivariate regression analysis of variables controlling for the age, education and household income of respondent revealed the significance of less number of dependent children (protective factor), availability of the safe place to go leaving violent husband permanently (protective factor) and attempts to leave husband (risk factor) in current PWA only.

## **DISCUSSION**

Multivariate analysis of the significant variables without controlling for age, education and household income of respondent revealed that the unavailability of safe place to go and not owning household land are significant risk factors for current and lifetime physical wife abuse (PWA) respectively. The multivariate regression analysis performed on variables controlling age, low education and household income indicates: the unavailability of safe place to go leaving violent husband temporarily or permanently (risk factor), few children (protective factor) and few or no dependent children (protective factor) of current physical wife abuse.

Illiteracy and below secondary education of respondents is found to be a protective factor against current PWA in binary logistic regression analysis. As the level of education decreases, the more protective factor education becomes for current PWA (Malhotra & Mather, 1997; Sen, 1999). Results also indicate that the unemployment of respondent is a protective factor against lifetime PWA (Atkinson, Greenstein, & Lang, 2005; Bates et al., 2004; Hadi, 2000).

Moreover, the unavailability of safe place to go in case of leaving violent husband is a risk factor for lifetime PWA as indicated by binary logistic regression analysis results. The open

ended responses of respondents revealed that the victims of PWA who want to leave their violent husbands, do not find any shelter and financial support for which they keep on bearing the physical abuse. In case of leaving the violent husband, respondent's personal source of income and shelter would perhaps be helpful in making them stand on their feet (Bates et al., 2004).

The strength of this study lies in the selected research setting that has never been studied before. Secondly, it yielded data collected from face to face interviews conducted in place free from interference. Also, it evaluates recent episodes of violence as well as marital histories of physical wife abuse. This research has limitations as it focused on violence against women that may show one side of the picture. The physical wife abuse may be a reaction to psychological or financial abuse of the husband. Secondly, this study uses the self-report method of measurement which may make its validity questionable.

A cross-sectional design gives snap shot of one time only which should be replaced with longitudinal type of research that lets comparative studies take place. Also, the external validity of the results is an important issue. Furthermore, the tool used to measure the factors of physical wife abuse not a validated one. The causal relationships are not determined in this research. The quality of responses and the truth told by the respondents is also one of the major limitations of this study. In Pakistan, women generally do not discuss their family matters before anyone unknown to them; it may be due to the fear of the in laws or for the respect of the family. On the contrary, some of the women exaggerated the facts while reporting physical abuse against them.

## **CONCLUSION**

Physical wife abuse is a legal and human rights issue worldwide. It provides evidence to the academia and policy makers that the household resources, socioeconomic dependence on marriage of women and social support have some association with the physical wife abuse. Improving social support, income

and education may be helpful in cases where rehabilitation of women experiencing severe physical abuse, after divorce is concerned. While for women being in violent marriages, education and employment may be a risk factor of physical wife abuse in rural Pakistan. In contrast to this, women's education and employment may act as an alternative of social support and may help them earn their livelihood on their own. Therefore, culturally acceptable intervention strategies are needed to cope with wife beating in rural areas of Pakistan.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, T. S. (2011). Intimate partner violence in urban Pakistan: prevalence, frequency, and risk factors. *International journal of women's health*, 3, 105–115.
- Anderson, K. (1997). Gender, status, and domestic violence: An integration of feminist and family violence approaches. *Journal of marriage and family*, 59, 655-669.
- Atkinson, M. P., Greenstein, T. N., & Lang, M. M. (2005). For women breadwinning can be dangerous: gendered resource theory and wife abuse. *Journal of marriage and family*, 67(5), 1137-1148. DOI:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00206.x
- Baker, N V., Gregware, P. R., & Cassidy, M. A. (1999). "Family killing fields: honor Rationales in the murder of women". *Journal of Violence against women*. 5, 164.
- Bates, L. M., Schuler, S. R., & Islam, F. (2004). Socioeconomic factors and processes associated with domestic violence in rural Bangladesh. *International family planning perspective*, 30, 190-199
- Bloom, S., Wypij, D., & Das Gupta, M. (2001). Dimensions of women's autonomy and the influence on maternal health care utilization in a north India city. *Demography*. 38, 67-78
- Bowker, L. (1985). The effect of national development on the position of married women in the third world: the case of wife beating. *International journal of comparative and applied criminal justice*, 9, 1-13.
- Coates, J., Rogers, B. L., Brewer, N., & Schoonmaker, L. (2010). Domestic violence against women is associated with lower

- household food security in rural Bangladesh. *The journal of the federation of American societies for experimental biology*. Retrieved.  
[http://www.fasebj.org/cgi/content/meeting\\_abstract/24/1\\_Mee tingAbstracts/104.1](http://www.fasebj.org/cgi/content/meeting_abstract/24/1_Mee tingAbstracts/104.1)
- Coker, A. L., & Richter, D. L. (1998). Violence against women in Sierra Leone: frequency and correlates of intimate partner violence and forced sexual intercourse. *African journal of reproductive health*, 2, 61-72.
- Farid, M., Saleem, S., Kareem, M. S., & Hatcher, J. (2008). Spousal abuse during pregnancy in Karachi, Pakistan. *International journal of gynecology & Obstetrics*. 101(2). 141-145.
- Fikri, F. F. and I. L. Bhatti. (1999). Domestic violence and health of Pakistani women. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*. 65(2). 195-201.
- Gelles, R. J. (1976). Abused wives: why do they stay? *Journal of marriage and family*. 38, 659-668.
- Goode, W. (1971). Force and violence in the family. *Journal of marriage and family*, 33(4), 624-636. Doi:10.2307/349435. JSTOR 349435.
- Hadi, A. (2000). Prevalence and correlates of the risk of marital sexual violence in Bangladesh. *Journal of interpersonal violence*. 15, 787-805.
- Hoffman, K. L., Demo, D. H. & Edwards, J. N. (1994). Physical wife abuse in a non-western society: an integrated theoretical approach. *Journal of marriage and family*. 56, 131-146.
- Islam, F., Mailman, N., Acharya, K., Higgins, J., Islam, M. K., & Bates, L. M. (2004). Violence against women within marriage in Bangladesh (Report prepared for Bangladesh Human Rights Advocacy Program, Centre for Civil Society and Governance). Washington, DC: Academy for Educational Development.
- Jejeebhoy, S. J., & Cook, R. J. (1997). State accountability for wife beating: the Indian challenge. *Lancet*, 349, S110-S112
- Jewkes, R., Penn-Kekana, L., Levin, J., Ratsaka, M., & Schriber, M. (2001). Prevalence of emotional, physical and sexual abuse of women in three South African provinces. *South African medical journal*, 91, 421-428

- Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, agency, achievements: reflection on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and change*. 30, 435-464
- Kalmuss, D. S., & Straus, M. A. (1982). "Wife's Marital Dependency and Wife Abuse". *Journal of marriage and family*, 44, 277-286.
- Kishore, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). *Profiling domestic violence: a multi country study*. Calverton, MD: ORC Macro
- Koeng, M. A., Ahmed, S., Hossein, M., & Muzamdar, K. A. A. (2003). Women's status and domestic violence in rural Bangladesh: individual and community level effects. *Demography*. 40,269-288.
- Krishnan, S., Subbiah, K., Khanum, S., Chandra, P. S., & Padian, N. S. (2012). An intergenerational women's empowerment intervention to mitigate domestic violence: results of a pilot study in Bengaluru, India. *Violence against women*. 18(3), 346-370.
- Leon, F., & Foreit, J. (2009). Developing women's empowerment scales and predicting contraceptive use: A study of 12 countries' demographic and health surveys (DHS) data.
- 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 family*, 61, 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)
- Moors, A. (1995). *Women, property and Islam: Palestinian experiences 1920-1990*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Morrison, (2007). *Addressing Gender-Based Violence: A Critical Review of Interventions*. World Bank Research Observer: 22: 25-51, Washington, DC.
- National institute of population studies NIPS. (2007). *Pakistan demographic health survey 2007* Retrieved. <http://www.nips.org.pk/abstracts.php?tag=RGVtb2dyYXBoaWM=>
- Naved, R.T., & Persson L. A. (2005). "Factors associated with spousal physical violence against women in Bangladesh". *Studies in Family Planning*, 36(4), 289-300.

- Parish, W.L., Wang, T., Laumann, E.O., Luo, Ye., & Pan, S. (2004). "Intimate partner violence in China: National prevalence, risk factors and associated health problems". *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 30(4), 174-181.
- Ruiz-Perez, I. J., Plazaola-Castano, M., Alvarez-Kindelan, M., Palomo-Pinto, M., Analte-Barrera, A., Bonet-Pla, M. L., De Santiago-Hernando, A., Herranz-Torrubiano, & Garralon-Ruiz, L. M. (2006). "The Gender Violence Study Group". *American Epidemiology Journal*, 16, 357-363.
- Schuler, S R., Bates, L. M., & Islam, F. (2008). "Women's rights, domestic violence, and resource seeking in rural Bangladesh". *Journal of Violence against Women*, 14(3), 326-345.
- Sen, P. (1999). Enhancing women's choices in responding to domestic violence in Calcutta: a comparison of employment and education. *The European journal of development research*, 11, 65-86.
- Shaikh, M. A. (2003). Is domestic violence endemic in Pakistan: perspective from Pakistani wives. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Science*, 19, 23-8.
- Smith, M D. (1990). Socio-demographic risk factors in wife abuse: results from a survey of Toronto women. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 15, 39-58.
- Straus, Murray A. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scales, (CTS2) Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data. *Journal of family issues*, 17.3, 283-316  
DOI: 10.1177/019251396017003001
- United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, General Assembly Resolution, December 1993. Article 4
- UNICEF. (2000). *Violence against women*. Innocent digest, No 6. June 2000 [data file].
- United States Department of Justice. (August 2007). "About domestic violence". Retrieved.  
<http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/domviolence.htm>
- Warner, R. L., Lee, G. R., & Lee, J. (1986). Social organization, spousal resources, and marital power: a cross-cultural study. *Journal of marriage and family*, 48, 121-128.

- World Health Organization report. (2001). Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against women. Retrieved.  
[www.who.int/gender/violence/who\\_multicountry\\_study/WHO](http://www.who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study/WHO)
- Xiao, X., Zhu, F., O'Campo, P., Koenig, M.A., Mock, V., & Campbell, J. (2005). "Prevalence of and risk factors for intimate partner violence in china". *American Journal of Public Health*, 1, 78-85.
- Yount, K. M. (2005). Resources, family organization, and domestic violence against married women in Minya, Egypt. *Journal of marriage and family*, 67, 579-596.
- Zakar, R., Zakar, M. Z., Mikolajczyk, R., & Kramer, A. (2012). Intimate partner violence and its association with women's reproductive health in Pakistan. *International journal of gynecology & Obstetrics*, 117(1). 11-14.

TABLE I. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE MARRIED WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE AGE ( $N = 151$ )

	%
<b>Religion</b>	
Islam	84.1
All others <sup>a</sup>	15.9
<b>Age</b>	
15 to 29	29.8
30 to 39	35.1
40 to 49	35.1
<b>Number of children</b>	
1 to 5 children	72.2
More than 5 children	23.2
No child	4.6
<b>Number of dependent children</b>	
No dependents	12.6
≤ 3 children	61.6
> 3 children	25.8
<b>Education of respondent</b>	
No schooling	60.3
≤ Secondary level	28.5
> Secondary level	11.3
<b>Employment status</b>	
Housewife	52.3
Agriculture laborers <sup>b</sup>	37.1
All others	10.6

a Hindu and Bahai

b these respondents do not receive income as their husband or the male family member is paid the whole amount of salary by the landlord

TABLE II. MARRIAGE, HUSBAND AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS (N=151)

	%
Age at marriage	
≤ 15 years	30.5
>15 years	69.5
Marriage duration	
≤ 20 years	68.9
> 20 years	31.1
Marriage type	
Love marriage	3.3
Arrange with consent marriage	21.2
Arrange without consent marriage	64.2
Exchange marriage <sup>1</sup>	11.3
Endogamous marriage	
Yes	34.4
No	65.6
Respondent lives with	
Husband	62.9
Natal kin	2
Marital kin	35.1

<sup>1</sup> exchange marriage is the marriage done to a woman in exchange of/ settlement of property or giving a women of one's own family to that family like a brother and sister marrying some other sister and brother.

TABLE III. WIFE'S FINANCIAL RESOURCES (N=151)

	%
Property ownership of wife	
Yes	11.3
No	88.7
Wife's ownership of productive assets	
Yes	32.5
No	67.5
Other sources of income	
Yes	4.6
No	95.4
Wife's income	
≤ 5,000 PRs	10.6
> 5,000 PRs	4.6
No income	84.8

a US \$1 is equivalent to 99 Pakistani rupees.

TABLE IV. HOUSEHOLD'S FINANCIAL RESOURCES

	%
Household income <sup>a</sup>	
≤10000	57
10000≤50000	17.9
>50000	25.2
Household land ownership	
Owned	42.4
Rent free	57.6
Number of household items	
0 – 2	46.4
3 – 5	29
6 – 7	25

a US \$1 is equivalent to 99 Pakistani rupees.

TABLE V. HOUSEHOLD FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND DEPENDENCE ON MARRIAGE IN ASSOCIATION WITH PHYSICAL WIFE ABUSE (*N=151*)

Predictors		Past 12 months PWA		Lifetime PWA	
		OR (95% CI)	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value
Household financial resources					
House ownership	Rent free	1.48 (.61- 3.58)	Ns	2.78 (1.31-5.82)	.007
	Owned	1		1	
Household items	Poor household	1.75 (.58-5.25)	Ns	.67 (.41-1.075)	ns
	Middle class HH	1.01 (.28 -3.62)		.33 (.62-.66)	
	Rich household	1		1	
Household monthly income	Low	1.87 (.64-5.45)	Ns	.65 (.42-1.01)	ns
	Medium	.53 (.09 -2.95)		.17 (.06-.50)	
	High	1		1	
Socio-economic dependence on marriage					
No of children	≤5	1		1	
	> 5 children	2.50 (.01-6.17)	.047	2.90 (1.33-6.33)	.007
No of dependent children	≤ 3	1		1	
	>3 children	4.67 (1.92-11..33)	.001	2.59 (1.22-5.52)	.01
Respondent income	No	.39 (.14-1.09)	Ns	.41 (.27 - .59)	<.001
	Yes	1		1	
Respondent education	Illiterate	.26 (.16 - .44)	<.001	.68 (.45-1.04)	.ns
	≤ secondary education	.19 (.08 - .43)	<.001	.34 (.17-.68)	
	> Secondary education	1		1	

TABLE V. HOUSEHOLD FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND DEPENDENCE ON MARRIAGE IN ASSOCIATION WITH PHYSICAL WIFE ABUSE ( $N=151$ )

Predictors		Past 12 months PWA		Lifetime PWA	
		OR (95% CI)	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value
Cash savings	No	1.40 (.56-3.47)	Ns	2.02 (.96-4.26)	ns
	Yes	1		1	
Productive assets	No	.49 (.20-1.16)	Ns	.57 (.28-1.17)	ns
	Yes	1			
Property ownership	No	1.63 (.35-7.63)	Ns	.86 (.30-2.49)	ns
	Yes	1		1	
Safe place to go leaving husband	No	1.90 (.88-4.08)	Ns	28.00 (3.81-205.79)	.001
	Yes	1		1	
Attempts to leave partner	Yes	1		1	
	Never	.85 (.28-2.55)	ns	32.00 (4.37-234.18)	ns

Note: the table shows results of binary logistic regression analysis

Abbreviations: 1 reference category, CI Confidence Interval, OR odds ratio, PWA= Physical Wife Abuse, ns= not significant

TABLE VI. ADJUSTED ODDS RATIOS OF DEPENDENCY ON MARRIAGE IN RECENT AND LIFETIME PHYSICAL WIFE ABUSE (N=151)

Predictors		Past 12 months PWA		Lifetime PWA	
		AOR (95% CI)	P value	AOR (95% CI)	P value
Number of children	≤5	1	Ns	1	ns
	> 5 children	2.36 (.79-7.02)		1.98 (.80 – 4.89)	
Number of dependent children	≤ 3	1	.008	1	ns
	>3 children	3.53 (1.39-.89)		1.84 (.83 – 4.03)	
Respondent income	No	2.28 (.77-6.81)	Ns	2.25 (.85-5.90)	
	Yes	1		1	
Respondent's education	Illiterate	.65 (.17–2.39)	Ns	1.51 (.48 – 4.76)	ns
	≤ secondary education	.45 (.15-1.31)		.64 (.25 – 1.64)	
	> Secondary education	1		1	
Cash savings	No	2.02 (.25-3.66)	Ns	2.02 (.31-6.50)	ns
	Yes	1		1	
Productive assets	No	.29 (.12 - .71)	.007	.34 (.16 - .72)	.005
	Yes	1		1	
Property ownership	No	1.06 (.16-6.84)	Ns	2.42 (.59-9.89)	ns
	Yes	1		1	
Safe place to go leaving	No	4.84 (1.17-19.96)	.029	28.00 (3.8-205.79)	.001

husband	Yes	1		1	
Attempts to leave partner	Yes	1		1	
	Never	.01 (.002 - .07)	<.001	.001 (.00-.014)	<.001

Note: The table shows binary regression analysis results of controlling for respondent's age, household monthly income and education

Abbreviations: PWA physical wife abuse, AOR adjusted odds ratio, 1 reference category, ns not significant

TABLE VII. ADJUSTED ODDS RATIOS AND P VALUES OF PHYSICAL WIFE ABUSE IN PAST 12 MONTHS AND LIFETIME IN MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS (N=151)

Variables		Past 12 months PWA		Lifetime PWA	
		AOR (95% CI)	P value	AOR (95% CI)	P value
No of dependent children	≤ 3 children	1			
	>3 children	4.50 (1.50 – 13.48)	.007		
Productive assets	No	.40 (.14-1.126)	.08	.48 (.05-4.58)	ns
	Yes	1		1	
Availability of safe place to go	No	4.47 (1.08-18.58)	.039	4.505 (.99-20.357)	ns
	Yes	1		1	
Attempts to leave partner	Never	.013 (.002-.09)	<.001	.102 (.004-2.43)	ns
	Yes	1		1	

Note: Multivariate regression analysis is carried out on significant variables controlling the age education and household income.

Age, education and income were found insignificant in binary logistic regression analysis.

The blank box indicates that the variable was insignificant in the binary logistic regression analysis and hence not included in multivariate analysis.

Abbreviations: PWA physical wife abuse, AOR adjusted odds ratio, 1 reference category, ns not significant

