

# **Domestic Violence in India: An Empirical Analysis**

## **Authors**

### **Harihar Sahoo**

Research Scholar

Centre for the Study of Regional Development, School of Social Sciences

Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi-110067

Email: [hariharsahoo@gmail.com](mailto:hariharsahoo@gmail.com)

### **Manas Ranjan Pradhan**

Research Scholar

International Institute for Population Sciences,

Govandi Station Road, Deonar, Mumbai-400088,

Email: [manas@iips.net](mailto:manas@iips.net)

*Paper to be presented in the National Seminar on Gender Issues and Women Empowerment  
organized by Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, 1-2 February 2007*

## Domestic Violence in India: An Empirical Analysis

### Introduction and Context

Domestic violence that is any act of physical, sexual, or psychological abuse, or the threat of such abuse, inflicted against a woman by a person intimately connected to her through marriage, family relation, or acquaintanceship is universal and has its root in the socio-cultural set up of the society. The perpetrators of domestic violence have often been found to be the males and the victims, their sexual partners. Internationally, one in three women have been beaten, coerced into sex or abused in their lifetime by a member of her own family (Heise et al. 1999). Looking at the domestic front, starting from Vedic age to twenty first century, women in India perhaps have never experienced equal rights and freedom compared to their male counterparts. The concept of '*Ardhangini*' [half of the body] seems to be restricted only in literatures and have never implemented in practical life. In addition to this, extracts from Ramcharitamanas of Tulsidas like '*Dhol, Gauwnaar, Shudra, Pashu aur Nari; Sakal Tadan ka Adhikari*' [drums, uncivilized illiterates, lower castes, animals and women are all fit to be beaten] besides other indicators like *Pardaha* system [hiding the face in veils], *Sati* system [self immersion of the lady in husband's pyre] that are subject to women only; is a reflection of the history of women's subordinate status. In short, it is always the women who have to be in the tight rope, subject to inequality and looked down as an inferior sex. Starting from childhood to the end of her life she has to be under the control of father or husband or the son. The subordinate status of women combined with socio cultural norms that are inclined towards patriarchy and masculinity can be considered as an important factor determining the domestic violence.

In view of the prevalence as well as the pervasiveness of domestic violence, many researchers in the past have attempted to assess the situation besides exploring its possible cause and subsequent consequences for society in general and women in particular. INCLN (2000), found it as a problem that cuts across age, education, social class and religion in India. The same study is of the view that 40 percent women had experienced at least one form of physical violence in their married life. Murthy et al. (2004) is of the view that numbers of family members, type of marriage and husband's education besides menstrual problems have significant influence on domestic violence. While many researchers come out with findings that lifestyle of men such as smoking, alcoholism and drugs promote men to commit

domestic violence (Leonard, 1992; McKenry et al., 1995; Rao, 1997 and Bhatt, 1998), some are of the view that masculinity and domestic violence are closely interlinked (Duvvury and Nayak, 2003 and Hamberger et al., 1997). Again, persons with lower socialization and responsibility are found to be the enhancers of the problem (Barnett and Hamberger, 1992). Studies have also revealed that sons of violent parents (Straus et al., 1980 and Martin et al., 2002), men raised in patriarchal family structure that encourages traditional gender role (Fagot et al., 1998 and Malamuth et al., 1995) are more likely to abuse their intimate partners. Gendered socialization process is what mainly responsible for domestic violence (Sahu, 2003). Another study among Uttar Pradesh men by Gerstein (2000) is of the view that low educational level and poverty are important reasons for domestic violence. Further, marriage at a younger age makes women vulnerable to domestic violence (Mishra, 2000; Hindin, 2002 and Rao, 1997). Besides this, the role of inter spousal relationship, sex of the children, ownership of property, dowry, working status, autonomy, religion and caste of the person can't be ignored (Sahu, 2003; Swain, 2002 and Jejeebhoy, 1998).

Many studies are of the view that violence by intimate partner most likely undermines the sexual and reproductive health of the women. This extensive violence has significant harmful effects like unwanted pregnancy (Khan et al., 1996), gynecological disorders (Golding and Taylor 1996) and physical injuries to private parts (Starck et al., 1979) besides large-scale mental health impacts (UNICEF, 2000). Again, many of the commonly associated disorders/problems are found to be inadequately addressed (Mitra, 1999; Visaria, 1999; Dave and Solanki, 2000 and Jaswal, 2000). Further, as Freedman has written, violence by husbands against wife should not be seen as a break down in the social order rather than an affirmation to patriarchal social order (Travers, 1997). Similarly, Jejeebhoy (1998) is of the view that not only wife beating is deeply entrenched, but also people justify it. Thus, domestic violence is simply not a personal abnormality but rather it roots in the cultural norms of the family and the society. Again, looking from another angle, it is found that many of the victims of domestic violence has either refused to name the perpetrator of the assault or attributed the injuries to other reasons (Daga et al., 1999).

In order to develop effective intervention programme and policy, it is vital to know the attitude and perception of the women towards the issue in-depth. Most of the studies conducted in the past are small in nature and reflects the regional picture that might not be a true picture of the whole country. In view of the above discussion, it seems essential to

understand the women's viewpoint besides the assessment of the problem and its correlates at national level. Further, in the present world, where gender equality and justice have become the buzz words, examining the domestic violence in the largest democracy of the world appears worthy for the betterment of half of its citizens.

In the present paper, an attempt has been made to study whether ever-married women of reproductive age group in India view wife beating justified on certain situations. In addition, emphasis is there to examine the prevalence of beatings or physical mistreatment since age 15 and in last one year, regionally and also by background characteristics. Specifically, the objectives of the present paper are as follows:

1. To study the regional variations of women's view about wife beating as justified, with specific reasons.
2. To examine the differentials of women's view about wife beating as justified with specific reasons by background characteristics.
3. To understand the regional variations of the prevalence of beatings or physical mistreatment since age 15 and the person who beat or physically mistreated and also the prevalence of beatings or physical mistreatment in the last one year (12 months) preceding the survey.
4. To examine the prevalence of beating or physical mistreatment since age 15 and also in the last one year by selected background characteristics.
5. To investigate the determinants of women's view about wife beating as justified and also the determinants of prevalence of beatings or physical mistreatment since age 15 and in the last one year.

## **Data and Methods**

Data from the National Family Health Survey (NFHS- II) conducted during 1998-99 has been used for the present analysis. The survey provides information on fertility, the practice of family planning, infant and child mortality, maternal and child health and utilization of health services provided to mothers and children. In addition, it provides indicators of the quality of health and family welfare services, reproductive health problems, status of women and domestic violence. The survey follows a multi-stage sampling design to select the eligible woman for the interview. The research findings of the present paper are based on a nationally representative sample of 90,303 ever-married women in the age group 15-49 years.

The data is analyzed using SPSS 11.5 and our analytical approach includes both bivariate and multivariate analysis. In view of the available literature and data a number of variables viz. age of woman, education of woman, work status of woman, age at first marriage, marital duration, sex of living children, exposure to mass media, women's autonomy, sex of the head of household, religion of the head of household, caste of the head of household, standard of living of household and place of residence of household have been included both in the bivariate and multivariate analysis. The bivariate analysis examines the association between each independent variables and dependent variables. Multivariate analysis in the form of logistic regression has been carried out to assess the statistical significance of the association and because of the dichotomous nature of women's view with at least one reason for justifying a husband beating his wife, beaten or physically mistreated since age 15 and beaten or physically mistreated in the last 12 months.

Two composite indices namely 'standard of living of the household' and 'women's autonomy' have been constructed as the important determinants of the domestic violence. The standard of living index (SLI) available in the data itself, has been constructed by taking into account the variables - 'type of house', 'ownership of house', 'source of lighting', 'source of drinking water', 'type of toilet', 'type of fuel', 'separate room for cooking', 'ownership of agricultural land', 'ownership of irrigated land' 'ownership of livestock' and 'ownership of durable goods'. The responses are given scores ranging between '0' and '4' according to the intensity in a five-point scale and then were summed up to get the total value of the index (See appendix 1). Similarly, the 'women's autonomy' index has been constructed by taking into account variables like- women's participation in household decision-making, freedom of movement and access to money that they could spend as they wish. While computing the autonomy index, specific scores have been assigned to different responses according to the intensity in a scale and then were summed up to get the total value of the index (See appendix 2). After obtaining the composite index for autonomy, it is divided into three groups of low, medium and high by using the formula:  $(\text{maximum} - \text{minimum})/3$ .

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Regional variations of women's view about wife beating as justified**

Table 1 reveals the percentage of women who agree with specific reasons for justifying a husband beating his wife by states. Surprisingly, about three out of every five Indian women agrees with at least one reason of wife beating as justified. Among the women who agrees wife beating is justified, the main reason that come out is wife neglects house or children (40 percent) followed by wife goes out without telling husband (37 percent), wife shows disrespect for in-laws (34 percent) and husband suspects wife is unfaithful (33 percent). Only 7 percent women agree with natal family does not give money or other items as a reason justified for wife beating.

Regional variation shows that 'husband suspects wife is unfaithful' is the reason varies from 55 percent in Andhra Pradesh to 10 percent in Arunachal Pradesh and West Bengal. Natal family does not give money or other items is a main reason in Andhra Pradesh while such problem is very marginal in most northern states like Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Delhi. In Nagaland (80 percent) and Manipur (77 percent), wife shows disrespect for in-laws is seems to be the main cause for wife beating while such reason is very low in Haryana (10 percent), Himachal Pradesh (9 percent) and Punjab (4 percent). Wife goes out without telling husband as the reason varies from 69 percent in Manipur to five percent in Punjab. Similarly north-eastern states like Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland wife neglects house or children is the main reason for wife beating while such variation is very low in the northern states like Punjab (5 percent), Himachal Pradesh (8 percent), Haryana (10 percent), New Delhi (12 percent). Wife does not cook food properly is the main reason in Maharashtra (47 percent), Madhya Pradesh (43 percent) and Jammu and Kashmir (43 percent) while such reason is negligible in northern states like Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Haryana. The women who agree with at least one reason are highest in Nagaland (97 percent) followed by Manipur (91 percent) and lowest in New Delhi (21 percent).

### **Differentials of women's view about wife beating as justified with specific reasons by background characteristics**

Table 2 shows the percentage of ever-married women who agree with specific reasons for justifying a husband beating his wife by selected background characteristics. It is evident from the table that younger women and those married before 18 years of age are agreeing relatively more with at least one reason of wife beating than the women who doesn't fall in those respective categories. Inter spousal age differences and lower age confounded with lack/poor awareness of the marital life may be the contributing factors for the same. Women engaged in agricultural activities are again found to be agreeing more towards the reasons for wife beating than those who are either not working or working in non-agricultural sector. Further, agreement with at least one reason and with each of the different reasons for wife beating declines sharply with the level of education. This may be due to the possible increase in awareness of their rights and duties with the higher level of education. Again, rural women, women belonging to low SLI households and women having low autonomy are having more acceptable attitude towards wife beating than their respective counterparts. More adherence to traditional gender norms in the rural areas as well as in the low SLI households and households where women are having lower autonomy may be the possible explanation.

### **Regional variations in the prevalence of domestic violence**

The reported prevalence of domestic violence since age 15 as well as in the last one-year preceding the survey is presented in table 3. It is evident from the table that one out of every five Indian women has reportedly experienced beating or physical mistreatment since they have turned 15. There is substantial state wise variation in the proportion of ever-married women who have been beaten or physically mistreated since age 15. Two-fifth of ever-married women in Tamil Nadu and at least one-quarter of ever-married women in Meghalaya, Orissa, Arunachal Pradesh and Bihar have been physically mistreated since age 15. Himachal Pradesh with only 6 percent women reporting it reflects a possible better position women cherished.

About one-fifth of ever-married women in India are beaten or physically mistreated by their husbands and there are interstate variations too in the same. More than one-third of women in Tamil Nadu have reported their husbands as the perpetrator. Again, the more than 20 percent

of the women in the states like Bihar, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh have reportedly been assaulted by their husbands as against of Meghalaya where a majority (29 percent) blame other persons for the mistreatment. Beating by persons other than the husband or in-laws constitutes a substantial proportion in most of the northeastern states as well as in Delhi, Jammu and Kashmir and Punjab. The percentages of women beaten in the 12 months preceding the survey varies from less than 5 percent in Himachal Pradesh and Kerala to more than 15 percent in Bihar, Arunachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Nagaland.

### **Differentials of domestic violence by background characteristics**

Table 4 represents the percentage of ever-married women who have been beaten or physically mistreated since age 15 by background characteristics. Prevalence is also shown according to the persons who beat or physically mistreated them – their husband, their in-laws or other persons. The youngest age group (15-19) shows a lower proportion of being beaten since age 15 compared to older women. This is probably due to their less time to be exposed to the risk of being beaten since age 15. Educational level of women makes substantial difference of being beaten or physically mistreated. Illiterate women have found to experience violence more than three times compared to women who are educated higher secondary or above. Workingwomen are found to be more mistreated than non-working women since age 15. Higher the age at marriage leads to lower the proportion of women to be beaten since age 15. Women who have been married for less than five years are less likely to have been beaten than women who have longer marital duration. It is generally believed that not bearing children and not bearing a son are important reason for wife beating. However, the findings show that women with no living child are somewhat less experienced violence than women with living children. The prevalence of violence also varies by caste of women as 16 percent of women belonging to other caste have been beaten compared to 27 percent of women belonging to SC and 23 percent belonging to ST as well as OBC. This reflects that women belonging to higher caste have a lower chance of being mistreated since age 15.

Again, the prevalence of domestic violence decreases substantially as the standard of living increases. This is reflected by the result that 29 percent of women with low standard of living have experienced violence compared with 20 percent of women with medium and 10 percent of women with high standard of living. Again, lower proportion of urban women (17 percent) has experienced violence since age 15 compared to rural women (23 percent). Further, their

husbands beat majority of women who report beatings since age 15. This is so in case of almost all the socio demographic characteristics. The proportion of women beaten or physically mistreated by their in-laws or by other persons is too small to allow a meaningful discussion of differentials by women's background characteristics.

Looking at the prevalence of beating or physical mistreatment in the last 12 months preceding the survey, it is clear that one out of every 10 women have reportedly experienced it. Age of the women, education of the women, age at marriage of the women, autonomy of the women and standard of living of the household shows a inverse relationship with occurrence of beating as with increase in the above mentioned indicators shows a decreasing trend in the beating or physical mistreatment. Again, as expected, the prevalence is found less in female-headed households and women residing in urban areas than their respective counterparts.

### **Determinants of women's view about wife beating as justified and also the determinants of domestic violence**

Table 5 reveals the odds ratios of women's view in justifying a husband beating his wife and women's experience with beatings or physical mistreatment. After controlling the effect of other variables women in the older age group (40-49) are 9 percent less likely to agree with at least one reason for justifying a husband beating his wife compared to the youngest age group of 15-19 years. Higher the educational level leads to lower the probability for justifying at least one reason. This is amply clear from the result that women with higher secondary and above educational level are 45 percent less likely for justifying at least one reason compared to illiterate women. Therefore, educational level of women is one of the main determinants of justifying at least one reason for husband beating his wife. Women engaged in agricultural activities are more likely for justifying one or more reason of wife beating. Lower the age at first marriage, higher is the probability of justifying at least one reason.

With regard to the sex composition of living children, those women having only daughter and both son and daughter are 13 and 15 percent more likely for justifying at least one reason of husband beating his wife compared to those who do not have any child. Further, controlling the effect of other variables, women who are not exposed to mass media are 22 percent more likely for justifying at least one reason. With respect to women's autonomy, medium and higher category are 11 percent and 37 percent less likely to justify at least one reason

compared to low category of women. Similarly, the result also consistent with respect to the ethnicity and religious categories of women. It is again found that women with higher standard of living are less likely to justify at least one reason for beating than those of low standard of living. Again, rural women are 16 percent more likely for justifying at least one reason than their urban counterparts. This may be due to the fact that urban women are more aware about their rights and duties compared to rural women.

With respect to beaten or physically mistreated since age 15, it is clear that women marrying between 19-24 years are 6 percent less likely of being beaten or physically mistreated since age 15 compared to those who marrying below 18 years of age. Longer the marital duration leads to greater the probability of being mistreated. It is noticeable that women who are not currently married (divorced, separated, deserted or widowed) are more likely than currently married women to have been beaten since age 15. After controlling the effect of other variables, rural women are 10 percent less likely of being beaten since age 15 compared to urban women. Educational level of women seems to have a negative effect on domestic violence in India. Similarly, women from scheduled caste, Muslim community is more likely of being beaten than their respective counterparts.

Women with lower autonomy are more likely of being beaten compared to women of higher autonomy. Those who are not exposed to mass media are 18 percent more likely of being beaten than those who have exposed. Households headed by female members are about 15 percent less likely of being beaten since age 15 compared to those household headed by male members. Workingwomen have a greater likelihood of being mistreated than the non-working women. Women from medium and high standard of living are about 34 percent and 60 percent respectively less likely of being beaten or physically mistreated compared to low standard of living. The similar trend also follows in case of women being beaten or physically mistreated in the last 12 months preceding the survey.

## **Conclusions**

The foregoing analysis reveals not only widespread prevalence of domestic violence (21 percent, since age 15) in India but also the acceptance of majority of ever-married women (57 percent) to at least one reason for justifying a husband beating his wife. There are again large-scale interstate differences in the prevalence as well as acceptance of violence among

women. In addition to this, it is noteworthy to mention that a lot of variables like age, education of women, age at first marriage, ethnic and religious categories, women's autonomy, exposure to mass media, work status of women and standard of living besides place of residence contribute significantly to the prevalence of domestic violence. Nevertheless, it is the husbands who are reportedly the perpetrators of violence showing one reason or another.

The experience of violence undermines the empowerment women and certainly is a barrier to the socio-economic and demographic development of the country. In view of the prevalence of the problem, it is suggested to have programmes that take into account involvement of the community and especially the males for effective as well as fruitful amelioration of the issue. It can again be suggested that education of the girls should be encouraged, which will undoubtedly work as deterrent to domestic violence. Again, though the present findings are silent about the legal side of the issue, stringent laws against the perpetrators of the violence, laws giving more rights to the women will always be beneficial to curb the issue. As it is found to be deep rooted in the socio cultural practices and both the perpetrator as well as victim take it granted, there is need of major transformation in the socio cultural milieu. In order to address the problem, social norms and values towards gender roles should be transformed to facilitate the implementation of appropriate and meaningful responses to domestic violence and ultimately to prevent it from happening altogether.

## **References**

- Barnett, O and L.K. Hamberger, 1992. The Assessment of Martialy Violent Men on the California Psychological Inventory. *Violence and Victim.* 7:15-22.
- Bhatt, R. V. 1998. Domestic Violence and Substance Abuse. *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics.* 63(Suppl.1): S25-31.
- Daga, A S., S. Jejeebhoy and S. Rajgopal. 1999. Domestic Violence against Women: An Investigation of Hospital Causality Records, Mumbai'. *Journal of Family Welfare,* 45 (1): 1-11.
- Dave A. and G. Slinky. 2000. Special Cell for Women and Children: A Research Study on Domestic Violence', in *Domestic Violence in India 2: A Summary Report of Four Record Studies.* Washington DC: International Centre for Research on Women and The Centre for Development and Population Activities.

- Duvvury, N and M. B. Nayak. 2003. The Role of Men in Addressing Domestic Violence: Insights from India'. *Development*. 46(2): 45-50.
- Fagot, B. I.; R.Loeber and J. B. Reid. 1998. Developmental Determinants of Male to Female Aggression. In. G.W. Russell (ed.), *Violence in Intimate Relationships*. PMA Publishing Corp. pp 91-105.
- Gerstein, L. 2000. In India, Poverty and Lack of Education are Associated with Men's Physical and Sexual abuse of their Wives. *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 26(1): 44-5.
- Golding, J.M and D. L.Taylor.1996. Sexual Assault History and Premenstrual Distress in two General Population Samples. *Journal of Women's Health* 5(2): 143-152.
- Hamberger, L.K; J.M.Lore; D. Bonge and D.F.Tolin. 1997. An Empirical Classification for Motivations for Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 3(4): 401-23.
- Heise, L., Ellsberg, M and Gottemoeller, M. 1999. Ending Violence Against Women. *Population Reports, Series L, No. 11*. Baltimore, John Hopkins University School of Public Health, Population Information Program, December.
- Hindin, J.M. 2002. Who is at risk? Factors Associated with Intimate Partner Violence in the Philippines, *Social Science and Medicine*. 55:1385-1399.
- International Clinical Epidemiologists Network (INCLEN). 2000. Domestic Violence in India 3: A Summary Report of a Multi-Site Household Survey. Washington, DC: International Centre for Development and Population Activities.
- International Institute for Population Sciences. 1998-99. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-2) India.
- Jaswal, S. 2000. Health Records and Domestic Violence in Thane District, Maharashtra', in *Domestic Violence in India 2: A Summary Report of Four Record Studies*. Washington DC: International Centre for Research on Women and The Centre for Development and Population Activities.
- Jejeebhoy, S. 1998. Wife beating in Rural India: A Husband's Right? Evidence from Survey Data. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 33(15): 855-862.
- Khan, M E., J.W. Townsend; R. Sinha and S Lakhnarpal. 1996. Sexual Violence within Marriage. In: Seminar. New Delhi, Population Council. Pp 32-35.
- Leonard, K.E. and H.T.Blane. 1992. Alcohol and Marital Aggression in a National Sample of Young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 7(1): 19-30.
- Malamuth, N. M; D. Linz; C. L.Heavey; G. Barnes and M. Acker 1995. Using the Confluence Model of Sexual Aggression to Predict Men's Conflict with Women: A

- Ten year Follow up Study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 69(2): 353-369.
- Martin, L.S; K.E.Moracco; J.Garro; A.O.Tsui; L.L.Kupper; J. L.Chase and J.C.Campbell. 2002. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 31:560-572.
- McKenry, P.C; T. W. Julian and S. M. Gavazzi. 1995. Toward a Biopsychosocial Model of Domestic Violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57: 307-20.
- Mishra, J. 2000. *Women and Human Rights*. Chapter 5. Kalpaz Publications, New Delhi.
- Mitra, N. 1999. Best Practices Among Responses to Domestic Violence in Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh', in *Domestic Violence in India 1: A Summary Report of Three Studies*. Washington DC: International Centre for Research on Women and The Centre for Development and Population Activities.
- Murthy, M S R; P. Ganesh; J. Srivirajarani and R. Madhusudan. 2004. Proximate Determinants of Domestic Violence: An Exploratory Study on Role of Menstrual Problems and Life Style of Men'. *Demography India*. 33(1): 85-105.
- Rao, V. 1997. Wife- beating in Rural South India: A Qualitative and Econometric Analysis. *Social Science and Medicine*. 44(8): 1169-80.
- Sahu, B. 2003. Contextualizing Domestic Violence from Women's Perspective: A Study in a Slum Community in Orissa. IIPS, M.Phil dissertation (Unpublished).
- Stark, E; A. Flintcraft and W Frazier. 1979. Medicine and Patriarchal Violence: The Social Construction of Private Event. *International Journal of Health Services* 9: 461-493.
- Straus, M.A; R.J.Gelles and S. Steinmetz. 1980. *Behind Close Doors: Violence in the American Family*. Garden City, New York. Anchor Press.
- Swain, Suvkant. 2002. Understanding The linkage of Employment, Autonomy and Domestic Violence among Married Women: A comparative study of Uttar Pradesh and TamilNadu. IIPS, Seminar Paper (Unpublished).
- Travers, J.1997. *Domestic Violence in Cultural Context: A Response to Frederick Schiavone*. Department of History. Stony Brook University.
- United Nations Children's Fund (Unicef). 2000. *Domestic Violence against Women and Girls*. Innocenti Digest Number 6. Innocenti Research Centre, Florence, Italy.
- Visaria, L. 1999. Violence against Women in India: Evidence from Rural Gujarat', in *Domestic Violence in India 1: A Summary Report of Three Studies*. Washington DC: International Centre for Research on Women and The Centre for Development and Population Activities.

**Table 1: Percentage of ever married women who agree with specific reasons for justifying a husband beating his wife by states, India, 1998-99**

States	Who agrees with specific reasons						Who agree with at least one reason
	Husband suspects wife is unfaithful	Natal family does not give money or other items	Wife shows disrespect for in-laws	Wife goes out without telling husband	Wife neglects house or children	Wife does not cook food properly	
Andhra Pradesh	55.4	25.3	53.6	55.4	69.0	26.2	79.9
Arunachal Pradesh	10.2	4.8	37.4	30.4	44.5	26.2	51.9
Assam	32.7	8.2	40.5	39.4	44.5	12.8	66.7
Bihar	28.4	4.0	21.2	24.9	25.2	20.8	47.1
Goa	35.9	5.1	27.6	35.9	46.5	18.0	57.5
Gujarat	27.3	3.5	15.2	21.3	22.5	11.6	36.7
Haryana	20.1	0.2	9.8	12.4	10.2	7.0	26.4
Himachal Pradesh	16.4	0.2	9.3	8.8	8.3	3.3	23.7
Jammu	45.6	3.7	53.9	58.5	61.8	42.7	75.3
Karnataka	16.2	6.4	35.0	33.4	40.3	20.8	51.1
Kerala	21.6	3.1	39.0	37.8	47.0	25.4	61.8
Madhya Pradesh	50.0	10.2	46.7	48.5	50.0	43.0	72.4
Maharashtra	32.2	6.8	54.4	53.5	65.6	48.4	75.2
Manipur	34.1	3.5	76.6	69.1	83.2	15.3	91.4
Meghalaya	44.3	19.7	48.0	64.0	78.3	36.8	86.4
Mizoram	33.4	5.4	52.2	42.8	68.2	7.1	83.4
Nagaland	92.7	16.7	79.6	60.3	85.0	32.9	97.0
New Delhi	13.7	0.6	12.6	11.6	10.3	7.8	21.0
Orissa	32.3	6.9	32.7	32.1	29.9	18.9	50.6
Punjab	16.3	0.0	4.4	4.7	5.1	1.8	22.1
Rajasthan	32.9	4.0	29.9	30.8	31.3	21.2	51.3
Sikkim	37.3	3.6	34.4	32.1	43.3	11.6	68.3
Tamil Nadu	17.2	3.1	40.5	51.0	59.8	22.1	72.6
Tripura	16.8	5.8	21.8	19.1	22.2	14.9	38.6
Uttar Pradesh	48.0	5.3	33.4	39.1	34.5	29.2	61.2
West Bengal	10.3	2.5	11.3	14.3	15.7	6.7	23.0
<b>India</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>56.7</b>

**Table 2: Percentage of ever married women who agree with specific reasons for justifying a husband beating his wife by selected background characteristics, India, 1998-99**

Socio demographic Characteristics	Who agrees with specific reasons						Who agree with at least one reason
	Husband suspects wife is unfaithful	Natal family does not give money or other items	Wife shows disrespect for in-laws	Wife goes out without telling husband	Wife neglects house or children	Wife does not cook food properly	
<b>Age of woman</b>							
15-19	37.1	8.5	38.7	41.7	43.1	28.8	61.6
20-29	37.1	6.8	33.9	36.5	40.4	24.9	56.8
30-39	32.7	6.4	33.5	36.0	39.9	24.1	56.7
40-49	31.0	6.5	32.0	35.0	37.9	22.9	54.5
<b>Education of woman</b>							
Illiterate	39.2	9.1	37.0	41.1	43.0	29.0	62.0
Primary	31.3	5.8	35.4	38.5	43.4	25.2	59.0
Secondary	24.4	3.7	30.6	31.3	36.9	19.2	51.1
Higher	14.6	1.4	17.9	15.4	20.4	8.1	31.9
<b>Work status of woman</b>							
Not working	30.2	4.8	29.7	31.8	34.2	20.5	51.6
Agri. and HH activities	40.1	11.2	43.6	47.6	53.0	34.8	69.2
Non-agri. activities	29.4	7.2	33.9	35.9	40.8	23.1	55.6
<b>Age at first marriage</b>							
Up to 18	36.1	7.8	36.5	39.6	42.8	27.3	60.3
19-24	23.2	3.7	26.5	27.8	32.1	16.8	46.9
25 and above	15.0	2.4	19.5	20.1	23.9	9.9	35.5
<b>Marital duration</b>							
0-4	30.7	6.2	32.9	35.1	37.6	22.7	54.3
5-9	32.6	6.5	33.2	35.5	39.9	24.5	56.6
10 and above	33.6	6.9	34.2	37.1	40.6	25.2	57.7
Not currently married	30.9	8.5	35.0	38.0	41.9	24.9	55.6

**Cont. Table 2.**

<b>Sex of living children</b>								
No child	32.8	7.4	34.0	36.1	38.2	24.1	56.0	
Sons only	30.9	6.3	33.5	35.2	38.9	23.4	54.9	
Daughters only	30.7	6.9	32.7	36.0	40.1	22.8	55.5	
Both	33.9	6.8	34.2	37.2	40.7	25.6	57.9	
<b>Exposure to mass media</b>								
Exposed	38.7	8.0	35.4	39.4	40.5	28.8	60.2	
Not exposed	28.7	5.9	32.8	34.6	39.6	21.8	54.4	
<b>Women's autonomy</b>								
Low	38.9	8.5	37.7	41.5	43.2	30.4	61.3	
Medium	34.9	7.1	35.0	38.3	40.5	25.8	58.6	
High	25.6	5.1	29.7	30.6	37.1	19.0	51.0	
<b>Sex of the head of HH</b>								
Male	33.0	6.8	34.0	36.7	40.0	24.7	56.9	
Female	29.6	6.2	31.9	34.9	39.2	22.9	54.7	
<b>Religion of the head of HH</b>								
Hindu	32.8	7.0	34.0	36.6	40.2	25.2	56.9	
Muslim	34.7	5.9	33.6	38.1	38.7	23.2	57.0	
Others	27.7	5.8	31.9	31.4	38.8	19.3	53.1	
<b>Caste of the head of HH</b>								
Scheduled caste	34.5	7.3	34.6	38.3	41.1	26.0	58.3	
Scheduled tribe	40.2	11.2	40.1	41.3	45.9	28.7	63.4	
Other backward caste	34.0	7.6	36.7	40.3	44.7	26.7	62.2	
Others	28.7	4.9	29.3	31.0	33.9	20.8	49.5	
<b>Standard of living of HH</b>								
Low	36.8	9.1	38.1	42.2	45.0	29.1	62.7	
Medium	34.4	6.8	35.4	38.3	41.9	25.9	59.2	
High	22.3	3.0	23.3	23.1	27.3	14.1	41.2	
<b>Place of residence of HH</b>								
Urban	24.7	3.9	28.2	29.0	34.0	17.7	47.4	
Rural	35.6	7.8	35.9	39.2	42.1	27.0	60.0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>56.7</b>	

**Table 3: Percentage of ever married women who have been beaten or physically mistreated since age 15 and percentage beaten or physically mistreated in the past 12 months, according to states, India, 1998-99**

States	Beaten or physically mistreated since age 15	Beaten or physically mistreated since age 15 by			Beaten or physically mistreated in the past 12 months
		Husband	In-laws	Other persons	
Andhra Pradesh	23.2	21.2	2.8	2.1	12.8
Arunachal Pradesh	26.4	18.8	1.6	10.1	16.2
Assam	15.5	14.1	0.8	2.4	8.6
Bihar	26.6	24.9	2.4	3.1	18.5
Goa	17.9	13.9	2.4	4.0	6.4
Gujarat	10.1	8.6	0.9	1.6	5.8
Haryana	13.2	10.8	2.3	3.4	5.1
Himachal Pradesh	5.8	3.9	1.2	1.6	2.1
Jammu	22.0	15.4	4.8	7.2	9.3
Karnataka	21.5	19.7	1.1	2.4	9.9
Kerala	10.2	7.5	0.2	3.3	3.5
Madhya Pradesh	21.2	19.7	1.9	1.6	11.8
Maharashtra	18.1	16.7	2.0	2.2	7.3
Manipur	19.7	8.3	3.7	9.7	5.6
Meghalaya	31.1	2.8	0.9	28.9	9.6
Mizoram	20.1	11.5	0.0	9.6	9.5
Nagaland	19.0	12.8	0.7	7.9	15.2
New Delhi	14.1	9.8	1.1	5.1	7.6
Orissa	28.9	22.9	3.0	8.0	13.6
Punjab	13.7	11.7	1.3	4.4	6.4
Rajasthan	10.9	9.8	1.5	0.9	5.4
Sikkim	11.4	6.9	0.5	4.7	7.6
Tamil Nadu	40.4	36.0	0.5	9.0	16.1
Tripura	13.6	11.2	0.9	2.8	8.3
Uttar Pradesh	22.4	20.8	1.9	2.3	13.5
West Bengal	17.6	15.7	1.7	2.4	8.7
<b>India</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>11.0</b>

**Table 4: Percentage of ever married women who have been beaten or physically mistreated since age 15 and percentage beaten or physically mistreated in the past 12 months, according to selected background characteristics, India, 1998-99**

Socio demographic Characteristics	Beaten or physically mistreated since age 15	Beaten or physically mistreated since age 15 by			Beaten or physically mistreated in the past 12 months
		Husband	In-laws	Other persons	
<b>Age of woman</b>					
15-19	15.4	12.8	1.3	3.1	11.5
20-29	21.1	18.8	1.8	3.3	12.4
30-39	23.0	20.9	1.9	3.0	11.3
40-49	20.3	18.3	1.7	2.9	7.6
<b>Education of woman</b>					
Illiterate	25.0	23.3	2.1	2.6	14.0
Primary	23.3	20.5	1.9	3.9	10.7
Secondary	14.3	11.5	1.2	3.6	6.8
Higher	7.3	4.6	0.5	3.2	2.4
<b>Work status of woman</b>					
Not working	16.9	14.8	1.4	2.9	9.3
Agri. and HH activities	27.9	25.9	2.5	3.0	14.4
Non-agri. activities	26.1	23.1	2.0	4.3	12.2
<b>Age at first marriage</b>					
Up to 18	22.8	20.9	2.0	2.7	12.2
19-24	15.8	12.8	1.1	4.2	7.4
25 and above	11.6	8.1	0.6	4.7	4.8
<b>Marital duration</b>					
0-4	13.0	10.1	0.9	3.8	8.8
5-9	20.7	18.5	1.5	3.3	12.9
10 and above	23.0	21.2	1.9	2.7	11.6
Not currently married	27.4	24.2	4.2	4.2	6.8

**Cont. Table 4.**

<b>Sex of living children</b>					
No child	16.2	12.9	1.8	4.2	9.6
Sons only	20.5	18.2	1.6	3.4	11.3
Daughters only	20.3	17.9	1.6	3.5	11.0
Both	22.4	20.6	1.8	2.7	11.2
<b>Exposure to mass media</b>					
Exposed	24.0	22.3	2.0	2.6	13.9
Not exposed	19.0	16.5	1.6	3.4	9.0
<b>Women's autonomy</b>					
Low	21.5	19.7	2.0	2.6	12.9
Medium	20.9	18.7	1.8	2.9	11.7
High	20.7	18.2	1.5	3.8	8.7
<b>Sex of the head of HH</b>					
Male	20.9	18.8	1.7	3.1	11.3
Female	21.4	18.5	2.0	3.7	7.5
<b>Religion of the head of HH</b>					
Hindu	21.1	19.1	1.7	3.0	11.1
Muslim	21.2	19.1	2.1	2.9	11.4
Others	18.2	14.5	1.6	5.2	8.9
<b>Caste of the head of HH</b>					
Scheduled caste	27.4	25.1	2.2	3.4	15.4
Scheduled tribe	23.0	20.7	1.8	3.1	13.0
Other backward caste	23.0	20.7	1.7	3.6	11.6
Others	15.7	13.6	1.6	2.6	7.8
<b>Standard of living of HH</b>					
Low	29.1	26.9	2.2	3.4	16.6
Medium	20.1	17.9	1.8	3.1	10.1
High	10.1	7.8	1.0	2.7	4.0
<b>Place of residence of HH</b>					
Urban	16.8	14.2	1.5	3.6	7.7
Rural	22.5	20.4	1.8	2.9	12.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>11.0</b>

**Table 5: Variations in justifying a husband beating his wife and women's experience of beatings or physical mistreatment by background characteristics: Results of logistic regression analysis**

Predictor Variables	Agree with at least one reason	Beaten or physically mistreated	
	Exp (B)	Since age 15	In the last 12 months
		Exp (B)	Exp (B)
<b>Age of woman</b>			
15-19 ®			
20-29	0.94	1.156***	0.922
30-39	0.965	1.009	0.743***
40-49	0.91**	0.849***	0.496***
<b>Education of woman</b>			
Illiterate ®			
Primary	1.037***	1.057**	0.925**
Secondary	0.889***	0.798***	0.732***
Higher	0.553***	0.484***	0.333***
<b>Work status of woman</b>			
Not working ®			
Agri. and HH activities	1.689***	1.502***	1.332***
Non-agri. activities	1.379***	1.535***	1.365***
<b>Age at first marriage</b>			
Up to 18 ®			
19-24	0.872***	0.936***	0.901***
25 and above	0.822***	0.97	0.972
<b>Marital duration</b>			
0-4 ®			
5-9	1.009	1.468***	1.472***
10 and above	0.981	1.751***	1.585***
Not currently married	0.903**	2.247***	1.044

**Contd. Table 5.**

<b>Sex of living children</b>			
No child ®			
Sons only	1.067**	1.062	1.134***
Daughters only	1.129***	1.094**	1.118**
Both	1.151***	1.03	1.049
<b>Exposure to mass media</b>			
Exposed ®			
Not exposed	1.218***	1.188***	1.043
<b>Women's autonomy</b>			
Low ®			
Medium	0.892***	0.934***	0.92***
High	0.636***	0.928***	0.811***
<b>Sex of the head of HH</b>			
Male ®			
Female	0.976	0.846***	0.747***
<b>Religion of the head of HH</b>			
Hindu ®			
Muslim	1.566***	1.318***	1.275***
Others	1.495***	1.177***	1.156***
<b>Caste of the head of HH</b>			
Scheduled caste ®			
Scheduled tribe	1.584***	0.742***	0.729***
Other backward caste	1.298***	0.919***	0.855***
Others	0.937***	0.654***	0.636***
<b>Standard of living of HH</b>			
Low ®			
Medium	0.909***	0.657***	0.636***
High	0.571***	0.399***	0.354***
<b>Place of residence of HH</b>			
Urban ®			
Rural	1.159***	0.901***	0.924**
Constant	1.079**	0.24***	0.208***

\*\*\*P<=0.01, \*\*P<=0.05

Appendix 1:Standard of living Index			
Sl.No.	Variable	Categories	Scores
1	Type of house	Pucca	4
		Semi-pucca	2
		Kachha	0
2	Ownership of house	Yes	2
		No	0
3	Toilet facility	Own flush toilet	4
		Public/shared flush toilet	2
		Own pit toilet	2
		Public/shared pit toilet	1
4	Source of lighting	No facility	0
		Electricity	2
		Kerosene/gas/oil	1
5	Source of drinking water	Other source	0
		Pipe/hand pump/well in residence	2
		Public tap/ hand pump/well	1
6	Separate room for cooking	Other source	0
		Yes	1
7	Ownership of agricultural land	No	0
		5 acres or more	4
		2-4.9 acres	3
8	Ownership of irrigated land	Less than 2 acres/acreage not known	2
		No agricultural land	0
		Some irrigated land	2
9	Ownership of livestock	No irrigated land	0
		Yes	2
10	Fuel for cooking	No	0
		Electricity	2
		LPG/biogas	2
		Coal/Charcoal/Kerosene	1
11	Ownership of durable goods	Other fuel	0
		Car/tractor	4
		Moped/scooter/motorcycle/telephone/refrigerator/colour television	3
		Bicycle/electric fan/radio/transistor/sewing machine/Black and white television/water pump/bullock cart/thresher	2
		Mattress/pressure cooker/chair/cot/bed/table/clock/watch	1

**Appendix 2: Index of Women Autonomy**

Sl.No.	Variable	Categories	Scores
<b>(A)</b>	<b>Decision Making</b>		
1	What to Cook	1. Respondent 2. Husband 3. Jointly with husband 4. Others in household 5. Jointly with others in household	3 1 2 1 2
2	On obtaining health care	1. Respondent 2. Husband 3. Jointly with husband 4. Others in household 5. Jointly with others in household	3 1 2 1 2
3	To purchase Jewelry	1. Respondent 2. Husband 3. Jointly with husband 4. Others in household 5. Jointly with others in household	3 1 2 1 2
4	Staying with family	1. Respondent 2. Husband 3. Jointly with husband 4. Others in household 5. Jointly with others in household	3 1 2 1 2
<b>(B)</b>	<b>Permission needed</b>		
1	To go to market	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not allowed to go	3 2 1
2	To visit relatives or friends	0. No 1. Yes 2. Not allowed to go	3 2 1
<b>(C)</b>	<b>Access to money</b>		
1	Allowed to have money set aside	0. No 1. Yes	1 3