

PREVALENCE AND ASSOCIATED FACTOR OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE: A SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS OF PUNJAB, PAKISTAN

Aneesa Kafait^{*1}, Dr. Nazia Malik², Dr. Sana Ejaz³, Dr. Basharat Ali⁴

^{*1}Ph.D Scholar Department of Sociology, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

^{2,3,4}Assistant Professor Department of Sociology, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

¹anisawan68@gmail.com, ²naziamalik@gcuf.edu.pk, ³sanaejaz005@gmail.com, ⁴basharat492@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15049691>

Keywords

Intimate Partner Violence, Prevalence, Associated Factors, Situational Analysis

Article History

Received on 12 February 2025

Accepted on 12 March 2025

Published on 19 March 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Abstract

This study examines intimate partner violence (IPV) among women in Pakistan, aiming to identify leading factors and demographic characteristics of respondents who faced IPV. The study employed a quantitative approach, using structured interviews with 105 female respondents from Multan, Lahore, and Rawalpindi. Statistical findings revealed: no significant differences in social factors among women from rural, urban, and semi-urban areas ($p = .995$); no associations between IPV prevalence and respondents' or their husbands' employment status ($p = .191$, $p = .682$, respectively); and reliability coefficients of .65 for experience of IPV, .65 for health-related factors, .69 for social factors, and .69 for overall questionnaire reliability. The study highlights the role of systemic inequalities and entrenched gender norms in maintaining IPV, emphasizing the need for broader interventions targeting patriarchal norms. Findings challenge the notion that urbanization uniformly improves women's conditions, underscoring the importance of addressing structural inequalities and societal factors influencing IPV.

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence (IPV) remains a pressing social and public health issue worldwide, affecting millions of individuals across different socioeconomic and cultural contexts. It encompasses physical, emotional, psychological, and sexual abuse perpetrated by a current or former intimate partner. The World Health Organization (WHO) reports that nearly one in three women globally experiences some form of IPV in their lifetime (WHO, 2021). This alarming prevalence highlights the need for in-depth research to understand the underlying factors contributing to IPV, particularly in regions where cultural norms and gender roles significantly shape relationship dynamics.

Definition of the Intimate Partner Violence:

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is defined as any behavior within an intimate relationship that causes harm to a partner, whether in the form of physical, psychological, or sexual abuse. World Health Organization categorized IPV into three primary types: physical abuse, sexual abuse, and psychological abuse (Ewkes & Krug, 2002). Physical abuse involves the infliction of bodily harm, sexual abuse includes coercion or forced participation in sexual acts, and psychological abuse encompasses emotional manipulation, intimidation, and humiliation. Economic violence in intimate relationships involves strategic, manipulative tactics designed to limit a partner's financial independence and stability.

The objectives of the paper to explore demographic characteristics of respondents who faced intimate partner violence and to identify the leading factors associated with the prevalence of Intimate partner violence.

Global and national Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV):

Spousal abuse remains a significant issue affecting countless women worldwide. Studies estimate that nearly one in three (27%) women aged 15 to 49 have experienced physical or sexual violence at some point in their lives. The World Health Organization's (WHO) 2018 report revealed that high-income countries reported a 22% prevalence rate of domestic abuse against women. However, the frequency of IPV is substantially higher in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where gender inequality, lack of access to justice, and social stigmas often exacerbate the issue (Shaikh, 2023). According to the World Bank's 2021 estimates, the prevalence of domestic and spousal abuse in Sub-Saharan Africa stands at 33%. Meanwhile, South Asia records the highest rates of IPV, with an estimated lifetime prevalence of 35% among women.

Pakistan ranks 150th in the Women, Peace, and Security Index for 2023-24, with an overall score of 0.48. The country exhibits some of the highest levels of gender-based discrimination, particularly among men who restrict female family members from engaging in employment outside the home (Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace, and Security, 2023). Domestic violence continues to impact a significant portion of Pakistan's female population, with approximately 116 million women at risk. The PDHS 2017-18 findings reveal that nearly 23% of Pakistani women have experienced domestic abuse at some point in their lives. IPV prevalence is highest in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) at 56%, followed by Balochistan (48%) and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (43%). Conversely, Sindh reports the lowest IPV prevalence at 15% (Tazeen Saeed Ali et al., 2020).

Factors of Intimate Partner Violence:

Understanding the underlying causes and risk factors of intimate partner violence (IPV) is essential for developing effective strategies to combat it. IPV is a

deeply complex issue that cannot be attributed to a single cause; rather, it is influenced by a combination of individual, relational, community, and societal factors. The ecological model provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing IPV, emphasizing its multifaceted nature and how various levels of influence interact to shape violent behaviors (P. A. Ali & Gavino, 2008).

Causes Associated with Intimate Partner Violence:

Literacy and Education Research indicates that education plays a crucial role in rejecting the normalization of wife battering, with higher academic attainment correlating with lower acceptance of spousal abuse (Nadeem & Malik, 2021). Male-Dominated Society Pakistan's prevailing feudal culture, which is predominantly male-driven, significantly contributes to gender inequality (Taga, 2012). Despite Islam's emphasis on gender equality, societal norms continue to favor male dominance. Practices such as early and child marriages limit women's educational opportunities and personal freedoms, making them more vulnerable to domestic violence. Joint Family System: A newly married woman's primary relationship is typically with her mother-in-law, while the husband's primary relationship is with his father. This dynamic, combined with cultural expectations of female subservience, often leads to strained relationships between daughters-in-law and their mothers-in-law (Rew et al., 2013). Cultural and Religious Perspectives: South Asian societies differ significantly from Western perspectives regarding women's roles within families. Women are expected to be under strict control, particularly concerning their sexuality. Consequently, mothers-in-law often exercise significant authority over their daughters-in-law, reinforcing gender hierarchies (Rew et al., 2013). Psychosocial Challenges Married women in patriarchal households frequently experience psychosocial challenges, including stress, depression, low self-esteem, and emotional exhaustion due to excessive domestic responsibilities and family disputes (Mirza, 2017). Household and Childbearing Choices: In many South Asian homes, the mother-in-law exerts control over childbearing decisions, often limiting private discussions between spouses (Parveen Azam Ali et al., 2021). Fractured Relationships and IPV: Marital conflicts are prevalent in both joint and

nuclear family setups. However, interference from in-laws exacerbates tensions, increasing the risk of intimate partner violence (Ali et al., 2018). Violence by Mother-in-Law: Psychological and physical abuse by mothers-in-law is a common issue in South Asian communities. Conflicts over household chores and domestic responsibilities frequently escalate into verbal and physical violence, contributing to intimate partner violence (Bhandari & Hughes, 2017). Observing Parental Violence: Men who witness domestic violence during childhood are more likely to perpetrate IPV as adults. Early exposure to violence normalizes aggressive behaviors, reinforcing the belief that violence is an acceptable means of conflict resolution (Murshid & Critelli, 2020).

Lack of Social Support for Women: Women in South Asian marriages often experience social isolation, limiting their access to support networks. This isolation heightens their susceptibility to IPV, as they have fewer resources to seek help or escape abusive relationships (Kalokhe et al., 2017). Alcohol Abuse: Alcohol consumption is a strong predictor of IPV. It lowers inhibitions and heightens aggression, leading to increased physical, verbal, and sexual abuse. Additionally, wives of alcohol-dependent husbands experience heightened psychological distress (Fokukora et al., 2023). Multiple Wives or Partners: Polygamous marriages or extramarital relationships often result in IPV. Competition among co-wives can lead to manipulation and marital discord, further exacerbating abusive behaviors (Shinwari et al., 2022). Age Difference: Marriages with significant age gaps increase the risk of spousal abuse, as older husbands often adopt a paternalistic approach, exerting control over their younger wives (Navarro-Mantas et al., 2022). Religious and Cultural Rationales The practice of dowry is often justified through misinterpretations of religious teachings, despite lacking any endorsement in Islamic doctrine (Rehman et al., 2015). Legal Challenges and Criminal Justice Barriers: Victims of IPV frequently encounter significant legal hurdles, including delays in obtaining essential documentation, such as Medico-Legal Certificates, which are critical for prosecuting perpetrators (Hashim, 2016).

Material & Methods:

The universe of the study comprises victimized women residing in Dar ul Aman shelters across Punjab's three regions: South, Central, and North. These regions are represented by Multan, Lahore, and Rawalpindi, respectively. A cross-sectional design with repeated survey has been used to assess the prevalence and associated factors of intimate partner violence (IPV) over multiple time points. In each phase, data was collected from different respondents among the same population (women residing in Dar ul Aman shelters in Multan, Lahore, and Rawalpindi). Though the respondents vary in each phase, this design helps in capturing temporal variations in the IPV prevalence and associated factors across different periods. The questionnaire collects data on demographic, marital dynamics, experience of intimate partner violence, associated factors related to (health, social, economic, and psychological) factors associated with IPV. Time Points: Data will be collected quarterly over a 3-month period from July to September resulting in four waves of data collection. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria Women aged 16 and above residing in Dar ul Aman shelters at the time of the study. Women who married and have experienced any form of IPV (physical, emotional, sexual, psychological, and financial). Exclusion Criteria: Women who were not willing to participate in the study or were unable to provide informed consent due to psychological distress. Women who were living in Dar ul Aman but their cases not related to spousal partner violence also excluded. Women under the age of 16, and don't face IPV given the focus on adult IPV experiences. Sampling Strategy The study employs a purposive sampling strategy. Women who had directly experienced IPV and were seeking refuge at Dar ul Aman shelters were included in the sample. 41 were selected from Multan, 25 from Lahore and 39 from Rawalpindi. Structured face-to-face interviews were conducted with the selected women using a pre-tested, structured questionnaire. It included the following sections: Demographics, Types of IPV, Socioeconomic and Cultural Factors, General / Psychological Health, and Legal Awareness.

Inferential Analysis: To explore the differences and relationships between variables, inferential statistics were conducted. Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square

tests for independence were applied to explore the relationships/associations between variables where both variables were categorical. Additionally, One-way ANOVA was applied to explore the differences between variables where the dependent variable was continuous and the independent variable was categorical with more than two categories.

Results:

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents:

A total of 105 women were included in the study. More than half (54.3%) of the participating women

were in the age range of 21-30 years. The majority of them were still married (62.9%), a little less than half (46.7%) from the poorest socio-economic background, approximately half (48.6%) of the respondents had no formal education, and two-thirds (66.7%) were housewives. Almost half (49%) of the respondents' husbands had no formal education and slightly more than one-third (34.3%) were skilled labor. Most of the respondents (63.8%) were residing in a rural setting and half (49.5%) of them were living in a joint family system (Table 1).

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variables	Categories	f	%
Age	Less than 20	11	10.5
	21-25	34	32.4
	26-30	23	21.9
	31-35	15	14.3
	36-40	11	10.5
	Above 40	11	10.5
Marital Status	Married	66	62.9
	Separated	29	27.6
	Divorced	10	9.5
Socio-Economic Background	Poorest	49	46.7
	Poor	23	21.9
	Middle	6	5.7
	Rich	10	9.5
	Richest	17	16.2
Respondent's Education	Illiterate / No Education	51	48.6
	Primary	12	11.4
	Secondary	16	15.2
	Below Matric/ Matric	11	10.5
	Inter/FA	8	7.6
	Undergraduate	1	1.0
	Postgraduate	6	5.7
Husband's Education	Illiterate / No Education	49	46.7
	Primary	13	12.4
	Secondary	12	11.4
	Below Matric/ Matric	12	11.4
	Inter/FA	7	6.7
	Undergraduate	6	5.7
	Postgraduate	6	5.7
Respondent's Employment Status	Housewife	70	66.7
	Govt job	2	1.9
	Private Job	11	10.5
	Skilled Labor/ Labor	15	14.3

	Farm in Hands/ Agriculture worker	4	3.8
	Pensioner	3	2.9
Husband's Employment Status	Govt. job	2	1.9
	Private Job	18	17.1
	Skilled Labor/ Labor	36	34.3
	Farm in Hands/Agriculture worker	16	15.2
	Pensioner	2	1.9
	Self Employed	19	18.1
	Not Working	12	11.4
Family Type	Nuclear	46	43.8
	Joint Family	52	49.5
	Extended Family	7	6.7
Residence	Rural	67	63.8
	Urban	27	25.7
	Semi-Urban	11	10.5

Marital Dynamics of Respondents:

A majority of respondents (62.9%) had arranged marriage and 72.4% of marriages had a duration of 1-10 years. The age range of the majority (76.2%) of the respondents at the time of marriage was from less than

18 to 24, and the husbands' age ranges from 25 to above 30 (79.1%). A little less than one-third (32.4%) of the couple had an age difference of 6-10 years, 67.6% have children and 42.9% have 1-2 children (Table 2).

Table 2: Marital Dynamics of Respondents

Variables	Categories	f	%
Marriage Type	Arrange Marriage	66	62.9
	Love Marriage	28	26.7
	Forced Marriage	11	10.5
Duration of Marriage	1-5	40	38.1
	6-10	36	34.3
	11-15	13	12.4
	16-20	9	8.6
	21+	7	6.7
Age at First Marriage	Less than 18	37	35.2
	18-24	43	41.0
	25-29	16	15.2
	30+	9	8.6
Husband Age at First Marriage	Less than 18	2	1.9
	18-24	20	19.0
	25-29	43	41.0
	30+	40	38.1
Age Difference Between Spouses	Same Age	9	8.6
	Less than 5 years	33	31.4
	6-10 Years	34	32.4
	More than 10 years	29	27.6
Any children	Yes	71	67.6
	No	34	32.4

Total Number of Children	No Children	34	32.4
	1-2	45	42.9
	3-4	21	20.0
	5+	5	4.8

Association Between Demographic Characteristics of Respondents and Intimate Partner Violence

In the results of chi-square analysis, all forms of intimate partner violence (physical, emotional, sexual, and financial) were significantly more prevalent among women from the poorest socio-economic background, and it decreases as the socio-economic background improves. However, it also prevails among women from the richest socio-economic background. The findings show that there is no statistically significant association between socio-

economic background and prevalence of intimate partner violence ($p=0.909$, Table 3). The results also show that all forms of intimate partner violence prevail among couples where the respondent and the husband have no formal education, and it significantly decreases where both have a higher level of education. However, the findings show that there is no significant association between education and prevalence of intimate partner violence ($p=0.542$, Table 3).

Table 3: Association Between Demographic Characteristics of Respondents and Intimate Partner Violence

Variables	Intimate Partner Violence					Statistical Significance		
	PV	EV	SV	FV	All	Chi ²	Df	p
Socio-Economic Background						9.105	16	0.909
Poorest	6	2	5	6	30			
Poor	3	3	1	2	14			
Middle	1	0	0	1	4			
Rich	0	1	0	1	8			
Richest	2	2	1	0	12			
Respondent's Education						22.622	24	0.542
Illiterate / No Education	7	2	3	5	34			
Primary	1	1	0	1	9			
Secondary	1	3	0	2	10			
Below Matric/ Matric	2	1	0	1	7			
Inter/FA	0	0	2	1	5			
Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	1			
Postgraduate	1	1	2	0	2			
Husband's Education						30.941	24	0.155
Illiterate / No Education	4	3	3	6	33			
Primary	2	0	0	1	10			
Secondary	0	2	1	0	9			
Below Matric/ Matric	1	2	1	2	6			
Inter/FA	2	0	0	1	4			
Undergraduate	3	0	0	0	3			
Postgraduate	0	1	2	0	3			
Respondent's Employment Status						25.279	20	0.191
Housewife	7	4	4	6	49			
Govt job	1	0	0	0	1			
Private Job	1	1	2	0	7			
Skilled Labor/ Labor	2	2	1	2	8			

Farm in Hands/ Agriculture worker	0	1	0	0	3	20.267	24	0.682
Pensioner	1	0	0	2	0			
Husband's Employment Status								
Govt job	0	0	0	0	2			
Private Job	0	1	3	0	14			
Skilled Labor/ Labor	6	3	2	3	22			
Farm in Hands/ Agriculture worker	1	3	0	3	9	4.903	8	0.768
Pensioner	1	0	0	0	1			
Self Employed	3	1	1	2	12			
Not Working	1	0	1	2	8			
Family Type								
Nuclear	7	3	5	4	27			
Joint Family	4	4	2	5	37			
Extended Family	1	1	0	1	4			
Residence						15.045	8	0.058
Rural	9	5	4	3	46			
Urban	3	3	3	3	15			
Semi-Urban	0	0	0	4	7			

PV: Physical Violence, EV: Emotional Violence, SV: Sexual Violence, FV: Financial Violence

All forms of intimate partner violence tended to prevail among housewives, and were committed by their husbands who were in skilled labor. The findings of association analysis show that there is no significant association between respondent ($p=0.191$) and husband's ($p=0.682$) employment status and prevalence of intimate partner violence (Table 3). Moreover, findings show that the majority of the women from a joint family system (52) and living in rural areas (67) experienced all forms of intimate partner violence (Table 3). The findings reveal no significant association of intimate partner violence with family type ($p=0.768$) and residence ($p=0.058$).

Association between Leading Factors and Intimate Partner Violence:

Table 4 presents the association between leading factors and intimate partner violence. The findings reveal that the majority of women reported that non-supportive behavior of their families (61), neglecting household tasks (42), husband's dominance in decision-making (53), history of intimate partner violence (61), age difference (96), son preference (81), extra-marital affair (63), and arrange marriage are the leading factors (66) of intimate partner violence in their marriage.

Table 4: Association between Leading Factors and Intimate Partner Violence

Variables	Intimate Partner Violence					Statistical Significance		
	PV	EV	SV	FV	All	Chi ²	Df	p
Non-Supportive Behavior of Family						2.762	4	0.598
Yes	6	4	6	6	39			
No	6	4	1	4	29			
Respondents' Fertility Issues						4.954	4	0.292
Yes	4	1	0	1	9			
No	8	7	7	9	59			
Number of Spouses						4.329	4	0.363
First	9	5	7	7	56			
Second	3	3	0	3	12			
Neglecting Household Tasks						27.489	16	0.036
Strongly Disagree	4	0	3	1	6			
Disagree	1	2	3	1	10			
Neural	3	2	1	6	20			
Agree	4	2	0	0	25			
Strongly Agree	0	2	0	2	7			
Household Decision-Making						26.371	12	0.010
Husband Dominates	4	2	3	3	41			
Wife Dominates	0	0	0	0	9			
Makes Decisions Jointly	1	2	3	2	5			
In-laws Dominate	7	4	1	5	13			
Substance Abuse by Partner						2.825	4	0.587
Yes	1	0	1	0	9			
No	11	8	6	10	59			
History of Intimate Partner Violence						3.168	4	0.460
Yes	7	3	6	6	39			
No	5	5	1	4	29			
Age Difference						24.959	12	0.015
Same Age	1	2	2	3	1			
Less Than 5 Years	6	3	3	1	20			
6-10 Years	4	1	2	2	25			
More Than 10 Years	1	2	0	4	22			
Son Preference						3.390	4	0.495
Yes	8	7	6	6	54			
No	4	1	1	4	14			
Extra-Marital Affair						4.483	4	0.345
Yes	9	5	2	7	40			
No	3	3	5	3	28			
Marriage Type						11.830	8	0.159
Arranged Marriage	9	6	3	3	45			
Love Marriage	2	2	4	4	16			
Forced Marriage	1	0	0	3	7			

PV: Physical Violence, EV: Emotional Violence, SV: Sexual Violence, FV: Financial Violence

Table No. 4 shows the findings from chi-square analysis, which show a statistically significant association of intimate partner violence with neglecting household tasks ($p=0.036$), household decision-making ($p=0.010$), and age difference ($p=0.015$). However, findings show no association of intimate partner violence with non-supportive behavior of family ($p=0.598$), respondents' fertility issues ($p=0.292$), presence of multiple spouses ($p=0.363$), substance abuse by partner ($p=0.587$), history of intimate partner violence ($p=0.460$), son preference ($p=0.495$), extra-marital affair ($p=0.345$) and marriage type ($p=0.159$).

Discussion:

The findings from Research showed no statistically significant differences in social factors among women from rural, urban, and semi-urban areas ($p = .995$). This outcome aligns with studies like those by Mahadevan et al. (2019), which suggest that socio-cultural norms impacting women's social status may transcend geographical boundaries in many regions. Despite urbanization's perceived benefits, structural inequalities and deeply ingrained patriarchal norms may act as equalizing forces, limiting the variance in social factors based on location (Kabeer, 2011).

Similarly, analysis on household expenses and IPV prevalence also revealed no significant differences across income brackets ($p = .259$). These results contrast with theories suggesting that financial strain intensifies IPV risks (Anderberg et al., 2016). However, it is possible that IPV occurs irrespective of income levels, as noted by Garcia-Moreno et al. (2021), who emphasize that IPV is rooted more in power dynamics and cultural attitudes than in economic factors alone. This finding underscores the complexity of IPV and highlights the need to consider broader sociocultural variables beyond household expenses.

The Chi-Square tests further showed no associations between IPV prevalence and respondents' or their husbands' employment status ($p = .191$, $p = .682$, respectively). These findings challenge earlier studies, such as those by Heise et al. (2024), which linked unemployment to higher IPV rates. However, recent research by Jewkes et al. (2020) suggests that the

relationship between employment and IPV is mediated by other factors, such as gender norms, substance abuse, and marital power imbalances. These nuances were not fully captured in this study's quantitative framework.

Conclusion:

(IPV) remains a pervasive issue deeply entrenched in sociocultural norms and institutional structures. Women, particularly in patriarchal societies, are vulnerable to various forms of violence, including physical, emotional, financial, and sexual abuse, both within their homes and in public spaces. Findings from this study reveal the intricate ways in which cultural stigmatization normalizes IPV, silencing women and perpetuating cycles of violence regardless of socioeconomic or geographical distinctions. Many women endure abuse without resistance due to societal pressure, lack of awareness, or fear of reprisal, underscoring the role of systemic inequalities in maintaining this status quo.

The insights further highlight the dual burden faced by employed women, who, despite financial empowerment, often experience IPV as a backlash to shifts in traditional gender roles. This dynamic exposes the limitations of economic empowerment alone in addressing IPV, emphasizing the need for broader interventions targeting entrenched gender norms. Additionally, findings challenge the notion that urbanization uniformly improves women's conditions, as structural inequalities and patriarchal norms remain persistent across rural, urban, and semi-urban settings.

Addressing IPV requires more than legal reforms; it demands societal shifts, education, and robust support systems to empower women and dismantle the structures enabling violence. These findings underscore the importance of a holistic approach to IPV, combining cultural, legal, and psychological interventions to create lasting change.

Recommendations:

1. Awareness Campaigns: Public awareness programs should be launched to educate communities about intimate partner violence (IPV) and its detrimental effects on individuals and society. Social media, community workshops, and digital tools can be effectively utilized to spread awareness.

2. Education and Training: Integrate lessons on gender equality, respect, and violence prevention into school and college curricula to foster a culture of non-violence from a young age.

3. Empowerment Programs: Initiate women's empowerment initiatives focusing on financial independence, self-defense training, and emotional resilience.

4. Legal Framework: Strengthen and implement comprehensive legal frameworks addressing IPV, ensuring swift action and stringent penalties for offenders.

5. Support Services: Develop a network of crisis centers equipped with medical, legal, and psychological support services for survivors. These centers should be staffed with trained professionals, including female officers.

6. Helplines and Emergency Services: Establish 24/7 helplines and mobile units to assist victims in crisis situations.

7. National Policy on IPV: Formulate a comprehensive national policy focusing on IPV prevention, victim support, and societal transformation.

REFERENCES:

Ali, P. A., & Gavino, M. I. (2008). Violence against women in Pakistan: A framework for analysis. *Journal of Pakistan Medical Association*, 58(4), 198-203.

Ali, P. A., Rew, M., & Gavino, M. I. B. (2018). Violence against women: A case against patriarchal interpretations of Islam. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 24(1), 7-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2018.1429436>

Bhandari, S., & Hughes, M. (2017). Mother-in-law violence and intimate partner violence in Nepal: A qualitative study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(20), 3157-3180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515596337>

Ewkes, R., & Krug, E. (2002). Violence by intimate partners. *World Report on Violence and Health*, 89-121.

Fokukora, A., Nyame, A., & Bawa, A. (2023). Alcohol consumption and intimate partner violence: Evidence from Ghana. *BMC Public Health*, 23(1), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15057-y>

Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace, and Security. (2023). *Women, Peace, and Security Index 2023-24*. Georgetown University.

Hashim, S. (2016). Barriers to seeking justice: Medico-legal challenges for IPV victims in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Issues*, 5(1), 12-24.

Kalokhe, A. S., del Rio, C., Dunkle, K., Stephenson, R., Metheny, N., Paranjape, A., & Sahay, S. (2017). Domestic violence against women in India: A systematic review of a decade of quantitative studies. *Global Public Health*, 12(4), 498-513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2015.1123743>

Mirza, M. (2017). Women's psychosocial challenges in patriarchal households: Stress and emotional exhaustion. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 5(2), 134-156.

Murshid, N. S., & Critelli, F. (2020). Witnessing parental violence and perpetration of intimate partner violence: The mediating role of childhood trauma in Bangladesh. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 108, 104648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2020.104648>

Nadeem, S., & Malik, M. (2021). The role of education in rejecting wife battering in Pakistan. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 30(2), 165-182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2021.1890657>

Navarro-Mantas, L., López-Ossorio, J. J., González-Álvarez, J. L., & Loinaz, I. (2022). Age difference and intimate partner violence: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 67, 101715. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2022.101715>

- Parveen Azam Ali, M. H., & Nisar, N. (2021). Maternal-in-law dominance and reproductive autonomy: Exploring cultural and social determinants. *Women's Health Journal*, 11(3), 44-59.
- Rehman, A., Jabeen, S., & Syed, A. (2015). Dowry system and women's vulnerability in Pakistan: Religious and cultural perspectives. *Pakistan Journal of Gender & Social Justice*, 3(2), 99-116.
- Rew, M., Gangoli, G., & Gill, A. (2013). Violence between women in South Asian communities: A study on mother-in-law and daughter-in-law abuse. *Feminist Review*, 105(1), 124-136. <https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2013.3>
- Shaikh, A. (2023). Gender-based violence in South Asia: An analysis of intimate partner violence prevalence and socio-cultural determinants. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, 19(4), 230-256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2023.1987056>
- Shinwari, S., Ullah, A., & Yousaf, F. (2022). The impact of polygamy on intimate partner violence in Pakistan. *Journal of Family Violence*, 37(2), 354-370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-022-00322-1>
- Taga, A. (2012). Male dominance and feudal culture: The persistent challenge for women in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies*, 9(1), 79-101.
- Tazeen Saeed Ali, Karmaliani, R., McFarlane, J., & Somani, R. (2020). Intimate partner violence in Pakistan: A qualitative review. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 66(4), 392-402.
- World Bank. (2021). Prevalence of domestic violence in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Washington, DC.
- World Health Organization. (2018). Global estimates of intimate partner violence prevalence. WHO Press.
- World Health Organization. (2021). Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018. WHO Press..

